

Action Plan for the Pacific Ocean LL Tuna FIP (Cheng Hung Seafood Frozen Produce Co., Ltd.) Fishery

Confidential Report

Version 2.2

Prepared by

first drafted by Kang Tai, June 2022
*updated by Ocean Outcomes, **December 2025***

Contents

Introduction	3
Overview of Preassessment Results	6
Introduction to FIP Workplan	7
Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks	8
Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts	18
Principle 3: Effective management	21
Actions By Priority	30
Budget	31
Glossary	32
Appendix A – Scoring of the Pacific Ocean LL Tuna FIP (Cheng Hung Seafood Frozen Produce Co., Ltd.) fishery	33

Introduction

The fishery being assessed is the Pacific Ocean LL Tuna FIP (Cheng Hung Seafood Frozen Produce Co., Ltd.) fishery. The fishery targets albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*), bigeye (*T. obesus*), yellowfin (*T. albacares*) and skipjack (*Katsuwonus pelamis*) tuna. The longline vessels are flagged to Taiwan and fish on the high seas (and occasionally in the national Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of the Solomon Islands). The fishery is managed regionally by the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) and by the Inter American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) in the Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO).

The report uses the MSC Fisheries Standard v2.01, the Fisheries Certification Process v2.2 and MSC pre-assessment reporting template v3.1):

- 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 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 fish. A single set by vessels in the client fleet usually consists of a mainline around 135 - 150km in length with ca. 20 - 50 m long branch lines attached at intervals along the length of the line. The distance between floats is about 1km, with about 17 - 30 hooks between floats. The depth of main line ranges between 220 – 260 metres in the water column. The use of circle hooks is encouraged by ICCAT but not mandatory, to reduce the catch of marine turtles and other bycatch such as Atlantic sailfish, white and blue marlin.

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

- North Pacific stocks of albacore fished in western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) and eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO), and Taiwan flagged vessels and managed jointly by WCPFC and IATTC (high seas) and in the EEZ of the Solomon Islands.
- South Pacific stocks of albacore fished in western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) and eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) by Taiwan flagged vessels and managed jointly by WCPFC and IATTC (high seas) and in the EEZ of the Solomon Islands.
- Western and central Pacific bigeye fished in the western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) by, and Taiwan flagged vessels and managed jointly by WCPFC and IATTC (high seas).
- Eastern Pacific bigeye fished in the eastern Pacific Ocean (WCPO) by, and Taiwan flagged vessels and managed jointly by WCPFC and IATTC (high seas) and in the EEZ of and the Solomon Islands.
- Western and central Pacific yellowfin fished in the western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) by, and Taiwan flagged vessels and managed jointly by WCPFC and IATTC (high seas) and in the EEZ of and the Solomon Islands.
- Eastern Pacific yellowfin fished in the eastern Pacific Ocean (WCPO) by, and Taiwan flagged vessels and managed jointly by WCPFC and IATTC (high seas) and in the EEZ of and the Solomon Islands.

Table 1 - Unit(s) of Assessment (UoA)

UoA 1-4	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Albacore
Stock	North Pacific
Geographical area	Western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) and eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) by Taiwan flagged vessels and managed jointly by WCPFC and IATTC (high seas) and in the EEZ of the Solomon Islands.
Fishing method or gear type	Longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Cheng Hung Fleet
UoA 5-8	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Albacore
Stock	South Pacific
Geographical area	Western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) and eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) by Taiwan flagged vessels and managed jointly by WCPFC and IATTC (high seas) and in the EEZ of and the Solomon Islands.
Fishing method or gear type	Longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Cheng Hung Fleet
UoA 9-12	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Bigeye
Stock	WCPO
Geographical area	Taiwan flagged vessels and managed jointly by WCPFC and IATTC (high seas).
Fishing method or gear type	Longline

Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Cheng Hung Fleet
UoA 13-16	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Bigeye
Stock	EPO
Geographical area	Taiwan flagged vessels and managed jointly by WCPFC and IATTC (high seas) and in the EEZ of the Solomon Islands.
Fishing method or gear type	Longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Cheng Hung Fleet
UoA 17-20	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Yellowfin
Stock	WCPO
Geographical area	Taiwan flagged vessels and managed jointly by WCPFC and IATTC (high seas) and in the EEZ of the Solomon Islands.
Fishing method or gear type	Longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Cheng Hung Fleet
UoA 21-24	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Yellowfin
Stock	EPO
Geographical area	Taiwan flagged vessels and managed jointly by WCPFC and IATTC (high seas) and in the EEZ of the Solomon Islands.
Fishing method or gear type	Longline

Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Cheng Hung Fleet
---	------------------

Overview of Preassessment Results

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

Overall, all stocks except EPO bigeye and yellowfin tuna would pass Principle 1 due to too many conditional passes, with two conditions per stock, except North Pacific (NP) albacore that has one. All stocks are well above the Point of Recruitment Impairment (PRI) and fluctuating around F_{MSY} and are not likely to be subject to overfishing. However, the continued lack of HCRs for tuna species continues to be the main issue for P1.

For Principle 2, primary and secondary species score well. All primary species are thought to be above the point of recruitment impairment (PRI), with suitable management in place. The Risk Based Framework (RBF) was used to score secondary bait species, which all scored well using a Productivity Susceptibility Analysis (PSA). Both the WCPO and EPO ETP species outcomes failed their respective PIs due to the poor or unknown stock status of multiple ETP shark species, the vulnerability of those species to be captured in longline operations in the Pacific and the lack of fishery specific data to provide evidence to accurately describe fishery impacts. There is management in place for ETP species such as marine turtles and some shark species in both Regional Fisheries Management Organisation areas.

For Principle 3, the pre-assessments considered the WCPFC and IATTC RFMO management systems, which predicted scores of 80 or above for all PIs. All flag states were also assessed in this report. The Solomon Islands scored well and would be expected to pass Principle 3 without issue, the lack of information hampered scoring for Taiwan.

In general, the key strengths of the fishery are:

- The regional governance and management of the fisheries is well documented and well implemented.
- Primary and secondary species stocks appear to be above PRI.

The key weaknesses in the fishery are:

- Lack of a formal harvest strategy and harvest control rules for target stocks;
- Lack of management and information for manta and mobula ray and some other shark species;
- Lack of information on the ETP species;
- Lack of information and possibly poorly managed flag states on the high seas.

In conclusion, two Performance Indicators in this assessment scored <60, which was for WCPO and EPO ETP species outcomes (2.3.1) and Information (2.3.3).

Introduction to 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 of the gaps between fishery performance and the MSC Standard identified in the preassessment.

This workplan includes:

- FIP coordination 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 such as hosting steering group and stakeholder meetings, updating FisheryProgress.org and supporting action implementation.
- 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 also 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. The workplan also includes 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.
- Timeframes - An estimate of the timeframe needed to complete each action and/or task.
- An associated budget which estimates the main expenses for the FIP.

Table 2 - Workplan Overview

Workplan Version and Date	1.0 (July 2022) 2.0 (November 2024)
Start date (expected)	End date (anticipated month/year)
August 2022	July 2027
FIP Lead (organisation/individual responsible for Action Plan)	Improvements recommended by (meeting/group that supported the development)
Ocean Outcomes (Since August 2024)	Ocean Outcomes (Since August 2024)
FIP Coordinator (organisation/individual responsible for reporting on FisheryProgress)	Workplan developed by (consultant or person)
Kevin Lin, Ocean Outcomes (Since August 2024)	Ho-Tu Chiang & Kevin Lin (Since August 2024); updated December 2025

Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks

Action Number and Name	1.1 – Stock Status and Rebuilding for EPO Bigeye and Yellowfin Tuna
Action Goal	There is evidence of stock rebuilding within a specified timeframe and fishing mortality is reduced to achieve MSY.
Action Description	<p>This action has two goals associated with it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sla – Having a rebuilding timeframe is specified for the yellowfin stock that is the shorter of 20 years or 2 times its generation time. 2. Sib – There is evidence that the rebuilding strategies are rebuilding the stock, 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. <p>Both require large levels of advocacy to the IATTC and flag states to conduct rebuilding scenarios and build robust, comprehensive rebuilding strategies to enable fishing to be at MSY levels.</p>
Expected Completion Date	July 2027
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: US\$ 10,000 for time collecting advocacy and developing positions, using it to lobby IATTC. Expenses to attend IATTC meetings estimated at a further \$5,000 per year.</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 5,000</p> <p>Year 3: As per year 1</p> <p>Year 4: As per year 1</p> <p>Year 5: As per year 2</p>
Responsible Parties	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC, Flag states
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	1.1.1, 1.1.2

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

1.1a: Lobbying IATTC and flag states to conduct re-building scenarios. Independent scientific assistance to support the IATTC in developing bigeye and yellowfin re-building scenarios.	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC	Flag states, NGOs, FIP co-ordinator	August 2022	July 2027	Reports with the latest RFMO policies
1.1b: Lobbying IATTC and flag states for robust, comprehensive rebuilding strategy developed to enable fishing to be at MSY levels.	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC	Flag states, NGOs, FIP co-ordinator	January 2023	July 2027	Letters to TFA and IATTC related to IATTC rebuilding strategy developed to enable fishing to be at MSY levels harvest strategies Letter to TFA documenting industry asks
1.1c: Lobbying IATTC and flag states to adopt the above rebuilding strategy.	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC	Flag states, NGOs, FIP co-ordinator	January 2024	July 2027	Letters to TFA and IATTC related to IATTC rebuilding strategy developed to enable fishing to be at MSY levels harvest strategies Letter to TFA documenting industry asks
1.1d: Re-evaluation of the re-building plan at end of Yr. 3. Short-term technical assistance to the IATTC. Fishing mortality (F) is $<F_{MSY}$	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC	Flag states, NGOs, FIP co-ordinator	January 2025	July 2027	Reports with the latest RFMO policies
1.1e: Review Stock status relative to reference points annually	FIP co-ordinator	IATTC	March 2027	July 2027	Reports with the latest RFMO policies

Action Number and Name	1.2 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for all tuna species
Action Goal	There is a robust and precautionary harvest strategy in place
Action Description	<p>The FIP should detail how the performance of the harvest strategy (by both WCPFC and IATTC) is currently monitored, reviews and where necessary amended in response to the state of the stock. A harvest strategy can then be developed from this review. This action has two tasks associated with it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To address Sla, explicit harvest strategies for tuna are to be designed. 2. To address Sib, a formal evaluation procedure for the harvest strategies is to be put in place for tuna.
Expected Completion Date	July 2027
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: 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 in order to cover the necessary fees and expenses involved in undertaking this activity. Plus US\$ 5,000 for expenses</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 5,000</p> <p>Year 3: As per year 1</p> <p>Year 4: As per year 1</p> <p>Year 5: As per year 2</p>
Responsible Parties	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, RFMOs, Flag states
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	1.2.1

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

<p>1.2a: Monitor and report on the WCPFC and IATTC workplan for the adoption of HCRs and monitor and report on, and if appropriate to participate with, existing advocacy activities such as the NGO Tuna Forum.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC</p>	<p>Flag states, NGOs</p>	<p>August 2022</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Reports with the latest RFMO policies</p>
<p>1.2b: Engage with RFMO scientists and CCM delegations to advocate for Management Strategy Options (MSEs) for controlling tuna harvest developed.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC</p>	<p>Flag states, NGOs</p>	<p>October 2022</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Letters and meetings with RFMO scientists and/or TFA delegations</p>
<p>1.2c: Hold meetings with delegation members with the following purpose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Continuing to emphasise the importance of the harvest strategy process and YFT stock rebuilding to the FIP industry partners and other fisheries in the Eastern Pacific Ocean. ii. Proposing practical ways that the governments could support the process, e.g., via liaison to support capacity-building with Flag states, or other activities. Reporting regularly to the delegations so that they are kept informed of current ideas and proposals at RFMO and within Flag states where the industry partners have links. iii. Request that delegates support HS at RFMO meetings. 	<p>FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC</p>	<p>Flag states, NGOs</p>	<p>October 2022</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Meeting minutes with TFA delegations Letter to TFA documenting industry asks</p>
<p>1.2d: RFMO briefing Document on Harvest Strategies (2022). Prior to RFMO plenary 2022 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>FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC</p>	<p>Flag states, NGOs</p>	<p>October 2022</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Reports with the latest RFMO policies</p>

Action Number and Name	1.3 – Develop Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for tuna
Action Goal	There are well-defined and effective HCRs in place for tuna
Action Description	<p>The seasonal closure is likely to be sufficient to control the exploitation rate to ensure that the PRI is not reached, meeting SG60 for Slc. However, it cannot be argued to be likely to achieve the exploitation rates set out in the HCR (i.e., the reference points). If there is a stock recruitment relationship, which is a common assumption in many other tuna stock assessments, then effort would have to be reduced significantly.</p> <p>The FIP must undertake an initial review (in both WCPFC and IATTC) of the tools which are used to set the exploitation rate in the fishery as determined by the HCRs. This we will then be used to amend the tools in use to control the exploitation rate as defined by the HCR. These should then be implemented and periodically reviewed.</p> <p>This action has two tasks associated with it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To address Slb, HCRs are determined to be robust to main uncertainties for bigeye. 2. To address Slc, HCR tools are determined to be effective in achieving the exploitation levels under the HCRs for bigeye and yellowfin.
Expected Completion Date	July 2027
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: An estimate of US\$ 15,000 to pay for associated fees and an additional \$3,000 in expenses should be budgeted to complete the year one tasks for this action.</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 10,000</p> <p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 10,000</p> <p>Year 5: No associated costs</p>
Responsible Parties	RFMOs, Flag states
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	1.2.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Proposed completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>1.3a: Building regional consensus on the need for robust HCRs. Intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded IATTC and WCPFC members and organisations and formally at meetings at each RFMO meeting.</p> <p>Options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing tuna harvest developed.</p>	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag states, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	August 2022	July 2027	Activity and/or meeting notes of engaging with TFA and RFMOs scientists
<p>1.3b: Ensure a holistic implementation HCR development. Monitor work plan development for the implementation of Res. C-17-02 (or other proposal for a harvest strategy) (see action 1.2) to ensure the development, evaluation, and agreement of a HCR for the three species, alongside the development of the tools required for implementation.</p> <p>Options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing tuna harvest developed.</p>	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag states, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	October 2022	July 2027	Reports with the latest RFMO policies
<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 species that meet the objective of action 3 for submission to the IATTC and WCPFC. Will include an evaluation of current (candidate) HCRs and tools for their effectiveness, and the main uncertainties identified and considered.</p> <p>Options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing tuna harvest developed.</p>	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag states, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	October 2022	July 2027	Summary report of the scope and needs of HCRs that identify candidate HCRs and tools for all three species (if necessary)

<p>1.3d: On-going engagement with Flag states and IATTC 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 IATTC meeting process. To include Intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded IATTC and WCPFC members and organisations and formally at meetings at each IATTC meeting.</p> <p>HCR options considered and discussed inter-sessionally and formally through WCPFC and IATTC meeting processes. WCPFC and IATTC record reflect discussions and progress.</p> <p>The main uncertainties for different HCR options are identified.</p>	<p>FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC</p>	<p>Flag states, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>October 2022</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Letters and meetings with RFMO scientists and/or TFA delegations</p> <p>Letter to TFA documenting industry asks</p>
<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 all three species discussed and agreed within IATTC and WCPFC and formally adopted as part of the harvest strategy implementation approach.</p> <p>The main uncertainties are considered and discussed inter-sessionally and formally through IATTC and WCPFC meeting processes. IATTC record reflect discussions and progress.</p>	<p>FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC</p>	<p>Flag states, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>October 2022</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Summary report to evaluate progress made in developing HCRs</p>

Action Number and Name	1.4 – Assessment of Stock Status for EPO Bigeye and Yellowfin
Action Goal	Have uncertainties in the assessments removed
Action Description	An external review revealed a series of critical uncertainties. For this reason, the stock assessment was not considered sufficient to provide management advice or to apply the HCR for 2019 or 2020, and the assessment instead relied on estimating a series of indicators. A workplan for the improvement of the stock assessment is in place and in implementation and the assessment will be benchmarked (along with the yellowfin assessment) during 2022, taking into account the external review and in time for the revision of the HCR in 2022. SG60 is met but SG80 is not met.
Expected Completion Date	July 2027
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	Year 1: An estimate of US\$ 15,000 to pay for associated fees and an additional \$3,000 in expenses should be budgeted to complete the year one tasks for this action. Year 2: US\$ 10,000 Year 3: US\$ 10,000 Year 4: US\$ 10,000 Year 5: No associated costs
Responsible Parties	RFMOs, Flag states
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	1.2.4

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Proposed completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.4a: Review the existing method of estimating stock status for the fishery, assessing its robustness, timeliness and appropriateness. This may be combined with a review of the information that is currently available.	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC	Flag states, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	August 2022	July 2027	Reports with the latest RFMO policies and scientific papers

<p>1.4b: Identify most appropriate method for stock assessment given the characteristics of the species, the stock and the fishery. This should allow for the assessment of stock status (whether it is analytical stock assessment or proxy indicators) to be reported on, relative to limit and target reference points.</p>	<p>FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC</p>	<p>Flag states, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>October 2022</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Reports with the latest RFMO policies and scientific papers</p>
<p>1.4c: Identify additional data needs and develop and implement research and data collection programs and engage with IATTC scientists.</p>	<p>FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC</p>	<p>Flag states, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>October 2022</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Summary report to evaluate data needs and develop and implement research and data collection programs</p>
<p>1.4d: Contact qualified scientists to perform a peer-review of the stock assessment, particularly in terms of the appropriateness of the assumptions, the validity of the data used and the considerations on main uncertainties.</p>	<p>FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC</p>	<p>Flag states, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>October 2022</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Activity and/or meeting notes of engaging with flag state and RFMOs scientists</p>
<p>1.4e: Periodically undertake baseline assessments, which draw upon the conclusions of both external and internal peer review, which evaluate the performance of past assessments, and consider alternative approaches.</p>	<p>FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC</p>	<p>Flag states, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>October 2022</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Summary report of the stock assessment that evaluate the performance of past assessments, and consider alternative approaches</p>

Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts

Action Number and Name	2.1 – ETP Species Outcome, Management and Information
Action Goal	Ensure that all ETP species interacted with are taken into account and the fishery causes minimal harm to ETP species.
Action Description	<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 PIs. The data will be collected in coordination with the vessel owners and 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 also 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 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 flag states are well-above the minimum 5% observer coverage for longline fleets, for example Fiji with 40% of fleet trips observed and American Samoa with 20% of the same). At best there will be information adequate to support measure to manage ETP species, but no higher score can be awarded, especially without fishery-specific data for this assessment.</p>
Expected Completion Date	July 2027
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: The initial task of collecting and reviewing logbook and observer data is estimated to be US\$ 5,000 per flag and coastal state over the course of the first few months of the FIP. A brief report explaining the findings will be created and shared with the FIP Participants highlighting gaps and recommending changes to the FIP documents as well as amended improvement actions. A budget of \$15,000 is recommended for this review to be undertaken.</p> <p>Year 2: 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 3: Subsequently a budget of US\$ 5,000 is recommended per year to update and review data.</p> <p>Year 4: Same as year 3</p> <p>Year 5: Same as year 3</p>
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, Fisheries consultant

MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3
--	---------------------

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Proposed completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>2.1a: Collect fishery specific data from fisheries and states and analyse this to better understand the impacts on ETP species and any evidence that the measures are being implemented or reviewed.</p> <p>Collect and provide catch, discard and interaction data relating to the Fishery UoA. The data should be sufficient to determine performance against all relevant PIs including ETP and others such as P3 catch locations.</p>	FIP co-ordinator	Flag states, fishery	August 2022	July 2023	Data requests to TFA, observer data obtained
2.1b: Use this information to build an ETP species mitigation strategy , including materials for onboard vessels on best practices and buy any equipment needed, go to consultation if necessary.	FIP co-ordinator	NGO, fishery	July 2023	December 2023	Written plan and communications with CHSF
2.1c: Collect evidence from FIP participants that shark finning is not taking place and validate the public shark finning policies.	FIP co-ordinator	NGO, fishery	August 2022	July 2023	Data requests to TFA, observer data obtained
2.1d: Deliver skipper training to teach best practices, safe handling and release, species identification and other elements consistent with ISSF guidance.	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery	August 2022	July 2027	Training notes and activity notes
2.1e: Engage with RFMOs and flag states regarding improving the management of ETP species	FIP co-ordinator	RFMO, Flag states	August 2022	July 2027	Letters to RFMOs and flag states

<p>2.1f: Enhance scientific observer coverage of FIP participants through engaging with the human observer schemes or Electronic Monitoring. The aim is to ensure a representative sample of catch, discard and species interaction data is collected, reviewed and shared with relevant fishery authorities.</p> <p>The first milestone for this task is completion of an analysis of FIP vessels relating to human and electronic observers. This report should recommend scientifically robust levels of human and electronic observer coverage and review and include associated costs. Subsequent milestones for this task will be defined once the analysis has been carried out. They should include target levels of observer coverage and review across the fleets.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, FIP participants</p>	<p>RFMO, Flag states, fishery</p>	<p>August 2022</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Meeting minutes with TFA and OFDC and meetings notes with EM providers</p>
<p>2.2g: Develop monitoring programmes to address any data gaps concerning ETP species.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator</p>	<p>Flag states, fishery</p>	<p>July 2024</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Monitoring programmes of CHSF</p>

<p>Action Number and Name</p>	<p>2.2 - Improve Bait Species Information, Management Strategy, and Verification</p>
<p>Action Goal</p>	<p>Ensure that bait species used by the CHSF FIP fleet are highly likely to be above the point of recruitment impairment (PRI), supported by adequate, fishery-specific information and a partial management strategy consistent with MSC SG80 requirements.</p>
<p>Action Description</p>	<p>The Three-Year Evaluation (October 2025) identified significant information and management gaps related to bait species used by the CHSF FIP fleet, resulting in yellow scores for PIs 2.1.1 (Outcome), 2.1.2 (Management), and 2.1.3 (Information). This action aims to address these gaps by establishing a comprehensive bait species information system, developing a partial</p>

	<p>bait species management strategy, and implementing verification mechanisms across the entire FIP fleet.</p> <p>The action will focus on collecting quantitative bait-use data (including species, volumes, and sourcing), assessing bait species sustainability status using RFMO and scientific information, and developing procurement and reporting requirements to ensure bait species are highly likely above PRI. Implementation will be supported through supplier engagement, vessel-level reporting tools, and periodic verification and review.</p>
Expected Completion Date	July 2027
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	<p>US\$ 15,000–25,000 (next 1–2 years)</p> <p>Costs will primarily support the establishment of a bait species data collection system, development of a partial bait species management strategy, supplier engagement, and initial verification activities. Longer-term costs are expected to be integrated into routine FIP monitoring, review, and reporting processes and will be subject to annual resource availability.</p>
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, Fisheries consultant, bait suppliers
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Proposed completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.2a: Collect bait species information across the FIP fleet	FIP Coordinator	Fishery, FIP participants, bait suppliers	January 2026	July 2027	Fleet-wide bait species dataset covering all FIP vessels, including scientific name, common name, purchase and use volumes, country of origin, source fishery, gear type, and bait form.
2.2b: Develop and maintain a centralized bait species database	FIP Coordinator	Fishery	January 2026	December 2026	Centralized bait species database consolidating historical and current bait-use data, with an annual summary report produced for FIP reporting.
2.2c: Assess bait species sustainability status relative to PRI	FIP Coordinator	Fishery, NGOs, WCPFC, IATTC	June 2026	July 2027	Annual bait species sustainability assessment report demonstrating whether bait species used by the FIP fleet are highly likely to be above PRI.
2.2d: Develop a bait species management strategy	FIP Coordinator	Fishery, FIP participants	July 2026	July 2027	CHSF Sustainable Bait Sourcing / Bait Species Management Policy, including sourcing guidelines, documentation requirements, and corrective actions.
2.2e: Engage bait suppliers to improve traceability and documentation	Fishery	FIP Coordinator, bait suppliers	January 2026	July 2027	Supplier correspondence and records demonstrating provision of bait species identity, origin, fishing gear, and management information.
2.2f: Provide onboard bait reporting tools and training	FIP Coordinator	Fishery, FIP participants	September 2026	July 2027	Standardized bait reporting templates and training records demonstrating improved accuracy and consistency of bait-use reporting.
2.2g: Verify implementation and review effectiveness annually	FIP Coordinator	Fishery	January 2027	July 2027 (then ongoing annually)	Annual verification and review reports, including cross-checks of logbooks, receipts, and EM data (where available),

					and documented updates to the bait management strategy if required.
--	--	--	--	--	---

Principle 3: Effective management

Action Number and Name	3.1 Consultation, Roles & Responsibilities for Solomon Islands
Action Goal	Have fishery management systems for Solomon Islands that identifies and actively engages with all interested parties and all roles are understood.
Action Description	No evidence could be found on consultation, Roles and Responsibilities so an initial fact finding is required to understand this, if not, advocacy must take place.
Expected Completion Date	July 2027
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	Year 1: US\$ 8,000 for reviewing the flag states, stakeholder analysis and recommending resolving gaps. Year 2: US\$ 2,000 Year 3: US\$ 1,000 Year 4: US\$ 1,000 Year 5: US\$ 1,000
Responsible Parties	National management bodies.

MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.1.2
---------------------------------------	-------

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Proposed completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.1a: 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	August 2022	July 2027	Summary report to identify the roles and responsibilities within the fishery
3.1b: Identify all relevant stakeholders to the fishery	FIP co-ordinator	National management authorities, fishery	July 2023	July 2027	Update information or summary report to identify the roles and responsibilities within the fishery
3.1c: Ensure all agencies within the management framework clearly identify the role publicly.	National management authorities	FIP co-ordinator	December 2023	July 2027	Summary report to identify the roles and responsibilities within the fishery
3.1d: Develop a strategy to ensure and encourage wider engagement and representation in consultations.	National management authorities	FIP co-ordinator	March 2024	July 2027	Summary report to develop a statement or strategy to engage in the consultation process
3.1e: Ensure the fishery management plan clearly identifies which departments will undertake which roles in the fishery.	National management authorities	FIP co-ordinator	March 2025	July 2027	Summary report to identify the roles and responsibilities within the fishery
3.1f: Periodically review the efficacy of the consultation process.	FIP co-ordinator	National management authorities	August 2022	July 2027	Summary report of the compliance

Action Number and Name	3.2 Decision-making processes for Taiwan and Solomon Islands
Action Goal	Have decision-making processes for Taiwan and Solomon Islands respond to serious and other important issues.
Action Description	<p>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.</p> <p>Decision-making processes for Taiwan and Solomon Islands 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 (SIb).</p> <p>Due primarily to limited information on the management process, we are unable to determine if the precautionary approach is to be applied in this fishery.</p> <p>For SId, 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 SId.</p>
Expected Completion Date	July 2027
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: US\$ 10,000 plus expenses if in-person meeting is necessary</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 10,000 plus expenses if in-person meeting is necessary</p> <p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 1,000</p> <p>Year 5: No associated costs</p>
Responsible Parties	FIP Coordinator, National management bodies.
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.2.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Proposed completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>3.2a: Conduct review of the decision-making processes in Taiwan and the Solomon Islands 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. Do 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. 5. If there are/have been any legal challenges and how these have been addressed by the management system and/or fishery. <p>A report should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant</p>		<p>August 2022</p>	<p>July 2025</p>	<p>Summary report of decision-making processes in Taiwan and Solomon Islands</p>
<p>3.2b: Define decision-making processes in the management plan. 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 	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>August 2022</p>	<p>July 2025</p>	<p>Summary report of decision-making processes in Taiwan and Solomon Islands</p>

<p>relevant recommendations emerging from research, monitoring evaluation and review activity).</p> <p>5. Process for addressing legal challenges if necessary.</p> <p>6. Precautionary approach in management plan.</p>					
<p>3.2c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to incorporate above into decision-making processes. Multiple consultations may need to be held.</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>August 2022</p>	<p>July 2026</p>	<p>Letters or meeting notes between CHSF and TFA</p>
<p>3.2d: 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>July 2024</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Letters or meeting notes between CHSF and TFA</p>
<p>3.2e: Review the efficacy of the decision-making process.</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>July 2025</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Summary report of compliance</p>

Action Number and Name	3.3 - Compliance and enforcement for Taiwan
Action Goal	Have sufficient evidence to conclude that sanctions are consistently applied and provide an effective deterrence.
Action Description	Based on the information available, 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.
Expected Completion Date	July 2027
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	Year 1: Costs for the first year are estimated to be higher than later years in order to carry out the analysis for all two countries. Subsequent follow-ups and advocacy costs in later years should be lower. Budget for year one is estimated to be US\$ 10,000. Year 2: US\$ 4,000 Year 3: No associated costs Year 4: US\$ 5,000 (performance review) Year 5: US\$ 1,000
Responsible Parties	National management bodies.
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.2.3

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Proposed completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.3a: Review MCS systems in place in the fisheries. This should include: 1. MCS plans and strategies.	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	Fishery	August 2022	July 2027	Summary report of MCS systems in Taiwan and the Solomon Islands

<p>2. Information on MCS mechanisms in place (VMS, logbooks, landed catch documentation etc.).</p> <p>3. Interviews with enforcement personnel.</p> <p>4. Records of previous infringements, penalties, sanctions and/or court proceedings.</p> <p>5. Any previous reviews or evaluations of MCS systems.</p> <p>A report should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>					
<p>3.3b: Develop a plan to combat the gaps identified in the national MCS systems based on findings of report in.</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>July 2023</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Analysis of national MCS systems</p>
<p>3.3c: 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.</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>December 2023</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Letters or meeting notes between CHSF and TFA</p>
<p>3.3d: Implement finalised plan where necessary, allocating the necessary resources to ensure successful employment of improved MCS system.</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>March 2024</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Analysis of national MCS systems</p>
<p>3.3e: 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 (i.e., 9c).</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>March 2025</p>	<p>July 2027</p>	<p>Analysis of national MCS systems</p>

Action Number and Name	3.4 - Monitoring and management performance evaluation for Taiwan
Action Goal	The fishery-specific management systems of Taiwan subject to regular internal and occasional external review.
Action Description	<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 Sla.</p> <p>There is no evidence of any external reviews, which is not to say that there haven't been any. In the absence of information SG80 cannot be met for Slb. 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 (Slb).</p>
Expected Completion Date	July 2027
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: US\$ 10,000</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 5,000</p> <p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 1,000</p> <p>Year 5: No associated costs</p>
Responsible Parties	National management bodies.
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.2.4

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Proposed completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.4a: 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,	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant		August 2022	July 2025	Analysis of National Fishery Management and MCS systems

MCS, compliance to RFMO/international regulations etc.) and the frequency to which these occur. A report will be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.					
3.4b: 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	July 2023	July 2025	Code of Conduct or company policy
3.4c: 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	March 2023	July 2027	Letters or meeting notes between CHSF and TFA
3.4d: 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	July 2024	July 2027	Code of Conduct or company policy
3.4e: 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	July 2025	July 2027	Summary report of compliance

Actions By Priority

Table 3 - High Priority actions for the Pacific Ocean LL Tuna FIP (Cheng Hung Seafood Frozen Produce Co., Ltd.) fishery

Action Number and Name		Priority	PI Addressed
2.1	ETP Species Outcome, Management and Information	High	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3

Table 4 – Medium Priority actions for the Pacific Ocean LL Tuna FIP (Cheng Hung Seafood Frozen Produce Co., Ltd.) fishery

Action Number and Name		Priority	PI Addressed
1.1	Stock status and rebuilding of EPO Bigeye and Yellowfin	Medium	1.1.1
1.2	Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for all tuna species	Medium	1.2.1
1.3	Develop Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for tuna	Medium	1.2.2
1.4	Assessment of Stock Status for EPO Bigeye and Yellowfin	Medium	1.2.4
3.1	Consultation, Roles & Responsibilities for Solomon Islands	Medium	3.1.2
3.2	Decision-making processes for Taiwan and Solomon Islands	Medium	3.2.2
3.3	Compliance and enforcement for Taiwan	Medium	3.2.3
3.4	Monitoring and management performance evaluation for Taiwan	Medium	3.2.4

Budget

The below table lays out the budget as suggested in this workplan. Assumptions were made and this budget is inclusive of possible costs, note electronic monitoring is not included and would be a separate budget stream.

Table 5 - Budget for the Pacific Ocean LL Tuna FIP (Cheng Hung Seafood Frozen Produce Co., Ltd.) fishery

Action Number and Name		Year 1 (US\$)	Year 2 (US\$)	Year 3 (US\$)	Year 4 (US\$)	Year 5 (US\$)	Total (US\$)
<i>FIP Coordination</i>		39,000	39,000	39,000	27,000	27,000	171,000
1.1	Stock status and rebuilding of EPO Bigeye and Yellowfin	10,000	5,000	10,000	10,000	5,000	40,000
1.2	Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for all tuna species	10,000	5,000	10,000	10,000	5,000	40,000
1.3	Develop Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for tuna	18,000	10,000	0	10,000	0	38,000
1.4	Assessment of Stock Status for EPO Bigeye and Yellowfin	18,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	48,000
2.1	ETP Species Outcome, Management and Information	15,000	25,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	55,000
3.1	Consultation, Roles & Responsibilities for Solomon Islands	8,000	2,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	13,000
3.2	Decision-making processes for Taiwan and Solomon Islands	10,000	10,000	0	1,000	0	21,000
3.3	Compliance and enforcement for Taiwan	10,000	4,000	0	5,000	1,000	20,000
3.4	Monitoring and management performance evaluation for Taiwan	10,000	5,000	0	1,000	0	16,000
Total (US\$)		157,000	115,000	75,000	80,000	44,000	471,000

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 of 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 Pacific Ocean LL Tuna FIP (Cheng Hung Seafood Frozen Produce Co., Ltd.) fishery

Table 6 - Principle 1 list of scoring for WCPO and EPO longline fisheries for albacore, bigeye and yellowfin tuna

Component	PI	Performance Indicator	WCPO BET	WCPO YFT	WCPO SKJ	EPO BET	EPO YFT	EPO SKJ	SP ALB	NP ALB
Outcome	1.1.1	Stock Status								
	1.1.2	Stock Rebuilding	N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A	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

N/A – Not Applicable

Table 7 - Principle 2 list of scoring WCPO and EPO longline fisheries

Principle 2 – Minimising Environmental Impacts			WCPO	EPO
Primary Species	2.1.1	Outcome		
	2.1.2	Management		
	2.1.3	Information		
Secondary Species	2.2.1	Outcome		
	2.2.2	Management		
	2.2.3	Information		
ETP Species	2.3.1	Outcome		
	2.3.2	Management		
	2.3.3	Information		
Habitats	2.4.1	Outcome		
	2.4.2	Management		
	2.4.3	Information		
Ecosystem	2.5.1	Outcome		
	2.5.2	Management		
	2.5.3	Information		

Table 8 - Principle 3 list of scoring flag states involved in the fishery

Principle 3 – Effective Management				WCPFC	IATTC	Taiwan	Solomon ns
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			N/A		
	3.2.2	Decision Making Process					
	3.2.3	Compliance and Enforcement					
	3.2.4	Management Performance Evaluation					