

# FIP Workplan of the Indian Ocean tuna - longline (FCF) fishery against the Marine Stewardship Council Fisheries Standard

**Confidential Report**  
**Version 2.0**

*Prepared by*

**by Tom Evans - KangTai**  
**April 2025**



KT Asia Co Ltd. (KangTai)  
Tom Evans: t.evans@keytraceability.com  
22nd F.-5, N0.56 Minsheng 1st Road, Xinxing  
District, Kaohsiung City, 800304 Taiwan  
(R.O.C.)

*Project ref. KTA01*

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Overview of MSC Pre-assessment Results.....	4
Introduction to the FIP Workplan.....	4
Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks.....	5
Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts .....	9
Principle 3: Effective management.....	12
Actions by Priority.....	27
Budget.....	28
Glossary.....	29
Appendix A – Scoring of the Indian Ocean tuna - longline (FCF).....	30

## Introduction

The Indian Ocean tuna - longline (FCF) fishery targets albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*), bigeye (*T. obesus*) and yellowfin (*T. albacares*). The pelagic longline vessels are flagged to China, Taiwan, Malaysia, Seychelles and Oman and fish on the high seas of the Indian Ocean and within the EEZ's of Mauritius, Seychelles, and Madagascar. The fishery is managed regionally by the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC).

Table 1 - Number of vessels by flag included in the FIP

Flag	Number of Vessels
China	29
Taiwan	183
Malaysia	10
Seychelles	25
Oman	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>251</b>

The fishery under assessment is within the scope of the MSC Fisheries Standard v2.01 and the Fisheries Certification Process v2.2 :

- 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 enhanced fishery as per the MSC FCP 7.4.6; and
- The fishery is not an introduced species-based fishery as per the MSC FCP 7.4.7.

Pelagic longline gear is used throughout the world's oceans to capture tuna and tuna-like species. Longline gear is typically deployed from a single vessel across many miles of ocean. The vessel deploys a single mainline that is periodically buoyed with floatation devices and thinner branch lines (with baited hooks) are then attached to the mainline between the floats. Within this simple framework, a variety of configurations and operational practices can be employed to specifically target different depths and species of pelagic fish. A single set by vessels (LOA <30m) in the client fleet usually consists of a mainline around 120km in length with the distance between floats being about 2.2nm, with 111 hooks per interval floats.

The fishery is within scope of the MSC Fisheries Standard. This report considers the following updated Unit(s) of Assessment as of June 2021 and according to the MSC Pre-assessment plus October 2021 addendum:

- Indian Ocean stocks of albacore caught by longline vessels flagged to China, Taiwan, Malaysia, Seychelles, and Oman that fish on the high seas of the Indian Ocean and within the EEZ's of Mauritius, Seychelles, and Madagascar, and are managed regionally by IOTC (FAO area 51/ 57)
- Indian Ocean stocks of bigeye caught by longline vessels flagged to China, Taiwan, Malaysia, Seychelles, and Oman that fish on the high seas of the Indian Ocean and within the EEZ's of Mauritius, Seychelles, and Madagascar, and are managed regionally by IOTC (FAO area 51/ 57)
- Indian Ocean stocks of yellowfin caught by longline vessels flagged to China, Taiwan, Malaysia, Seychelles, and Oman that fish on the high seas of the Indian Ocean and within the EEZ's of Mauritius, Seychelles, and Madagascar, and are managed regionally by IOTC (FAO area 51/ 57)

### Overview of MSC Pre-assessment Results

The pre-assessment only considered publicly available information and data and no site visits or consultations with stakeholders were carried out. Data was collected from the IOTC and FAO website and other publicly available studies. Additional information was obtained from existing MSC assessments.

In conclusion, there are several PIs in this assessment that would likely receive a “failure” score (<60) or conditions on an MSC full assessment and actions need to be taken to improve the scoring. **The plan to rectify these shortcomings is detailed in this report.**

### Introduction to the FIP Workplan

Based on the assessment, scoping document, and participant input, the fishery improvement project has developed this workplan with activities that will help it correct the deficiencies necessary to achieve its objectives. This addresses all the failing principles identified in the preassessment.

This workplan includes:

- **Objectives** - We recommend objectives focus on a time frame of five years (or less). Objectives will address all the fishery’s environmental challenges necessary to achieve a level of sustainability consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. We additionally recommend all fishery improvement projects work toward including traceability and addressing social issues as part of their objectives.
- **A list of actions** - Actions are major activities that must be completed to address the deficiencies identified in the need’s assessment/pre-assessment. A workplan may also include tasks, which break actions down into specific steps that describe how the action will be accomplished.
- **Responsible parties** - Organisations/people responsible for completing each action are identified.
- **Timeframes** - An estimate of the timeframe needed to complete each action and/or task (e.g., January 2022 – June 2022).
- **An associated budget** - At minimum, a budget includes a list of projected expenses and revenue sources for the FIP.

Kang Tai offer FIP coordination services in which we help to run the FIP by carrying out the actions listed below. Further to these actions, there are necessary FIP coordination tasks that need to be arranged that include but are not limited to elements such as hosting steering group and stakeholder meetings and updating the FIP website.

## Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>1.1 – Stock Status and Rebuilding for Indian Ocean Yellowfin and bigeye Tuna</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	There is evidence of YFT and BET stock rebuilding within a specified timeframe and fishing mortality is reduced to achieve MSY.
<b>Action Description</b>	<p>The IOTC Working Party on Tropical Tunas (WPTT) conducts stock assessments for IO tuna ( ) every three years, with the most recent assessment conducted for YFT in 2018. The WPTT used a Stock Synthesis (version 3; SS3) model based on four types of data: catch, size frequency, tagging, and longline CPUE indices (IOTC 2018). The SS3 stock assessment produced similar though slightly more pessimistic results as compared to the 2015/2016 assessment. The assessment included sensitivity analyses of key parameters and uncertainty analysis. The stock assessment results suggested the stock is slightly overfished (SB2017/SBMSY = 0.83; 95% CI: 0.74-0.97), and that overfishing is occurring (F2017/FMSY =1.20; 95% CI: 1.00- 1.71)</p> <p>The latest BET assessment was in 2022 with two models being applied to the stock. Spawning biomass in 2021 was estimated to be 25% (80% CI: 23-27%) of the unfished levels and 90% (75- 105%) of the level that can support MSY. Fishing mortality was estimated at 1.43 (1.1-1.77) times the FMSY level. Considering the characterized uncertainty, the assessment indicates that SB2021 is below SBMSY and that F2021 is above FMSY (79%). On the weight-of-evidence available in 2022, the bigeye tuna stock is determined to be overfished and subject to overfishing.</p> <p>This action has two tasks associated with it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sla – a rebuilding timeframe is specified for the stock that is the shorter of 20 years or 2 times its generation time.</li> <li>2. Sib – There is evidence that the rebuilding strategies are rebuilding stocks, or it is likely based on simulation modelling, exploitation rates or previous performance that they will be able to rebuild the stock within the specified timeframe so that SG80 is met.</li> </ol> <p>The FIP must be able to meet these two scoring issues to enable a score of a pass. The FIP must advocate to the RFMO –in this case IOTC, to be able to provide evidence of YFT stock rebuilding within a specified timeframe and fishing mortality is reduced to achieve MSY.</p>
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	October 2027
<b>Priority</b>	High
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<p>Year 3: US\$ 2,500 for time collecting advocacy and developing positions, using these materials to lobby IOTC and relevant CPC delegations. Cost of attending IOTC meeting estimated at a further \$2,000 per year.</p> <p>Year 4: As per year 3 plus undertaking the stock status review/update, \$3,500.</p>

	Year 5: As per year 4
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP Participants, FIP Coordinator, IOTC, Flag states of FIP vessels
<b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b>	1.1.1, 1.1.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.1a: Lobby IOTC and flag states (CPCs) to support or directly conduct YFT and BET re-building scenarios.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP participants	Coastal states, NGOs, IOTC	November 2021	November 2023	
1.1b: Lobby IOTC and flag states (CPCs) for the adoption of robust, comprehensive rebuilding strategy developed to enable fishing to be at MSY levels within a reasonable timeframe.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP participants	Coastal states, NGOs, IOTC	November 2021	November 2023	
1.1c: Re-evaluation of the effectiveness of the re-building plan at end of FIP Yr. 3. Provide short-term technical assistance to IOTC. Fishing mortality (F) is $<F_{MSY}$	FIP co-ordinator, FIP participants	Coastal states, NGOs, IOTC	November 2023	October 2027	
1.1d: Annual review of YFT and BET stock status relative to reference points.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP participants	IOTC	November 2023	October 2027	

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>1.2 - Promote the development of a well-managed harvest strategy and harvest control rules (HCRs) for bigeye and yellowfin tuna species by the IOTC</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	There is a robust and precautionary harvest strategy in place for BET and YFT
<b>Action Description</b>	<p>The fishery should detail how the performance of the harvest strategy is currently monitored, reviewed and where necessary, amended in response to the status of the stock. A harvest strategy can then be developed from this review.</p> <p>This action has two tasks associated with it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To address Sla, explicit harvest strategies for BET and YFT are to be designed.</li> <li>2. To address Sib, a formal evaluation procedure for the harvest strategies is to be put in place for BET and YFT.</li> </ol>
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	October 2027
<b>Priority</b>	High
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<p>Year 3: There will be costs involved in this action related to coordinating and holding meetings. Further, it will be necessary to create related FIP white papers and engagement strategies. A budget of US\$10,000 per year is estimated to cover the necessary fees and expenses involved in undertaking this activity.</p> <p>Year 4: As per year 3</p> <p>Year 5: As per year 3</p>
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP Participants, FIP Coordinator, IOTC, Flag states of FIP vessels
<b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b>	1.2.1, 1.2.2

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

<p>1.2a. Ensure a holistic HCR development and implementation by engaging with relevant scientists and delegations or , existing advocacy activities such as the NGO Tuna Forum and ISSF. Further engagement with overlapping MSC fisheries (certified and in assessment) and overlapping FIPs.</p>	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants	Coastal states, NGOs, IOTC	January 2022	November 2023	
<p>1.2b: Engage with relevant delegation members with the following purpose:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 IOTC and within coastal States where the industry partners have links.</p>	FIP Participants	Coastal states, NGOs, FIP co-ordinator	March 2022	November 2023	
<p>1.2b: Promote best practice for harvest strategy development and implementation (adoption by IOTC). Promote through the CPCs a process of consultation to inform IOTC members about best practice for harvest strategy and stock rebuilding, so as to build consensus towards support of proposals of management measures.</p>	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal states, NGOs, IOTC	March 2022	November 2023	
<p>1.2c: Engage with IOTC scientists and CPC 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.</p>	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal states, NGOs, IOTC	March 2022	November 2023	
<p>1.2d: 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 latest stock 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.</p>	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants	Coastal states, NGOs, IOTC	September 2023	October 2027	

## Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>2.1 Primary, Secondary and ETP Species Outcome, Management, and Information</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	Ensure that all all species interacted with are considered and the fishery causes minimal harm to these species.
<b>Action Description</b>	<p>Due to the uncertainties highlighted in the pre-assessment and the needs of the FIP, one of the initial and immediate tasks is to obtain UoA logbook and observer data. This will be the first step to give an accurate score for ETP species PIs. The data will be collected in coordination with the vessel owners and relevant authorities. The data will be used to build a robust picture of the fishing mortality as well as species interactions and on which to base FIP activities related to attaining the MSC Standard. Should any additional data collection needs be identified then solutions to these (for example via EM) will be recommended and subsequently added to the workplan.</p> <p>Understanding the species encountered will then enable the FIP to build a ETP management plan to ensure best mitigation and handling practices are being used. This plan could include delivering skipper training etc. There will be some quantitative information through some logbook entries but particularly from observer records. Longline fisheries are historically poorly observed when compared with the purse seine operations and even more so on the high seas (although it should be noted that some CPCs are well-above the minimum 5% observer coverage for longline fleets, for example Fiji with 40% of fleet trips observed). At best there will be information adequate to support measures to manage ETP species, but no higher score can be awarded, especially without fishery-specific data for this assessment.</p>
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	October 2027
<b>Priority</b>	High
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<p>Year 3: US\$ 75,000</p> <p>Year 4: Further data analysis will need to be conducted in Year 2 around ETP species interaction and a budget of US\$ 25,000 is recommended.</p> <p>Year 5: Subsequently a budget of US\$ 5,000 is recommended to update and review data.</p>
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	Fishery, FIP coordinator, Fisheries consultant, NGOs
<b>MSC PIs Addressed by the Action</b>	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.3a: Use the vessel data and proxy data collected from action 2.1 to develop an ETP species mitigation and management plan, that will include but not be limited to policies including materials for onboard vessel best handling practices etc. procure any equipment needed (e.g., dip nets, line cutters etc.), engage in direct vessel operator/crew consultation if necessary.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP participants	NGO, fishery	January 2022	March 2022	
2.3b: Carry out RBF required to score ETP Pls	FIP co-ordinator, FIP participants	Fishery	March 2022	May 2022	
2.3c: Validate that shark finning is not taking place through a review of the observer data, combined with interviews with fisheries officials and flag states to provide sufficient certainty as to whether Additional shark finning is occurring or certify that it is not. policies and management strategies may be required if any softness is suspected.	FIP co-ordinator	NGO, fishery	May 2022	September 2024	
2.3d: Enhance awareness of best practices, safe handling, and release. Develop (using existing materials) and distribute species identification documents etc.	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery	September 2022	October 2027	
2.3e: Engage with IOTC Secretariate and flag states regarding improving the management of ETP species to develop complete management strategies.	FIP co-ordinator	RFMO, Coastal states	September 2022	October 2027	

2.3f: Improve observer coverage and data quality through different observer programme. development.	FIP co-ordinator	RFMO, Coastal states, fishery	September 2022	October 2027	
2.3g: Evaluate the utility of Electronic Monitoring (EM), through feasibility studies, to increase data quality and robustness. Make a recommendation on the implementation of EM to materially improve data on bycatch and discard based on cost/benefit principles (including next best options. Or counterfactuals).	FIP co-ordinator	RFMO, Coastal states, fishery	September 2022	October 2027	
2.3h: Develop an implementation plans of EM systems and reporting templates	FIP co-ordinator	RFMO, Coastal states, fishery	January 2023	October 2027	
2.3i: If necessary, carry out an Ecosystem Risk Assessment to determine if the fishery is having negative direct and indirect negative impacts and if so how to best address them.	FIP co-ordinator	External Fisheries Consultant	March 2023	October 2027	

### Principle 3: Effective management

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>3.1 Legal and/or customary framework for IOTC, Oman, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	To fully understand the Legal and/or customary fishery management framework for IOTC, Oman, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar and improve them to a level of PI 3.1.1 SG80 if necessary.
<b>Action Description</b>	No evidence could be found on its transparency nor effectiveness so an initial fact finding is required to understand the frameworks for the IOTC, Oman, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar, if not, advocacy must take place and evidence collected.
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	October 2027
<b>Priority</b>	Medium
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	Year 3: 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 (25k total) plus extra US\$ 5,000 if direct consultation is required.  Year 4: US\$ 3,000 if consultation is required  Year 5: US\$ 3,000 if consultation is required
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP Coordinator, FIP participants, National management bodies.
<b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b>	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 the IOTC, Oman, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar 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 (if	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	Ministry, fishery	January 2022	June 2022	

any) over the particular flag state. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary.					
3.1b: Conduct a review of customary fishery rights of the IOTC, Oman, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar 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 particular flag state. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary. Communication records should be kept.	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	Ministry, fishery	March 2022	June 2022	
3.1c: Developing proposals of dispute mechanism where absent in the IOTC, Oman, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar where absent, by consulting with stakeholders.. The proposal at a minimum shall include topics discussed, outcomes and appropriate timelines for implementation.	Ministries/FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co- ordinator, NGOs	June 2022	June 2023	
3.1d: Developing proposals for a mechanism to integrate and observe customary rights in the IOTC, Oman, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar into the management system where absent. The proposal at a minimum shall include topics discussed, outcomes and appropriate timelines for implementation.	Ministries/FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co- ordinator, NGOs	June 2022	June 2023	
3.1e: Ensure appropriate transparent and effective dispute resolution is present in the IOTC convention text, and Oman, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar legislation/regulations.	FIP co-ordinator	Ministry	December 2023	October 2027	
3.1f: Ensure appropriate dispute resolution and respect for rights is present in the IOTC convention text, and Oman, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar legislation/regulations.	FIP co-ordinator	Ministry	December 2023	October 2027	

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>3.2 Consultation, Roles and Responsibilities for IOTC, China, Seychelles, Mauritius, Malaysia, and Madagascar</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	Demonstrate that fishery management systems for the IOTC, China, Seychelles, Mauritius, Malaysia, and Madagascar meet the MSC Standard PI 3.1.2. Specifically, that it identifies and actively engages with all interested parties and all roles are understood.
<b>Action Description</b>	The pre-assessment did not find evidence on consultation, roles, and responsibilities for the IOTC, China, Seychelles, Mauritius, Malaysia, and Madagascar so the FIP will need to undertake initial fact finding to understand these details. At which point the workplan will need reviewing and advocacy tasks added to promote these additions to fishery management. High priority is Scoring Issue b across these flag states, consultation processes.
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	October 2027
<b>Priority</b>	Medium
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	Year 3: US\$ 5,000 Year 4: US\$ 2,500 Year 5: US\$ 2,500
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP coordinator, FIP participants, National management bodies.
<b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b>	3.1.2

<b>Tasks/ Milestones</b>	<b>Responsible (lead)</b>	<b>Responsible (supporting role)</b>	<b>Starting date</b>	<b>Expected completion date</b>	<b>Evidence of completion / results</b>
3.2a: Conduct investigation and review the degree to which all roles and responsibilities within the relevant fishery system are clearly defined. Consult with industry and other stakeholders to ascertain how well the functions and responsibilities are understood.	FIP co-ordinator, Fishery	National management authorities	January 2022	June 2022	
3.2b: Identify all relevant stakeholders to the fishery	FIP co-ordinator	National management	January 2022	June 2022	

		authorities, fishery			
3.2c: Ensure all agencies within the management framework are clearly identified and their roles are publicly transparent.	National management authorities	FIP co-ordinator	September 2022	June 2023	
3.2d: Lobby Fishery authorities to develop a procedure to meet the requirements mentioned in the rationale. This may focus on support of transparency and regularity of the consultation process directly, how output from these processes is inputted/considered in decisions related to domestic and regional management arrangements as well as wider engagement and representation in consultations.	National management authorities	FIP co-ordinator	January 2023	October 2027	
3.2e: Ensure that any/all relevant fishery management plan(s) clearly identifies which departments will undertake which roles in the fishery.	National management authorities	FIP co-ordinator	January 2023	October 2027	
3.2f: Review and comment on the efficacy of the consultation process.	FIP co-ordinator	National management authorities	January 2023	October 2027	

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>3.3 Long Term Objectives for Oman, China, and Mauritius</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	For the states identified, determine if they articulate explicit long-term objectives.
<b>Action Description</b>	Across the flag states long term objectives to guide decision-making, consistent with MSC fisheries standard and the precautionary approach, are implicit within management policy, SG60 is met. As they are not explicit, SG80 cannot be met. The FIP must work with the authorities to make the precautionary approach explicit in the decision-making process.
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	October 2027
<b>Priority</b>	Medium
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	Year 3: 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 following up with consultations and meetings for all flag states.  Year 4: US\$ 7,500  Year 5: US\$ 3,000
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	National management bodies.
<b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b>	3.1.3

<b>Tasks/ Milestones</b>	<b>Responsible (lead)</b>	<b>Responsible (supporting role)</b>	<b>Starting date</b>	<b>Expected completion date</b>	<b>Evidence of completion / results</b>
3.3a: Gathering documented long-term objectives in Oman, China, and Mauritius with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as appropriate.	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	National management authorities	January 2022	June 2023	
3.3b: Directly engage with national management authorities of Oman, China, and Mauritius and other key stakeholders to promote the concept of long-term objectives in relation to MSC stated objectives. A	National management authorities/ FIP	NGOs	March 2022	June 2023	

summary of topics discussed surrounding these objectives to be produced to demonstrate progress, including but not limited to a list of participants.	co-ordinator/ fishery				
3.3c: The stakeholder group shall meet to discuss progress and the formulation of objectives that were not in place.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	NGOs	June 2022 and June 2023	June 2023	
3.3d: Embed the identified and agreed, explicit long-term objectives into a tuna management plan.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	NGOs	January 2024	October 2027	
3.3e: Review and report on appropriateness of the objectives implemented and amend as appropriate.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	Fishery	June 2024	October 2027	

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>3.4 Fishery specific objectives for China, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	Identify short- and long-term objectives, which are consistent with achieving the outcomes expressed by MSC's Principles 1 and 2 and are explicit within the fishery-specific (longline) management systems of China, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar.
<b>Action Description</b>	Evidence could not be found that there were short- and long-term objectives explicitly outlined in the fishery-specific management systems of China, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar. This could be an artifact of the pre-assessment that was conducted, which led to precautionary scoring against the MSC Fisheries Standard. Given we have no information about objectives that may exist at UoA level, only SG60 can be met (some objectives are only implicit).
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	October 2027
<b>Priority</b>	High
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	Year 3: US\$ 3,500 Year 2: US\$ 1,000 Year 5: US\$ 1,000
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	National management bodies.
<b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b>	3.2.1

<b>Tasks/ Milestones</b>	<b>Responsible (lead)</b>	<b>Responsible (supporting role)</b>	<b>Starting date</b>	<b>Expected completion date</b>	<b>Evidence of completion / results</b>
3.4a: Conduct a review of fishery specific (longline) management legislation of China, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as appropriate.	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	National management authorities	January 2022	June 2023	
3.4b: Engage with national management authorities of China, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar and other key stakeholders to promote the concept of a	National management authorities/ FIP	NGOs	July 2022	June 2023	

specific fisheries (longline) management plan for tuna fisheries. A summary of topics discussed surrounding these objectives to be produced to demonstrate progress, including but not limited to a list of participants.	co-ordinator/ fishery				
3.4c: The stakeholder group shall meet to discuss progress and formulation of tuna management plan if there is not one in place.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	NGOs	January 2023	November 2023	
3.4d: Promote the production of a tuna management plan for China, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar which explicitly lists the short- and long-term objectives that have been discussed and agreed during meetings with stakeholders.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	NGOs	January 2024	October 2027	
3.4e: Review appropriateness of tuna management plan implemented and advocate for amendments as appropriate.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator	Fishery	June 2024	October 2027	

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>3.5 Decision-making processes for the IOTC, Malaysia, Oman, China, Taiwan, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	<p>To ensure that decision-making processes for the IOTC, Malaysia, Oman, China, Taiwan, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar respond to serious and other important issues identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation, and consultation, in a transparent, timely and adaptive manner and take account of the wider implications of decisions (S1b).</p> <p>Due primarily to limited information on the management process, we are unable to determine if the precautionary approach to be applied in this fishery.</p> <p>For S1d, again the remote nature of this assessment meant it could not be determined whether information on the fishery's performance is available upon request and the management system is attempting to comply in a timely manner with judicial decisions. SG60 was not met for S1d.</p>
<b>Action Description</b>	The action potentially covers four scoring issues from PI 3.2.2. This could be a product of the remote pre-assessment that was conducted, which led to precautionary scoring against the MSC Fisheries Standard.
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	October 2027
<b>Priority</b>	High
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<p>Year 3: The review and reporting would need to be conducted by a qualified team and it is estimated that this could involve US\$ 20,000 of fees. If an in-person engagement is necessary then these expenses would be extra, a budget of \$3,000 per country would be recommended.</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 5,000 plus expenses if in-person meeting is necessary</p> <p>Year 5: US\$ 2,500</p>
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP consultant, FIP participants, national management bodies.
<b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b>	3.2.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.5a: Conduct review of decision-making processes in the IOTC, Malaysia, Oman, China, Taiwan, Seychelles,	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant		January 2022	January 2023	

<p>Mauritius, and Madagascar to better understand gaps identified in pre-assessment. The reviews should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the decision-making process transparent, timely &amp; evidence-based?</li> <li>2. Does the decision-making processes respond to serious and other important issues identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation, and consultation?</li> <li>3. Does it include the precautionary approach and use of best science available?</li> <li>4. Does it include input from management authorities and other relevant stakeholders?</li> <li>5. If there are/have been any legal challenges and how these have been addressed by the management system and/or fishery?</li> </ol> <p>A report will 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 plan. The process shall include, if necessary, how will information be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Included (from research, monitoring, evaluation, and consultation).</li> <li>2. Stakeholders be consulted.</li> <li>3. Support that the best-available information to ensure the precautionary approach</li> <li>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</li> </ol>	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2022	June 2023	

<p>research, monitoring evaluation and review activity).</p> <p>5. Process for addressing legal challenges if necessary.</p> <p>6. Precautionary approach is encompassed as a key element of the management plan.</p>					
<p>3.5c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to incorporate above identified elements into decision-making processes. Multiple consultations may need to be held to fully address this action item.</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>December 2022</p>	<p>June 2023</p>	
<p>3.5d: Implement the decision-making process, ensuring stakeholders are consulted and informed (for example via email, website, formal report etc.) best-available information (from other RFMOs, research etc.) and that the precautionary approach is included.</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>March 2023</p>	<p>October 2027</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>January 2024</p>	<p>October 2027</p>	

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>3.6 Compliance and enforcement for the IOTC, Malaysia, Oman, China, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	Have sufficient evidence to conclude that sanctions are consistently applied and provide an effective deterrence.
<b>Action Description</b>	Based on the information available, document that sanctions to deal with non-compliance exist and there is some evidence that they are applied, SG60 requirements are therefore met. However, there is not sufficient evidence to conclude they are consistently applied and provide an effective deterrence. The FIP will need to provide this evidence and if lacking, work with authorities to improve enforcement.
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	October 2027
<b>Priority</b>	High
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	Year 3: US\$ 7,500 Year 4: US\$ 7,500 Year 5: US\$ 1,000
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	National management bodies.
<b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b>	3.2.3

<b>Tasks/ Milestones</b>	<b>Responsible (lead)</b>	<b>Responsible (supporting role)</b>	<b>Starting date</b>	<b>Expected completion date</b>	<b>Evidence of completion / results</b>
3.6a: Review MCS systems in place in the fisheries. This should include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MCS plans and strategies.</li> <li>2. Information on MCS mechanisms in place (VMS, logbooks, landed catch documentation etc.).</li> <li>3. Interviews with enforcement personnel.</li> <li>4. Records of previous infringements, penalties, sanctions and/or court proceedings.</li> </ol>	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	Fishery	January 2022	January 2023	

<p>5. Review any previous reviews or evaluations of MCS systems.</p> <p>A report will be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>					
3.6b: Develop plan to combat the gaps identified in the national MCS systems based on findings of the above report.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2022	November 2023	
3.6c: Develop plan to promote IOTC MCS measures to be more comprehensive.	National management bodies	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2022	November 2023	
3.6d: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to discuss implementation and potential adjustments to plan. Meeting minutes should be produced at a minimum in a timely fashion after each consultation to allow topics, actions, opinions, difficulties, and progress to be recorded and monitored for all affect parties.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	December 2022	November 2023	
3.6e: 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	March 2023	November 2023	
3.6f: Review effectiveness of MCS system implemented and adjust as appropriate. A report will be produced and supplied to stakeholders and consultations re-opened if necessary.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2024	October 2027	

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>3.7 Management Performance Evaluation Oman, China, Taiwan, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	The fishery-specific management systems of Oman, China, Taiwan, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar are subject to regular internal and occasional external review.
<b>Action Description</b>	<p>The management system has internal processes to evaluate management performance. These include evaluations of policy, research, operations, compliance, and enforcement. These are carried out on a regular basis. SG80 is therefore met for SIa.</p> <p>In the absence of information regarding external reviews SG80 cannot be met for SIb. The action covers one scoring issue from PI 3.2.4. This could be a product of the remote pre-assessment that was conducted, which led to precautionary scoring against the MSC Fisheries Standard (SIb).</p>
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	October 2027
<b>Priority</b>	High
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<p>Year 3: US\$ 4,000</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 4,000</p> <p>Year 5: US\$ 2,000</p>
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP consultant, National management bodies.
<b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b>	3.2.4

<b>Tasks/ Milestones</b>	<b>Responsible (lead)</b>	<b>Responsible (supporting role)</b>	<b>Starting date</b>	<b>Expected completion date</b>	<b>Evidence of completion / results</b>
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 (e.g., tuna management plan, performance, decision-making, MCS, compliance to RFMO/international regulations etc.) and the frequency to which these reviews occur.	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	Fishery authority	January 2022	November 2023	

<p>Provide comment as to the degree to which reviews have led to change within each respective / cognizant organization.</p> <p>A report will be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>					
3.7b: Develop plan to correct for 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 2022	November 2023	
3.7c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to discuss implementation and potential adjustments to plan. At a minimum meeting minutes should be produced after each consultation in a timely fashion 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 2022	November 2023	
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	November 2023	
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	October 2027	

## Actions by Priority

**Table 2 - High Priority actions for the Indian Ocean tuna - longline (FCF)**

Action Number and Name		Priority	PI Addressed
1.1	Stock Status and Rebuilding for Indian Ocean Yellowfin Tuna	High	1.1.1, 1.1.2
1.2	Promote the development of a well-managed harvest strategy and harvest control rules (HCRs) for BET and YFT by the IOTC	High	1.2.1, 1.2.2
3.4	Fishery specific objectives for China, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar	High	3.2.1
3.5	Decision-making processes for the IOTC, Malaysia, Oman, China, Taiwan, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar	High	3.2.2
3.6	Compliance and enforcement for the IOTC, Malaysia, Oman, China, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar	High	3.2.3
3.7	Management Performance Evaluation for Oman, China, Taiwan, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar	High	3.2.4

*Note due to many actions being collated with different species and flags, the highest priority was marked as the priority.*

**Table 3 – Medium Priority actions for the Indian Ocean tuna - longline (FCF)**

Action Number and Name		Priority	PI Addressed
3.1	Legal and/or customary framework for the IOTC, Oman, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar	Medium	3.1.1
3.2	Consultation, Roles and Responsibilities for the IOTC, China, Seychelles, Mauritius, Malaysia, and Madagascar	Medium	3.1.2
3.3	Long Term Objectives for Oman, China, and Mauritius	Medium	3.1.3

## Budget

The below table lays out the budget as suggested in this workplan including fees and expenses involved. It should be noted that the costs of increasing observer coverage (including electronic monitoring) are not included in these estimates.

**Table 4 - Budget for the Indian Ocean tuna - longline (FCF)**

Action Number and Name		Year 3 (US\$)	Year 4 (US\$)	Year 5 (US\$)	Total (US\$)
<i>FIP Coordination</i>		39,000	27,000	27,000	93,000
1.1	Stock Status and Rebuilding for Indian Ocean YFT	4,500	7,500	7,500	19,500
1.2	Promote the development of a well-managed harvest strategy and harvest control rules (HCRs) for BET & YFT by the IOTC	10,000	10,000	10,000	30,000
2.1	ETP Species Outcome, Management, and Information	75,000	25,000	5,000	105,000
3.1	Legal and/or customary framework for the IOTC, Oman, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar	30,000	3,000	3,000	36,000
3.2	Consultation, Roles and Responsibilities for the IOTC, China, Seychelles, Mauritius, Malaysia, and Madagascar	5,000	2,500	2,500	10,000
3.3	Long Term Objectives for Oman, China, and Mauritius	10,000	7,500	3,000	20,500
3.4	Fishery specific objectives for China, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar	3,500	1,000	1,000	5,500
3.5	Decision-making processes for the IOTC, Malaysia, Oman, China, Taiwan, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar	20,000	5,000	2,500	27,500
3.6	Compliance and enforcement review for the IOTC, Malaysia, Oman, China, Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar	7,500	7,500	1,000	16,000
3.7	Management Performance Evaluation for Oman, China, Taiwan, Seychelles, and Mauritius, Madagascar	4,000	4,000	2,000	10,000
<b>Total (US\$)</b>		<b>208,500</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>64,500</b>	<b>373,000</b>

## Glossary

**Pre-assessment:** A pre-assessment is a preliminary evaluation of a fishery against all MSC performance indicators to provide a picture of the fishery's baseline environmental performance and challenges. A pre-assessment allows a fishery to identify any areas that need to be improved to reach an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. A pre-assessment must be completed by someone experienced with applying the MSC standard (e.g., is a [registered MSC technical consultant](#) or [accredited auditing body](#)).

**Basic FIP:** A fishery improvement project with time bound objectives for addressing a specific set of the fishery's environmental challenges to improve its performance against the MSC standard. Basic FIPs complete a needs assessment to understand the challenges in the fishery.

**Comprehensive FIP:** A fishery improvement project with time bound objectives for addressing all the fishery's environmental challenges necessary to achieve a level of performance consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. Comprehensive FIPs engage a party experienced with applying the MSC standard to complete an MSC pre-assessment to understand the challenges in the fishery and must have independent, in-person audits of progress against the MSC standard every three years.

**Performance indicator:** A performance indicator evaluates the success of a particular activity when compare against desired goals. In the case of FIPs that follow the MSC Standard, it measures the impact of the action in place against desired conditions or results.

## Appendix A – Scoring of the Indian Ocean tuna - longline (FCF)

**Table 5 - Principle 1 list of Scoring for the Indian Ocean tuna - longline (FCF)**

Component	PI	Performance Indicator	Albacore	Bigeye	Yellowfin
Outcome	1.1.1	Stock Status			
	1.1.2	Stock Rebuilding	N/A	N/A	
Management	1.2.1	Harvest Strategy			
	1.2.2	HCR and Tools			
	1.2.3	Information and Monitoring			
	1.2.4	Assessment of Stock Status			

### Key

Pass without conditions	
Pass with conditions	
Fail	

N/A – Not Applicable

Table 6 - Principle 2 list of scoring for the Indian Ocean tuna - longline (FCF)

Principle 2 – Minimising Environmental Impacts			
<b>Primary Species</b>	2.1.1	Outcome	Yellow
	2.1.2	Management	Yellow
	2.1.3	Information	Green
<b>Secondary Species</b>	2.2.1	Outcome	Yellow
	2.2.2	Management	Red
	2.2.3	Information	Red
<b>ETP Species</b>	2.3.1	Outcome	Red
	2.3.2	Management	Red
	2.3.3	Information	Red
<b>Habitats</b>	2.4.1	Outcome	Green
	2.4.2	Management	Green
	2.4.3	Information	Green
<b>Ecosystem</b>	2.5.1	Outcome	Green
	2.5.2	Management	Yellow
	2.5.3	Information	Yellow

Table 7 - Principle 3 list of scoring for the Indian Ocean tuna - longline (FCF)

Principle 3 – Effective Management			IOTC	China	Taiwan	Malaysia	Seychelles	Oman	Mauritius	Madagascar
Governance and Policy	3.1.1	Legal and Customary Framework								
	3.1.2	Consultation, Roles & Responsibilities								
	3.1.3	Long Term Objectives								
Fishery Specific Management System	3.2.1	Fishery Specific Objectives				NA		NA		
	3.2.2	Decision Making Process								
	3.2.3	Compliance and Enforcement								
	3.2.4	Management Performance Evaluation								