Work Plan for the Pacific Ocean Tuna – Longline Fue Shin Fishery Ltd. (FSF) Fishery

Prepared by

Ocean Outcomes

Original April, amended April 2021, amended July 2023 and February 2024, then July 2025

PIs 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 tasks were amended.

Table 1: Workplan Overview

Workplan Version and Date	31 July 2025 - V4.0
Start date (expected)	**End date** (anticipated month/year)
Started April 2020	April 2026
FIP Lead (organization/individual responsible for Action Plan)	**Improvements recommended by** (meeting/group that supported the development)
David Huang, Fue Shin Fishery Ltd	Fue Shin Fishery Ltd and Ocean Outcomes
FIP Coordinator (organization/individual responsible for reporting on FisheryProgress)	**Workplan developed by** (consultant or person)
Kevin Lin, Ocean Outcomes	Kathryn Read and Kevin Lin

Introduction

This document presents the updated workplan taking into account the FSF Pacific Ocean longline tuna fishery pre-assessment against the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fisheries Standard for sustainable fishing (Version 2.01). It is updated following the FIP's third year audit. The fishery targets albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*), and catches bigeye (*T. obesus*) and yellowfin (*T. albacares*) and skipjack (*Katsuwonus pelamis*). The pelagic longline vessels are flagged to Taiwan and fish on the high seas in the Pacific Ocean. Vessels on the high seas transship, while some vessels land product in American Samoa. The species targeted are Pacific Ocean albacore, bigeye, yellowfin and skipjack tunas. The fishery is managed regionally by the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) and the Inter-American Tropical Tunas Commission (IATTC). The aim of the document is to give guidance on gaps against the MSC fisheries standard that could be improved by a Fisheries Improvement Project (FIP).

The fishery under assessment is within the scope of the MSC Fisheries Standard (7.4 of the MSC 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 fish. A single set by vessels in the client fleet usually consists of a mainline around 135 - 150 km in length with ca. 20 - 50 m long branch lines attached at intervals along the length of the line.

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

Table 2. Units of Assessment (UoAs).

UoA 1	**Description**
Target species (common and scientific name)	Yellowfin tuna (*Thunnus albacares*)
Stock	Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) yellowfin tuna
Geographical area	High seas in FAO Areas 71 (WCPO) & 81 (Southwest Pacific Ocean) & 61 (Pacific, Northwest)
Fishing method or gear type	Pelagic longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Fue Shin Fishery
UoA 2	**Description**
Target species (common and scientific name)	Yellowfin tuna (*Thunnus albacares*)
Stock	EPO yellowfin tuna
Geographical area	High Seas in FAO Areas 77 Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) & 87 (Southeast Pacific Ocean) & 67 (Pacific, Northeast)

Fishing method or gear type	Pelagic longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Fue Shin Fishery

UoA 3	**Description**
Target species (common and scientific name)	Bigeye tuna (*Thunnus obesus*)
Stock	Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) bigeye tuna
Geographical area	High seas in FAO Areas 71 (WCPO) & 81 (Southwest Pacific Ocean) & 61 (Pacific, Northwest)
Fishing method or gear type	Pelagic longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Fue Shin Fishery
UoA 4	**Description**
Target species (common and scientific name)	Bigeye tuna (*Thunnus obesus*)
Stock	EPO bigeye tuna
Geographical area	High Seas in FAO Areas 77 Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) & 87 (Southeast Pacific Ocean) & 67 (Pacific, Northeast)
Fishing method or gear type	Pelagic longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Fue Shin Fishery

UoA 5	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Albacore tuna (*Thunnus alalunga*)
Stock	North Pacific albacore tuna
Geographical area	High Seas in FAO Areas 71 (WCPO) & 77 (EPO) & 61 (Pacific, Northwest) & 67 (Pacific, Northeast)
Fishing method or gear type	Pelagic longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Fue Shin Fishery
UoA 6	**Description**
Target species (common and scientific name)	Albacore tuna (*Thunnus alalunga*)
Stock	South Pacific Albacore
Geographical area	High Seas in FAO Areas 81 (Southwest Pacific Ocean) & 87 (Southeast Pacific Ocean)
Fishing method or gear type	Pelagic longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Fue Shin Fishery

UoA 7	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Skipjack tuna (*Katsuwonus pelamis*)

Stock	WCPO skipjack tuna
Geographical area	High seas in FAO Areas 71 (WCPO) & 81 (Southwest Pacific Ocean) & 61 (Pacific, Northwest)
Fishing method or gear type	Pelagic longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Fue Shin Fishery
UoA 8	**Description**
Target species (common and scientific name)	Skipjack tuna (*Katsuwonus pelamis*)
Stock	EPO skipjack tuna
Geographical area	High Seas in FAO Areas 77 Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) & 87 (Southeast Pacific Ocean) & 67 (Pacific, Northeast)
Fishing method or gear type	Pelagic longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Fue Shin Fishery

Overview of Pre-assessment Results

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

The main strengths of the fishery are:

- The stocks are generally considered to have healthy status based on recent stock assessments.
- There are established management frameworks for cooperation between countries that fish for tuna, and coastal states have tuna management plans.
- Reasonable observer coverage under the v2.01 of the MSC Fisheries Standards.

The main weaknesses of the fishery are:

- Harvest strategies are not precautionary and either lack official harvest control rules entirely or do not have

tools;

- Ecosystem impacts from parts of the UoAs are unclear due to relatively limited catch data, observer records, and other data from the fishery;
- On-board operational practices (such as training and handling) and Codes of Conduct in place to mitigate risks to ETP and Secondary species; and
- The main regional management framework, the WCPFC has not been very effective at implementing management measures for achieving environmental sustainability outcomes.

Information gaps:

- UoA specific gear characteristics (bait, hooks between floats, set depth), number hooks for vessels.
- Species and quantity of bait used by UoA.

It is worth noting that while the four mentioned Pacific species assessed are nominally the fishery's target species from the FIP perspective, skipjack is not targeted.

This fishery is consistent with the MSC standard in some areas. However, there are still significant environmental impacts from longline fishing and management issues to address.

Tables 3a-c below show the scoring for Performance Indicators (PIs) that scored less than 80 and will therefore be addressed in the FIP. For P1, the PI scores are by target stock, and for P3 the PIs are by geographic UoA.

Legend	<60	60 – 79

Table 3a. Principle 1 PIs that score less than 80 and for which the FIP workplan will address the potential deficiencies.

		Western and Central Pacific Ocean			**North Pacific**	**South Pacific**	**Eastern Pacific Ocean**		
PI No.	**Performance Indicator**	**BET**	**YFT**	**SKJ**	**ALB**		**BET**	**YFT**	**SKJ**
1.2.1	Harvest Strategy								
1.2.2	Harvest Control Rules and Tools								

Table 3b. Principle 2 PIs that score less than 80 and for which the FIP workplan will address the potential deficiencies.

Component	**PI No.**	**Performance Indicator**	**FSF Pacific Ocean**
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	
Ecosystem	2.5.2	Management	
	2.5.3	Information	

Table 3c. Principle 3 approximate scores for RFMO, flag state, and coastal state management tiers and for which the FIP workplan will address the potential deficiencies.

			RFMO	**Flag state**
PI No.	**Component**	**Performance Indicator**	**WCPFC**	**Taiwan**
3.2.2 ^	Fishery specific mgt system	Decision making processes		NB, will be rescored to green for the FIP's end of year 4 annual report.

^ In some MSC-certified fisheries, only the RFMO management level is assessed to score PI 3.2.2 SIs a, c, d and e. This approach is taken when the CAB considers the RFMO is where the relevant fisheries management arrangements of the fishery are established/or accountability is held.

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 pre-assessment.

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.

Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks

Action Number and Name	**1.1 — Stock Status and Rebuilding for IO yellowfin and bigeye tunas - COMPLETED JULY 2023 ANNUAL UPDATE**

Action Number and Name	**1.2 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for all four tuna species**
Action Goal	There are robust and precautionary HSs in place, and well-defined and effective HCRs in place for all four tuna stocks
Action Description	Robust and precautionary HSs are needed for all stocks. Fishery management bodies should describe how the performance of the harvest strategies are currently monitored, reviewed and where necessary amended in response to the state of the stock. Harvest strategies, including HCRs can then be refined or developed from this review. This action has four tasks associated with it: 1. PI 1.2.1a - explicit harvest strategies for tuna are to be designed responsive to the state of the stock and the elements of the harvest strategy work together towards achieving stock management objectives reflected in PI 1.1.1 SG80. 2. PI 1.2.1b - the harvest strategies may not have been fully tested but evidence exists that they are achieving their objectives.
Expected Completion Date	April 2026. **Note:** This Action's milestones/tasks were revised in February 2024 following the release of the WCPO yellowfin, bigeye, and albacore skipjack Final Reports of the new SE Annex assessments for tuna fisheries under v3 of the MSC Fisheries Standard (February 2024). However, the expected completion date for the FIP has not been amended due to the five year FIP life.
Priority	Medium

Estimated Cost	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$ 3,000 per flag per year is estimated in order to cover the necessary fees and expenses involved in undertaking this activity. Plus US$ 3,000 for expenses. Year 2 - 3: As per year 1 Year 4 - 5: It will depend on the outcomes of the new SE Annex assessments that are occurring for tuna fisheries under v3 of the MSC Fisheries Standard. Year 6: As per year 4-5
Responsible Parties	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, RFMOs, Flag states
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	1.2.1

Tasks/ Milestones • **Note:** These tasks were revised in February 2024 following the release of the WCPO yellowfin, bigeye, and albacore skipjack Final Reports of the new SE Annex assessments for tuna fisheries under v3 of the MSC Fisheries Standard. The report's Client Action Plans must adhere to the complexities of Section SE. Relevant to the stocks in this FIP, which have all been part of a UOA previously MSC-certified (SE3.3): "The CAB shall structure the condition to set a deadline of a maximum of one term of certification" and "The …milestone timeframes align with the plans developed by the relevant management agency of the UoA(s)". There will be a CAB annual harmonisation meeting scheduled by the CABs to occur in May each year.		**Responsible (lead)**	**Responsible (supporting role)**	**Starting date**
Milestones	**Tasks**			
For all western and central Pacific stocks annually.	1.2a: Monitor and report on the WCPFC workplan for the adoption of HCRs and monitor and report on, and participate in existing advocacy activities such as the NGO Tuna Forum.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants	Flag state, NGOs	April 2020

<u>For South Pacific albacore</u>, by May 2025: • Operating models and candidate management procedures that include mechanisms for catch or effort constraints are identified • Operating models and candidate management procedures that include mechanisms for catch or effort constraints are tested through management strategy evaluation simulations • Preferred harvest strategy(ies) adhering to a management procedure approach with an agreed catch or effort constraint identified • Mechanism for catch or effort constraints is agreed, and • A management procedure approach is adopted. <u>For WCPO yellowfin and bigeye</u>, by May 2025: • Operating models and candidate management procedures that include mechanisms for catch or effort constraints are identified. <u>For WCPO skipjack</u>, by May 2025; • Harvest strategy adhering to a management procedure approach, with and including catch or effort constraints or resource-sharing mechanism that follows scientific advice, is implemented.	1.2h: Prior to the 2024 WCPFC Scientific Committee meeting, FSF to write to the Taiwanese Fisheries Agency (TFA) summarising all harvest strategy and harvest control rule-related milestones that are required to be completed at the upcoming annual session of the WCPFC commission. The letter will also identify where deadlines of the current WCPFC Harvest Strategy Workplan are behind any joint Section SE milestone deadlines.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants	Flag state, NGOs	June 2024
	1.2i: Annually, FSF will meet remotely or in person with the TFA in order to discuss the joint HS and HCR milestone deadlines.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants	Flag state, NGOs	July 2024
	1.2j: Prior to the SC and annual session of the commission, FSF will advocate that the Taiwanese delegation to WCPFC issues public position statements as WCPFC Information Papers within the Management Issues Theme that call for advancing harvest strategies and harvest control rules to meet the Section SE timebound milestones.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants	Flag state, NGOs	July 2024
	1.2k: FSF will consider attending the 2024 WCPFC Scientific Committee meeting and/or the annual session of the WCPFC commission either as part of a government or observer delegation in order to provide additional opportunities to discuss with fisheries management authorities the joint HS and HCR milestone deadlines.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants	Flag state, NGOs	July 2024
<u>For eastern Pacific yellowfin and bigeye</u> annually.	1.2l: Monitor and report on the IATTC progress in developing HCRs and HSs, and participate in existing advocacy activities such as the NGO Tuna Forum.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants	Flag state, NGOs	April 2020

	1.2m: Prior to the annual session of the IATTC, FSF will advocate to the Taiwanese delegation to IATTC that they issue public position statements as IATTC Information Papers within the Management Issues Theme that call for advancing harvest strategies and harvest control rules.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants	Flag state, NGOs	May 2024

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 all stocks of tuna
Action Description	Robust and precautionary HSs, including HCRs are needed for all stocks. There are now HCRs partially in place for skipjack in the WCPO, however they are non-binding and still lack the tools to be effective and the WCPFC's history of stock management has been absent and/or ineffectual. The FIP must undertake an initial review of the tools which are used to set the exploitation rate in the fishery as determined by the HCRs. This can then be used to amend the tools in use to control the exploitation rate as defined by the HCR. This action has four tasks associated with it: 3. PI 1.2.2a - well defined HCRs are in place that ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as the PRI is approached, and are expected to keep the stock fluctuating around a target level consistent with (or above) MSY. 4. PI 1.2.2b - the eventual IO albacore and yellowfin HCRs are determined to be robust to the main uncertainties. 5. PI 1.2.2c - HCRs tools are determined to be appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required for all four tuna stocks.
Expected Completion Date	April 2026 **Note:** This action's tasks/milestones were revised in February 2024 following the release of the WCPO yellowfin, bigeye, and albacore skipjack Final Reports of the new SE Annex assessments for tuna fisheries under v3 of the MSC Fisheries Standard. However, the expected completion date for the FIP has not been amended due to the five year FIP life.
Priority	Medium

Estimated Cost	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$ 3,000 per flag per year is estimated in order to cover the necessary fees and expenses involved in undertaking this activity. Plus US$ 3,000 for expenses. Year 2 - 3: As per year 1 Year 4 - 5: It will depend on the outcomes of the new Section SE assessments that are occurring for tuna fisheries under v3 of the MSC Fisheries Standard. Year 6: As per year 4-5
Responsible Parties	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, RFMOs, Flag states
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	1.2.2

Principle 2: Minimising Environmental Impacts

Action Number and Name	**2.1 — ETP Species Outcome, Management and Information**
Action Goal	Ensure that all ETP species potentially interacted with are taken into account in the assessment and the fishery causes minimal harm to ETP species.

Action Description	Due to the sporadic nature of fisheries interaction with some ETP species, combined with the low levels of observer coverage required for the IOTC LL fleet (~5%); an alternative source of information is required in the short term to assess the potential risks to ETP species from the fishery. Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) can be applied in data limited situations to identify and rank ecological risks associated with fishing and can also be used to prioritise future management action and data collection. Without comprehensive logbook and observer data to assess risks to ETP, a more comprehensive assessment of which ETP species would potentially interact with the fishery, based on fishing location and the geographical range of the ETP species known to interact with wider longline fleet in these areas is needed. This process will also focus data collection plans and management approaches best suited to these species for incorporation into later steps/actions in the workplan. Focused data collection will improve the availability of fisheries specific information over time, and raise the fishery performance to a level where there is 'information adequate to support measures to manage ETP species' and therefore meet higher scores required for an unconditional pass.
Expected Completion Date	April 2026
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	Year 1: The initial task of collecting and reviewing logbook and observer data is estimated to be US$ 5,000 per flag 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 $7,000 is recommended for this review to be undertaken. Year 2: Further data analysis will need to be conducted in Year 2 around ETP species interaction and a budget of US$ 7,000 is recommended. Year 3: Subsequently a budget of US$ 5,000 is recommended per year to update and review data. Year 4: Same as year 3 Year 5: Same as year 3 Year 6: Same as year 3
Responsible Parties	FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant, fishery participants

MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date
2.1a: Collect fishery specific data from fisheries and states and analyse these to better understand the impacts on ETP species and any evidence that the measures are being implemented or reviewed. 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.	FIP co ordinator	Flag state, fishery	April 2020
2.1b: Use this information to build an ETP species management plan, including materials for on board vessels on best practices and buy any equipment needed, go to consultation if necessary.	FIP co ordinator	NGO, fishery	September 2020
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	May 2020
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	September 2020
2.1e: Engage with RFMOs and flag state regarding improving the management of ETP species.	FIP co ordinator	RFMO, Flag state	September 2020
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. 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	FIP co ordinator, FIP participants	RFMO, Flag state, fishery	September 2020

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.			
2.1g: If necessary, carry out an Ecosystem Risk Assessment to determine if the fishery is making negative direct and indirect impacts and if so how to address them	FIP co ordinator	External Fisheries Consultant	March 2021
2.1h: Develop monitoring programmes to address any data gaps concerning ETP species.	FIP co ordinator	Flag state, fishery	January 2021

Action Number and Name	**2.2 — Improve Primary and Secondary species outcome status, management and monitoring**
Action Goal	Comprehensive logbook and observer data available across all UoA vessels; and there is a strategy in place for managing bait species that is designed to maintain or to not hinder rebuilding of them and the UoA regularly reviews and implements measures.
Action Description	Availability of comprehensive logbook data and observer data for the entire UoA fleet would ensure the appropriate species are designated as Primary or Secondary main or minor primary species. This in turn would provide more certainty in assessment outcome and ability to pass MSC criteria unconditionally. The fishery currently lacks sufficient information on bait species. Quantitative catch data, comprehensive fleet effort data combined with additional information from observer data will provide a better understanding of the catch profile required to designate which species would be scored as main or minor under Primary and Secondary designations. Catch proportions can be estimated from a combination of observer data and logbook effort data for those species that might only be reported by observers. Similarly, there is insufficient observer coverage (need 20%+) to validate if shark finning is occurring (2.2.2d).
Expected Completion Date	April 2026
Priority	Medium

Estimated Cost	Year 4: A brief report explaining the findings to create and share with the FIP Participants highlighting gaps and recommending changes to the FIP documents as well as amended improvement actions. A budget of $3,000 is recommended for this review to be undertaken. Year 5: Implement increased observer coverage and EM US$ TBC depending on the approach taken for cost recovery of camera units and footage analyses. Year 6: Same as year 5.
Responsible Parties	FIP participants, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	Improved data validation also relates to Action 2.1. Bringing together all the information available from the UoA fleet cross-cuts Principle 2, and would specifically address following scoring issues which did not meet SG80: ● 2.1.1 and 2.2.1 evidence that the bait species are above are highly likely to be above the point where recruitment would be impaired/biologically based limits UoA is not hindering recovery of vulnerable main secondary species ● 2.1.2 and 2.2.2 - There is a strategy in place that is designed to maintain or to not hinder rebuilding of bait species. - It is highly likely that shark finning is not taking place. ● 2.1.3 and 2.2.3 Information is adequate to adequately assess and support a partial strategy to manage bait species.

Tasks/ Milestones	**Responsible (lead)**	**Responsible (supporting role)**	**Starting date**
2.2a: FIP coordinator to liaise with FIP participants for provision of existing comprehensive logbook and observer data (linked to logbook set IDs), including discards.	FIP coordinator, fishery/industry, flag state data manager		September 2023
2.2b: Implement improved data collection strategy (enhanced on board observer coverage, EM) as per Action 2.1.	FIP coordinator	Fishery/fleet manager or observer provider	December 2023

2.2c: Include specific training with skippers and companies to collect bait species information.	FIP coordinator	Fishery/fleet manager or observer provider	December 2023
2.2d: Analyse these to better understand the impacts on bait species and any evidence that the measures are being implemented or reviewed.	FIP coordinator	Fishery/fleet manager or observer provider	December 2024
2.2e: Continue to collect evidence from FIP participants that shark finning is not taking place and validate the public shark finning policies.	FIP coordinator	Fishery/fleet manager or observer provider	February 2024
2.1f: Promote monitoring and research on designated primary and secondary species so that the contribution of each fishery to overall fishing mortality of each stock is estimated.	FIP coordinator, FIP participants	WCPFC, flag state	July 2024

Principle 3: Effective Management

Action Number and Name	**3.1 — Decision-making processes for Taiwan COMPLETED JULY 2024 ANNUAL UPDATE**
Action Goal	Decision-making processes for Taiwan respond to serious and other identified important issues in a transparent, timely and adaptive manner and take account of the wider implications of decisions (SIb).
Action Description	Taiwan does not appear to respond to serious and other important issues brought to it, in a timely manner (SIb).
Expected Completion Date	July 2025
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	Year 4: US$ 0 Year 5: US$ 0
Responsible Parties	FIP consultant, FIP participants, national management bodies.

MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.2.2

Tasks/ Milestones	**Responsible (lead)**	**Responsible (supporting role)**	**Starting date**
3.1: Monitor for confirmation that NOAA agrees that Taiwan had taken steps to investigate the violations described by NOAA.	FIP coordinator, FIP consultant		July 2023