

Action Plan for the GSK Marine S.A. Atlantic Tuna Purse Seine Fishery

Confidential Report
Version 3 (November 2024 update)

Originally prepared by
Key Traceability Ltd.
October 2021



Key Traceability Ltd.
+44 7505 122728
Info@keytraceability.com
England Registered Company 09730288
70 Londesborough Road, Portsmouth, PO4 0EX

Project ref. 0082d

Contents

- Workplan overview 4
- Introduction 5
 - Overview of update to workplan 1
- Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts 34
- Next steps 10

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.

Workplan overview

Table 1: Workplan overview

Workplan version and Date	V2 – November 2024
Start Date (expected)	End date (anticipated month/year)
November 2024	November 2026
FIP Lead (Organisation/individual responsible for Action Plan)	Improvements recommended by (meeting/group that supported the development)
Mohammadou S. Wade (GSK Marine S.A.)	Key Traceability GSK Marine S.A.
FIP Coordinator (organisation/individual responsible for reporting on FisheryProgress)	Workplan developed by (consultant or person)
Emily Wardrop (Key Traceability)	Key Traceability

Introduction

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

Table 2: Unit(s) of Assessment (UoA)

UoA1	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Skipjack tuna (<i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i>)
Stock	Eastern Atlantic Ocean
Geographical range	High seas of the Atlantic Ocean EEZs: Senegal, Mauritania, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Cape Verde, Sierra Leone, Liberia
Fishing method or gear type	Purse seine
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing the stock	Commercial purse seine vessels
UoA1	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Yellowfin tuna (<i>Thunnus albacares</i>)
Stock	Eastern Atlantic Ocean
Geographical range	High seas of the Atlantic Ocean EEZs: Senegal, Mauritania, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Cape Verde, Sierra Leone, Liberia
Fishing method or gear type	Purse seine
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing the stock	Commercial purse seine vessels
UoA1	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Bigeye tuna (<i>T. Obesus</i>)
Stock	Eastern Atlantic Ocean
Geographical range	High seas of the Atlantic Ocean EEZs: Senegal, Mauritania, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Cape Verde, Sierra Leone, Liberia
Fishing method or gear type	Purse seine
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing the stock	Commercial purse seine vessels

The FIP has two fishing vessels flagged to Guinea and Senegal, operating in the Atlantic Ocean International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT). These vessels are as detailed the table below. SEA BREEZE is a relatively new vessel added to the fleet in October 2023.

Table 3. Vessels by flag included in the FIP

Previous vessel name	Vessel name	Call sign	IMO number	Flag	Areas of operation
Panofi Frontier	Sea Frontier	9GIF	8988806	Guinea	ICCAT High Seas, Guinea EEZ, Liberia EEZ, Senegal EEZ, Guinea Bissau EEZ, Sierra Leone EEZ, Cape Verde EEZ, Mauritania EEZ
Montemaior	Sea Breeze	6WQY	7817323	Senegal	ICCAT High Seas, Guinea EEZ, Liberia EEZ, Senegal EEZ, Guinea Bissau EEZ, Sierra Leone EEZ, Cape Verde EEZ, Mauritania EEZ

The fishery under assessment is within the scope of the MSC Fisheries Standard (7.4 of the MSC Certification Process v2.2):

- 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 introduced species-based fishery (ISBF) as per the MSC FCP 7.4.7;

Due to the use of FADs in this fishery, the specific UoAs are classified as enhanced fisheries, as FADs are classified by MSC scope criteria as habitat modified (see FCP v2.2 G7.4): “Habitat modifications in enhanced fisheries can include both physical changes to the seabed or river course and the use of a range of man-made structures associated with the rearing or capture of fish that are not strictly ‘fishing gear’. In the first case, modifications can range from the construction of simple ponds in intertidal areas or river floodplains through to watercourse management measures aimed at improving spawning habitats. Examples of the second case are fish attracting and/or aggregating devices (e.g., FADs), lobster casitas and mussel culture ropes (in CAG systems). Such artificial habitat modifications either enhance the productivity of the fishery or facilitate the capture or production of commercial marine species”.

The fishery is within scope of the MSC Fisheries Standard. The report considers the following Units of Assessment (24 in total):

- Bigeye tuna (one stock) caught by purse seine in the Atlantic (eight UoAs).

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

These UoAs are separated in Table 4 below:

Table 4 - UoAs considered for this FIP

Species	Gear Type	Stock	Countries
Bigeye tuna	Purse seine	Atlantic	Guinea
			Mauritania
			Cape Verde
			Guinea Bissau
			Senegal
			Sierra Leone
			Liberia
			High seas
Skipjack tuna	Purse seine	Eastern Atlantic	Guinea
			Mauritania
			Cape Verde
			Guinea Bissau
			Senegal
			Sierra Leone
			Liberia
			High seas
Yellowfin tuna	Purse seine	Atlantic	Guinea
			Mauritania
			Cape Verde
			Guinea Bissau
			Senegal
			Sierra Leone
			Liberia
			High seas

Original workplan actions

Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks

Action Number and Name	1.1 – Stock status and rebuilding for bigeye tuna
Action Goal	There is evidence of Atlantic bigeye stock rebuilding within a specified timeframe and fishing mortality is reduced to achieve MSY.
Action Description	<p>This action has two parts associated with it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sla – a rebuilding timeframe is specified for the stock that is the shorter of 20 years or two times its generation time. 2. Slb – 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. <p>The FIP must be able to meet these two scoring issues to enable a score of a pass. The action therefore consists of the FIP advocating to the RFMO to provide evidence of Atlantic bigeye stock rebuilding within a specified timeframe and fishing mortality is reduced to achieve MSY.</p>
Expected Completion Date	October 2026
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: US\$ 2,500 for time collecting advocacy and developing positions, using it to lobby ICCAT. Expenses to attend ICCAT meeting estimated at a further \$2,000 per year.</p> <p>Year 2: As per year 1 plus undertaking the stock status review, \$3,500.</p> <p>Year 3: As per year 2.</p> <p>Year 4: As per year 2.</p> <p>Year 5: As per year 2.</p>
Responsible Parties	FIP participants, FIP coordinator, ICCAT, flag states of FIP vessels.

MSC PI Addressed by the Action	1.1.1, 1.1.2, 2.1.1
---------------------------------------	---------------------

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.1a: Lobbying ICCAT and the vessel’s flag state to conduct re-building scenarios. Independent scientific assistance to support the ICCAT in developing bigeye re-building scenarios.	FIP co-ordinator and FIP participants	Coastal states, NGOs, ICCAT	October 2021	October 2026	
1.1b: Lobbying ICCAT and the vessel’s flag state for robust, comprehensive BET rebuilding strategy developed to enable fishing to be at MSY levels.	FIP co-ordinator and FIP participants	Coastal states, NGOs, ICCAT	October 2021	October 2026	
1.1c: Lobbying ICCAT and the vessel’s flag state to adopt the above rebuilding strategy.	FIP co-ordinator and FIP participants	Coastal states, NGOs, ICCAT	October 2021	October 2026	
1.1d: Re-evaluation of the re-building plan at end of Yr. 3. Short-term technical assistance to the ICCAT. Fishing mortality (F) is F_{MSY}.	FIP co-ordinator and FIP participants	Coastal states, NGOs, ICCAT	October 2021	October 2026	
1.1e: Review Stock status relative to reference points annually.	FIP co-ordinator and FIP participants	ICCAT	March 2022	October 2026	

Action Number and Name	1.2 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy and stock assessment for bigeye and skipjack.
Action Goal	There is a robust and precautionary harvest strategy and stock assessment in place for Atlantic bigeye tuna and skipjack tuna.
Action Description	<p>The fishery should detail how the performance of the harvest strategy 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.</p> <p>This action has two parts associated with it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To address Sla, explicit harvest strategies for bigeye are to be designed. 2. To address Slb, a formal evaluation procedure for the harvest strategies is to be put in place for bigeye and skipjack.
Expected Completion Date	October 2026
Priority	High
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 for the first year is estimated in order to cover the necessary fees and expenses involved in undertaking this activity.</p> <p>Year 2: \$5,000.</p> <p>Year 3: As per year 2.</p> <p>Year 4: As per year 2.</p> <p>Year 5: None.</p>
Responsible Parties	FIP participants, FIP coordinator, ICCAT, flag states of FIP vessels
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	1.2.1, 1.2.4, 2.1.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.2a: Develop a strategy for engaging with RFMO scientists and CCM delegations to advocate for Management Strategy Options (MSEs) for controlling bigeye tuna harvest developed.	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal states, NGOs, ICCAT	October 2021	October 2026	
1.2b: Advocate for a more robust stock assessment of Atlantic skipjack to remove the noted major sources of uncertainty so the Committee can be in a position to provide a reliable estimate of the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) and therefore provide advice on the state of the eastern stock unlike previous attempts. Engage with and use evidence from stock scientists about the Atlantic skipjack stock to form a robust evaluation.	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal states, NGOs, ICCAT	October 2021	October 2026	
1.2c: Apply engagement strategy. FIP participants to engage with flag state delegation members at least once per year with the following purpose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Continuing to emphasise the importance of the harvest strategy process and stock rebuilding to the FIP industry partners and other fisheries in the Atlantic Ocean. ii. Proposing practical ways that the governments could support the process, e.g., via liaison to support capacity-building with coastal states, or other activities reporting regularly to the delegations so that they are kept informed of current ideas and proposals at RFMO and within coastal states where the industry partners have links. iii. Request that delegates support harvest strategy (HS) at RFMO meetings. 	FIP participants	Coastal states, NGOs, FIP co-ordinator	October 2021	October 2026	

iv. Clarify what is understood by a harvest strategy and harvest control rule in the MSC context and how the anticipated milestones relate to the current workplan.					
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. Milestone: Briefing document drafted.	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal states, NGOs, ICCAT	October 2022	October 2026	
1.2e: Position paper for a harvest control strategy and HCRs. Prepare a position paper to submit to plenary in support of making significant progress in developing a harvest strategy and control rules for bigeye. Work with the governments delegations and scientists to obtain their support for the paper, as well as that of other member states as far as possible.	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal States, NGOs, ICCAT	October 2022	October 2026	
1.2f: Promote best practice for harvest strategy and stock rebuilding. Promote through the government a process of consultation to inform RFMO members about best practice for harvest strategy and stock rebuilding, to build consensus towards support of proposals of management measures prior to RFMO Sessions.	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal states, NGOs, ICCAT	October 2022	October 2026	
1.2g: Continue to advocate for progression of harvest strategy development. Intersessional discussions to progress the harvest strategies between like-minded RFMO members and organisations, and formally at the relevant RFMO meetings.	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal states, NGOs, ICCAT	October 2022	October 2026	

Action Number and Name	1.3 – Develop harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for eastern Atlantic bigeye, skipjack and yellowfin tuna
Action Goal	There are well-defined and effective HCRs in place for eastern Atlantic bigeye, and Atlantic skipjack, and yellowfin tuna.
Action Description	<p>To reach SG60 for Sla, harvest control rules are generally understood. HCRs are to be in place or available that are expected to reduce the exploitation rate as the point of recruitment impairment (PRI) is approached. Pending implementation of the ICCAT rebuilding plan, the HCR is provided through Rec. 16-01, which is extended through 2019 by Rec. 19-02. This is supplemented by some further provisions for the retention of tuna species in 17-01, which has the objective of achieving a substantial reduction in discards of tropical tunas by 2020. The PRI is being approached at the current level of effort, and F is not being reduced sufficiently (with the total allowable catch (TAC) being exceeded every year, for example catches in 2016-2017 exceeded the TAC by 20% and those in 2018 by 13% (ICCAT, 2019a)) and the TAC does not affect all countries that can catch bigeye (ICCAT, 2019a), so the ability for the TAC to be surpassed can still continue.</p> <p>The FIP must undertake an initial review of the tools which are used to set the exploitation rate in the fishery as determined by the HCRs. This will then be used to advocate for amendment of the tools in use to control the exploitation rate as defined by the HCR. These should then be implemented and periodically reviewed to ensure a reduction in catch so current projections do not materialise. The TAC needs to be all encompassing.</p>
Expected Completion Date	January 2025
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: Undertaking an initial review and forming recommendations is expected to cost around US\$ 10,000. Thereafter there will be a need to update the review and implement the recommendations including gaining support for catch strategies.</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 5,000 for implementing the actions and updating the review.</p> <p>Year 3: Same as Year.</p> <p>Year 4: Same as Year 2</p> <p>Year 5: Same as Year 2</p>
Responsible Parties	FIP participants, FIP coordinator, ICCAT, flag states of FIP vessels

MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	1.2.2, 2.1.2
--	--------------

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected 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 ICCAT members and organisations and formally at each ICCAT meeting.</p> <p>Milestone: White paper on options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing skipjack, yellowfin and bigeye tuna harvest agreed.</p>	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal states, fishery, ICCAT NGOs	October 2021	January 2025	
<p>1.3b: Ensure a holistic implementation HCR development. Monitor work plan development to ensure the development, evaluation, and agreement of a HCR for the three species, alongside the development of the tools required for implementation.</p>	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal states, fishery, ICCAT, NGOs	October 2021	January 2025	
<p>1.3c: If necessary, provide an independent paper on the scope and needs of HCRs. Conduct a study to identify candidate HCRs and tools for all three for submission to ICCAT. Will include an evaluation of current (candidate) HCRs and tools for their effectiveness, and the main uncertainties identified and considered.</p> <p>Milestone: Study agreed by FIP participants and advocacy begins.</p>	FIP co-ordinator	Coastal states, fishery, ICCAT, NGOs	October 2022	January 2025	

<p>1.3d: On-going engagement with coastal states and ICCAT over HCR development. Discussions held regarding the assessment of HCRs and tools for all stocks, including how to address the assessment’s findings have occurred through inter-sessional discussions and formally through the ICCAT meeting process. To include intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded ICCAT members and organisations and formally at meetings at each ICCAT meeting.</p> <p>HCR options considered and discussed between sessions and formally through ICCAT meeting processes. ICCAT records reflect discussions and progress.</p> <p>The main uncertainties for different HCR options are identified.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator</p>	<p>Coastal states, fishery, ICCAT, NGOs</p>	<p>December 2022</p>	<p>January 2025</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 ICCAT 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 ICCAT meeting processes. ICCAT records reflect discussions and progress.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator</p>	<p>Coastal states, fishery, ICCAT, NGOs</p>	<p>June 2024</p>	<p>January 2025</p>	

Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts

Action Number and Name	2.1 – Secondary species outcome and management
Action Goal	Understand all known parameters, for example selectivity of the gear, to increase the susceptibility scoring.
Action Description	<p>Only one ‘main’ secondary species has been potentially identified from the client’s Senegal purse seine fishery. This is little tunny (<i>Euthynnus alletteratus</i>). As this species is not managed and reference points are not available, the RBF was used to score this scoring element. Little tunny’s MSC PSA derived score was 62. This may have been because the susceptibility scoring includes unknowns, for example selectivity of the gear. The RBF methodology states that “Where there is limited information available to score a susceptibility attribute, the more precautionary score shall be awarded (Annex PF4.4.2.2 of the MSC Certification Process v2.2). Other attributes also got the highest risk score as the species is retained and the depth of the purse seine net overlaps heavily with the species’ depth range.</p> <p>More information is required to potentially improve the score of the PSA. This could be by gathering more information from the fishery with respect to gear dimensions or more formally through a risk-based framework (RBF) workshop. Collecting fishery-specific data and requesting observer data from the fishing vessel and from across the different countries that the vessel will be fishing in will be essential to better understand the impacts.</p>
Expected Completion Date	October 2026
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: US\$ 7,500</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 20,000 to include the assessment and analysis.</p> <p>Year 3: US\$ 2,000</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 2,000</p> <p>Year 5: None</p>
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant

MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.2.1, 2.2.2
--	--------------

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.1a: UoA observer data with associated forms obtained over at least five-year period and analysed for shark finning incidents. Based on the findings of this analysis, a management strategy should be validated by the UoA that demonstrates shark finning is not taking place, as required.	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery, Coastal states' ministries (MCS), ports authorities	October 2021	October 2026	
2.1b: Verify if there is a shark finning policy implemented across the company, if not develop a robust policy to be used by the vessel	FIP co-ordinator	FIP consultant	October 2021	October 2022	Yes
2.1c: Determine the need for an ecosystem risk assessment (ERA) and if necessary, go out to tender to plan and organise that includes finding unknown parameters to complete a PSA.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP consultant	October 2021	October 2026	
2.1d: Analyse, if necessary, the need for electronic monitoring (EM) in the fleet to provide third-party coverage of fleet activities with regard to secondary species.	Fishery	FIP co-ordinator	October 2021	October 2026	
2.1e: Development of a fleet-level generic bycatch reduction strategy to minimise bycatch levels, especially for associated sets. Strategy should include best-practice handling procedures.	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery	October 2021	October 2026	
2.1f: Put in place additional management measures and data collection, if required.	Fishery	FIP consultant/co-ordinator	June 2022	October 2026	

<p>2.1g: Review effectiveness of management strategy.</p> <p>A short consultancy project to be initiated to review the effectiveness of the management plan for mitigating impacts on ETP species. This is to include the measures and implementation processes to assess implementation successes and barriers, including results of data analysis to provide feedback on best practice procedures.</p> <p>Alternatives measures to be put in place as required.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator</p>	<p>Fishery, potentially Coastal states' management authorities (MCS) and port authorities</p>	<p>June 2026</p>	<p>October 2026</p>	
---	-------------------------	---	------------------	---------------------	--

<p>Action Number and Name</p>	<p>2.2 – FAD management</p>
<p>Action Goal</p>	<p>The associated actions concerning FADs cover a number of PIs. These have been disseminated below:</p> <p>ETP PIs – The use of FADs in the fishery will not hinder the recovery of ETP species (such as whale sharks, silky sharks, turtles, and other species) and indirect effects are highly likely not to create unacceptable impacts. Relevant information is collected to support the management of UoA impacts (including FADs) on ETP species, including information to develop a management strategy (which should aim not to hinder recovery of ETP species and regularly reviews and implements measures to minimise mortality of ETP species), assess its effectiveness and determine outcome status of ETP species.</p> <p>Habitat PIs - The use of FADs in the fishery will not cause serious or irreversible harm to habitat structure and function and there will be a management strategy in place with this objective. Information is adequate to determine the risk posed to the habitat by the UoA and the effectiveness of the strategy to manage impacts on the habitat.</p> <p>Ecosystem PIs – The use of FADs will not cause serious or irreversible harm to the key elements of the ecosystem structure and function. There will be management measures in place to meet this objective, and the information collected shall demonstrate adequate knowledge of the impacts of the UoA on the ecosystem.</p>
<p>Action Description</p>	<p>ETP species PIs - There are both direct and indirect effects associated with FADs. The behaviour of species such as silky sharks makes them more likely to be directly caught in purse seine operations due to their affinity for floating objects and secondly through FAD entanglement (for species like silky sharks and turtles) adding an unobserved mortality element to associated impacts. Additionally, with respect to indirect effects, tunas and silky sharks are more closely</p>

associated with FADs during daytime (Forget et al., 2015¹), making them vulnerable to capture but little information is known about how ETP species' behaviours are affected by interactions with FADs.

Habitats PIs - Whilst it is probable that the use of FADs is unlikely to reduce the structure and function of VME (coral reefs) and commonly encountered habitats as to cause serious or irreversible harm, the lack of information and understanding of the real nature of this issue and the accumulative effect of years of FAD deployment in the Atlantic (granted not just from this fishery) means the more information should be gathered to provide higher degrees of certainty in order to produce a management strategy to achieve a habitat outcome PI score of SG80 (i.e. a strategy is in place that is designed to ensure the UoAs do not pose a risk of serious or irreversible harm to the habitats encountered by the fishery).

Ecosystem PIs- The effects of FADs used in the fishery on the migration patterns and feeding of tuna and other key predators (e.g., silky shark and oceanic whitetip shark) is a subject of concern. The impact of current FAD numbers on tuna populations and the broader ecosystem are poorly understood. Research (Haillier and Gaertner, 2008²) indicated that tunas associated with FADs eat less than those in free schools, the difference in growth rate and condition potentially being a consequence of altered feeding patterns. Significant changes in migratory direction and displacement rates were observed in the presence of drifting FADs, supporting the hypothesis that FADs act as a super-stimulus, misleading tunas to make inappropriate habitat selection. However, further studies are required to investigate the long-term effect of FADs on the entire life cycle of tunas.

The steps involved in this action will contribute to a deeper understanding of the effects of FADs on both the marine environment, as well as for fishing efficiency across purse seine vessels, and better these devices can be managed across the fishery/FIP. A review of the literature will help to understand the 'Ecological Trap Hypothesis' of FADs and to identify the impacts this has on both target and secondary species, including important ETP species. The action will also need to verify the use of non-entangling FADs and provide skipper training to be able to identify the species that are caught, to ensure that they are fully represented in catch data. Observer data and Electronic Monitoring (EM) systems are required to be implemented across the vessel to check for species bycatch and identify the species' interactions with the specific fishing gear.

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

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

Expected Completion Date	October 2026
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 1: US\$ 15,000 Year 2: US\$ 7,500 Year 3: TBC dependent on previous years Year 4: TBC dependent on previous years Year 5: None
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.4.3, 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.2a: Review current literature to understand the 'ecological trap hypothesis' of FADs on behaviour, feeding and migration of key elements of the ecosystem, including ETP sharks, indication of other potential impacts of FADs on key elements of the ecosystem to frame the problem and necessary research. This shall then be used to advise task 2.2b.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2022	October 2026	Yes

<p>2.2b: Define the approach to investigate the ‘ecological trap hypothesis’ of FADs on behaviour, feeding and migration of key elements of the ecosystem, including ETP species such as sharks, indication of other potential impacts of FADs on key elements of the ecosystem. The objective of this is to add to the information base on indirect effects of the UoAs on ETP species and main impacts of the UoA on these key ecosystem elements. This can then be used to update the pre-assessment and action plan.</p>	FIP co-ordinator	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2022	October 2026	
<p>2.2c: Verify the fishery has formally adopted best practice non-entangling FADs. Taking into account the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Clarifying latest ISSF recommendations on ‘non-entangling FADs’. Note, the requirement on ‘non-entangling FADs’ in ICCAT Recommendation 19-02 potentially refers to the ‘lower risk entanglement FADs’ according to some ISSF guidelines (where there is conflicting definitions of NE FADs in ISSF guidelines as of April 2021). To meet the MSC standard, it is likely the FIP will have to go further than this. II. Look at promoting the adoption of biodegradable materials (as per Task 4) to help reduce the severity of FAD beaching. 	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery, NGOs	March 2022	October 2026	
<p>2.2d: Species identification training for skippers is needed to improve the accuracy of fishery-dependent recordings of non-target species interacting with the fishery and make sure best practice on board is happening. These species are normally not of commercial interest, so may have been previously overlooked. Training should cover the commonly</p>	FIP co-ordinator, fishery	NGOs	March 2022	October 2026	

<p>encountered species (ETP and secondary species) and identification guides provided to each vessel.</p>					
<p>2.2e: Fishery-dependent recording of ETP species needs to be improved to allow cross-checking with observer data and EMS analysis to build a more accurate picture of fishery-specific impacts and identify potential ‘hot-spots’ for ETP interactions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Design addition to daily catch reporting logbook (electronic or hard copy) to record. II. Using the format described in 1. above, record set-types, locations, numbers, and fates of ETP species (to species level) caught in the fishery (by operations and entangled with FADs). This should include those species which are not broad onboard or when found entangled with a FAD prior to remove of the FAD from the water (see 4f Implement FAD management plan). 	<p>FIP co-ordinator, fishery</p>	<p>NGOs</p>	<p>June 2022</p>	<p>October 2026</p>	
<p>2.2f: Define a fishery specific FAD management plan aimed at reducing the risk of derelict and impact of entangling FADs and to make sure best practice on board is happening. The plan should focus on a number of measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Development and practical implementation of biodegradable FADs. II. Record the number of FADs deployed. III. Removal and recording (location, type of FAD, any entanglements of animals) of abandoned FADs when encountered, regardless of ownership. IV. Gathering more information of lost FADs, spatial extent and interactions with habitats and explore how these may be tracked. A research paper will 	<p>FIP co-ordinator, fishery</p>	<p>NGOs</p>	<p>July 2022</p>	<p>October 2026</p>	

<p>be compiled gathering more information to allow identification of the main impacts of derelict FADs in this fishery. The focus will be around the issues as discussed in the pre-assessment. An output will include recommendations for mitigating the impacts.</p> <p>V. Avoiding high risk FAD deployment areas.</p> <p>VI. Collaboration in a FAD Watch programme across the WCPO.</p> <p>VII. Limiting FAD deployments.</p>					
<p>2.2g: Implement investigation approach as outlined in task 2.2b.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, fisheries research organisation</p>	<p>NGOs</p>	<p>July 2022</p>	<p>October 2026</p>	
<p>2.2h: Align work with relevant e-NGOs to the fishery to test the difference in the impacts of biodegradable and traditional non-entangling FADs in selected locations.</p>	<p>Fishery/ FIP co-ordinator</p>	<p>NGOs</p>	<p>July 2022</p>	<p>October 2026</p>	
<p>2.2i: Reach out to e-NGOs in relevant countries to determine the potential risk to corals from derelict FADs and entanglement of ETP species. This information will be included to the assessment, and possible additional actions shall be added at a later date.</p>	<p>Fishery/ FIP co-ordinator</p>	<p>NGOs</p>	<p>July 2022</p>	<p>October 2026</p>	
<p>2.2j: Analyse fishery reporting on ETP species in conjunction with observer data to quantify direct effects of the fishery operations and FAD-use (entanglement). This analysis should be done annually to build an information base on the fishery.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator</p>		<p>October 2021</p>	<p>October 2026</p>	
<p>2.2k: Improve FAD management strategies at the fishery level, where necessary to fill gaps through advocacy to</p>	<p>Fishery, Flag States</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator</p>	<p>March 2022</p>	<p>October 2026</p>	

necessary states. Further advocate for the implementation of sustainable FAD management strategies at the RFMO level.					
2.2l: Implement the FAD management plan (2.2f) and ensure sure best practice (covering points described in the management plan).	Fishery	FIP co-ordinator, observer programme	March 2023	October 2026	
2.2m: Verify application of the FAD management plan in the fishery of through observer data	Fishery	FIP co-ordinator, observer programme	July 2023	October 2026	
2.2n: Present a report that provides evidence that the collected information has been analysed with the identification of the main impacts of derelict FADs on coral reefs, and an understanding of the spatial extent and timing of the interactions (as per 2.2f).	Research group/institute	FIP consultant/FIP co-ordinator	July 2023	October 2026	
2.2o: Present a report on investigation as outlined in 2.2b. Report will cover: (i) the potential impact of the UoAs FADs on the behaviour, feeding and migration of key elements of the ecosystem (including ETP species); and (ii) any other main consequences of the UoAs FADs for the ecosystem that may be inferred (i.e., indirect effects).	Research group/institute	FIP consultant/FIP co-ordinator	July 2023	October 2026	
2.2p: If necessary, the FIP shall advocate to the authorities to update this document to include the latest guidelines on FAD design as well as other FAD measures.	Research group/institute	FIP consultant/FIP co-ordinator	July 2023	October 2026	

Principle 3: Effective management

Action Number and Name	3.1 - Legal and customary framework for Guinea, Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone and Liberia
Action Goal	Demonstration that a comprehensive legal and customary framework is in place for these countries.
Action Description	Efforts are required to collect information across all countries that the fishing vessel operates in, including: Guinea, Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Liberia. Communication with stakeholders to determine their involvement in the management of the FIP is essential. Regular engagement with coastal states to learn more about the operation and management policies in place regarding dispute resolutions to support the requirement that there are effective and practicing dispute resolution policies implemented.
Expected Completion Date	October 2026
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: The consultation and review can be managed by the FIP coordinator in collaboration with the relevant FIP participants and flag states. It is estimated that this would cost US\$ 5,000 per flag state (35k total) plus extra US\$ 5,000 if consultation is required.</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 3,000 if consultation is required</p> <p>Year 3: US\$ 3,000 if consultation is required</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 3,000 if consultation is required</p> <p>Year 5: US\$ 3,000</p>
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant, and flag states
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	3.1.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.1a: Collect information and conduct a review of fishery dispute mechanisms of Guinea, Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Liberia with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. This is to be arranged by the FIP coordinator and supported by the FIP participants with influence over the flag state. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary.	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	Ministry, fishery	October 2021	October 2026	
3.1b: Conduct a review of customary fishery rights of Guinea, Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Liberia with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. This is to be arranged by the FIP coordinator and supported by the FIP participants with influence over the flag state. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary.	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	Ministry, fishery	October 2021	October 2026	
3.1c: Engage regularly with coastal State management to develop dispute mechanism where absent in Guinea, Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Liberia. Minutes should be kept of each meeting, topics discussed, outcomes and appropriate timelines for implementation.	Ministries/FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	October 2021	October 2026	

<p>3.1d: Engage regularly with coastal State management to develop a mechanism to integrate and observe customary rights in Guinea, Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Liberia into the management system where absent. Minutes should be kept of each meeting, topics discussed, outcomes and appropriate timelines for implementation.</p>	<p>Ministries/FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>October 2021</p>	<p>October 2026</p>	
<p>3.1e: Ensure appropriate transparent and effective dispute resolution is enshrined in legislation in Guinea, Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Liberia.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator</p>	<p>Ministry</p>	<p>January 2026</p>	<p>October 2026</p>	
<p>3.1f: Ensure appropriate dispute resolution and respect for rights is enshrined in legislation in Guinea, Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Liberia.</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator</p>	<p>Ministry</p>	<p>January 2026</p>	<p>October 2026</p>	

<p>Action Number and Name</p>	<p>3.2 - Consultation, roles and responsibilities for Guinea, Senegal, Mauritania, and Guinea Bissau</p>
<p>Action Goal</p>	<p>Demonstrate that fishery management systems for Guinea, Senegal, Mauritania, and Guinea Bissau meet the MSC Standard PI 3.1.2. Specifically, that it identifies and actively engages with all interested parties and all roles are understood.</p>
<p>Action Description</p>	<p>Conduct investigations into the degree of involvement in the FIP from stakeholders and external industry members to understand how their responsibilities are influencing the management and policies for the FIP. If the FIP is lacking participation from any particular external organisations/members, advocate and encourage more involvement and engagement and review the efficacy of this involvement.</p>
<p>Expected Completion Date</p>	<p>October 2026</p>

Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	Year 1: US\$ 3,000 Year 2: US\$ 3,000 Year 3: US\$ 1,00 Year 4: US\$ 1,000 Year 5: US\$ 1,000
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant and Flag States
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	3.1.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.2a: Conduct investigation and review the degree to which all roles and responsibilities within the fishery are clearly defined. Consult with industry and other stakeholders to ascertain how well the functions and responsibilities are understood.	FIP co-ordinator	National management authorities	October 2021	October 2026	
3.2b: Identify all relevant stakeholders in the fishery.	FIP co-ordinator	National management authorities, fishery	October 2021	October 2026	
3.2c: Ensure all agencies within the management framework clearly identify the role publicly.	National management authorities	FIP co-ordinator	October 2021	October 2026	

3.2d: Develop a strategy to ensure and encourage wider engagement and representation in consultations.	National management authorities	FIP co-ordinator	October 2021	October 2026	
3.2e: Ensure the fishery management plan clearly identifies which departments will undertake which roles in the fishery.	National management authorities	FIP co-ordinator	October 2022	October 2026	
3.2f: Periodically review the efficacy of the consultation process.	FIP co-ordinator	National management authorities	October 2022	October 2026	

Action Number and Name	3.3 – Long-term objectives for Guinea Bissau
Action Goal	Have evidence of long-term objectives defined by Guinea Bissau.
Action Description	A review on the long-term objectives in Guinea Bissau is required to fulfill this action and means organising meetings with stakeholders and national management authorities to devise a management plan that fulfills these objectives as necessary.
Expected Completion Date	October 2026
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	Year 1: There is an initial need for research and review of the long-term objectives with led by the FIP coordinator and supported by the relevant FIP participants. Most of the work will be conducted in year 1 (a budget of US\$ 10,000 is estimated) and the subsequent years should involve just following up with consultations and meetings. Year 2: US\$ 5,000 Year 3: US\$ 5,000

	Year 4: US\$ 3,000 Year 5: none
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant, and flag states
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	3.1.3

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.3a: Conduct a review of long-term objectives in Guinea Bissau with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary.	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	National management authorities	October 2021	October 2026	
3.3b: Engage with national management authorities of Guinea Bissau and other key stakeholders to promote the concept of long-term objectives in relation to MSC. A summary of topics discussed surrounding these objectives to be produced to demonstrate progress, including a list of participants.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	NGOs	March 2022	October 2026	
3.3c: The stakeholder group shall meet annually to discuss progress and formulation objectives where not in place.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	NGOs	October 2022	October 2026	

3.3d: Embed these explicit long-term objectives that have been discussed and agreed during meetings with stakeholders into a tuna management plan.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	NGOs	July 2024	October 2026	
3.3e: Review and report on appropriateness of the objectives implemented and amend as necessary.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/	Fishery	July 2026	October 2026	

Action Number and Name	3.4 – Fishery-specific objectives for Guinea, Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Liberia
Action Goal	Have a robust fishery specific management plan or obtain and understand the existing fishery specific objectives.
Action Description	Conduct a review of the fishery-specific management legislation in place across Guinea, Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Liberia using stakeholder information. Engage with stakeholders and national management bodies to attain this information and hold annual meetings to discuss the progress.
Expected Completion Date	October 2026
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 1: US\$ 7,500 Year 2: US\$ 5,000 Year 3: US\$ 5,000 Year 4: US\$ 2,500 Year 5: US\$ 2,500

Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant, and flag states
MSC Pls Addressed by the Action	3.2.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.4a: Conduct a review of fishery specific management legislation of Guinea, Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Liberia with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary.	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	National management authorities	October 2021	October 2026	
3.4b: Engage with national management authorities of Guinea, Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone and Liberia and other key stakeholders to promote the concept of a specific fisheries management plan for tuna fisheries. A summary of topics discussed surrounding these objectives to be produced to demonstrate progress, including a list of participants.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	NGOs	January 2022	October 2026	
3.4c: The stakeholder group shall meet annually to discuss progress and formulation of tuna management plan where not in place.	National management authorities/ FIP	NGOs	August 2022 and August 2023	October 2026	

	co-ordinator/ fishery				
3.4d: Promote the production of a tuna management plan for Senegal which explicitly lists the short- and long-term objectives that have been discussed and agreed with stakeholders.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator/ fishery	NGOs	August 2024	October 2026	
3.4e: Review appropriateness of tuna management plan implemented and advocate for amendments as necessary.	National management authorities/ FIP co-ordinator	Fishery	August 2025	October 2026	

Action Number and Name	3.5 – Decision-making processes for Guinea, Mauritania, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Liberia
Action Goal	Evidence that the management system or fishery is attempting to comply in a timely fashion with judicial decisions arising from any legal challenges
Action Description	Conduct a review of the decision-making processes in Guinea, Mauritania, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Liberia to fill in the gaps from the pre-assessment. This report should discuss the relevant stakeholders' involvement and participation in these decision-making processes. Continuously consult with stakeholders to incorporate the decision-making processes and implement them into the FIP following the precautionary approach.
Expected Completion Date	October 2026
Priority	High

Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: The review and reporting would need to be conducted by a qualified team and it is estimated that this could involve US\$ 15,000 of fees. If an in-person meeting is necessary then these expenses would be extra, a budget of \$3,000 per country would be recommended.</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 2,000 plus expenses if in-person meeting is necessary</p> <p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 1,000</p> <p>Year 5: No associated costs</p>
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant, and flag states
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	3.2.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>3.5a: Conduct review of decision-making processes in Guinea, Mauritania, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Liberia to fully understand gaps identified in pre-assessment. The reviews should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the process transparent, timely & evidence-based? 2. Does the decision-making processes respond to serious and other important issues identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation and consultation? 3. Does it include the precautionary approach and use of best science available? 4. Input from management authorities and other relevant stakeholders. 	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant		October 2021	October 2026	

<p>5. If there are/have been any legal challenges and how these have been addressed by the management system and/or fishery.</p> <p>A report should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>					
<p>3.5b: Define decision-making processes in the management system. The process shall include, if necessary, how will evidence be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Included (from research, monitoring, evaluation, and consultation). 2. Stakeholders be consulted. 3. Utilised from best-available information to ensure the precautionary approach. 4. Outcomes be communicated (information should be made available on request and explanations are provided for any actions or lack of action associated with findings and relevant recommendations emerging from research, monitoring evaluation and review activity). 5. Process for addressing legal challenges if necessary. 6. Precautionary approach in management plan. 	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>October 2022</p>	<p>October 2026</p>	
<p>3.5c: 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>March 2023</p>	<p>October 2026</p>	
<p>3.5d: Implement the decision-making process, ensuring stakeholder are consulted and informed (for example via email, website, formal report etc.) best-available information (from RFMOs, research etc.) and the precautionary approach are included.</p>	<p>Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery</p>	<p>FIP co-ordinator, NGOs</p>	<p>October 2023</p>	<p>October 2026</p>	

3.5e: Review the efficacy of the decision-making process.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co- ordinator, NGOs	March 2024	October 2026	
---	--	-------------------------------	---------------	-----------------	--

Action Number and Name	3.6 - Compliance and enforcement for Guinea, Senegal, Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Liberia
Action Goal	Obtain further evidence to understand all flag states meet SG80 in the MSC standard and ensure there is no evidence of systematic non-compliance.
Action Description	Review the current MCS systems in place including plans and strategies, interviews with enforcement personnel, researching records of previous infringement/penalties given, and previous reviews of the systems. Use this information to determine any gaps, and look to fill those gaps with more findings. Hold consultations with stakeholders to implement the MCS systems and conduct a final review once all are in place.
Expected Completion Date	October 2026
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 1: US\$ 5,000 Year 2: US\$ 5,000 Year 3: No associated costs Year 4: US\$ 2,000 Year 5: US\$ 1,000
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant, and flag states
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	3.2.3

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>3.6a: Review MCS systems in place in the fisheries. This should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MCS plans and strategies. 2. Information on MCS mechanisms in place (VMS, logbooks, landed catch documentation etc.). 3. Interviews with enforcement personnel. 4. Records of previous infringements, penalties, sanctions and/or court proceedings. 5. Any previous reviews or evaluations of MCS systems. <p>A report should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	Fishery	October 2021	October 2026	
3.6b: Develop plan to combat the gaps identified in the national MCS systems based on findings of report in.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	October 2022	October 2026	
3.6c: 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	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2023	October 2026	

3.6d: Implement finalised plan where necessary, allocating the necessary resources to ensure successful employment of improved MCS system.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2023	October 2026	
3.6e: Review effectiveness of MCS system implemented and adjust where necessary. A report should be produced and supplied to stakeholders and consultations re-opened if necessary.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2024	October 2026	

Action Number and Name	3.7 - Management performance evaluation for Guinea, Mauritania, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, and Liberia
Action Goal	Ensure regular internal and external reviews are taking place across all flag states.
Action Description	Review the fishery-specific management processes in place and ascertain whether these systems are subject to internal and/or external review via a report. Use this report to identify and develop on gaps in the management process. Hold stakeholder consultations to discuss the steps required to implement the plans which will be subject to regular internal and external review. A final review and report will be devised to assess the effectiveness of the system.
Expected Completion Date	October 2026
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 1: US\$ 5,000 Year 2: US\$ 2,500 Year 3: No associated costs Year 4: US\$ 2,500 Year 5: No associated costs

Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant, and flag states
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	3.2.4

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>3.7a: Review fishery-specific management processes currently in place. Ascertain whether these systems are subject to internal and/or external review, the format, the areas already reviewed (tuna management plan, performance, decision-making, MCS, compliance to RFMO/international regulations etc.) and the frequency to which these occur.</p> <p>A report should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	Fishery authority	October 2021	October 2026	
<p>3.7b: Develop plan to combat the gaps identified in the national fishery-specific systems based on findings of report.</p>	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP co-ordinator	October 2022	October 2026	
<p>3.7c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to discuss implementation and potential adjustments to plan. Meeting minutes should be produced after each consultation to allow topics, actions, opinions, difficulties and progress to be recorded and monitored for all affect parties.</p>	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP co-ordinator	January 2023	October 2026	

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 2024	October 2026	
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 2025	October 2026	

Overview of update to workplan and additional actions

In October 2024 the FIP underwent the mandatory three-year independent evaluation to assess the progress made on the workplan actions from FIP initiation-to-date. In the evaluation, it was determined that the habitats performance indicator (PI) scores should be reduced from an unconditional pass (>80) to a conditional pass (60-79) as there is currently no specific evidence that the FIP is engaged in a FAD retrieval programme to reduce the impact of lost, discarded or abandoned FADs used by the vessels. Therefore, as there is scope to improve this area, the FIP has devised a new action to be added to the FIP actions to align with meeting this area of data paucity.

Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts

Action Number and Name	2.4 – FAD retrieval programme
Action Goal	The aim of this action is to ensure that there is a plan in place, which is also effective at reducing the number of FADs that are lost, discarded and abandoned by the vessels in the GSK Marine FIP
Action Description	The tasks associated with this action are based on ensuring that the FIP is accurately reporting on the number of FADs that it activates, deploys, sets upon, and retrieves.
Expected Completion Date	November 2026
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 4: Normal FIP budget costs Year 5: Normal FIP budget costs
Responsible Parties	Fishery, FIP coordinator, fisheries consultant
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	2.4.2, 2.4.3

Tasks	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Estimated completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.4a: Request all FAD use information (activation, deployment, set numbers, and retrieval). This could originate from Zunibal sources or from the FIP’s own collection of FAD use data.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	November 2024	November 2026	FAD use data
2.4b: Using the data supplied from Zunibal or the FIP itself, conduct an analysis of the data and produce a report outlining the findings, including how many FADs are used per year, how many FADs are retrieved at the end of their use, and how many are lost.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	November 2024	November 2026	Report featuring the details of the FAD usage by the GSK Marine vessels.
2.4c: Using the information from 2.4b, assess the importance of initiating a specific scheme or programme that ensures that the vessels are retrieving any FADs that are broken, damaged, or no longer in use.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	November 2024	November 2026	Initiation of a FAD retrieval programme.
2.4d: Regularly monitor the FAD retrieval programme to ensure that the vessels are maintaining good progress with the recovery of all FADs deployed by the FIP.	FIP co-ordinator	FIP participant	November 2025	November 2026	
2.4e: Collaborate with local coastal states within which lost or discarded FADs may drift. Align this work with activities already being undertaken by other companies in Senegal (e.g., CAPSEN S.A.)	FIP participant,	FIP co-ordinator	November 2024	November 2026	Collaboration with relevant coastal states and other FAD retrieval initiatives

Next steps

The FIP will continue to ensure that it closely monitors its FAD use, which considers both FAD activation, deployment, and retrieval practices. Collaboration with other existing FAD retrieval programmes could be a good way to engage with these practices but in lieu of this, the FIP shall work to develop its own FAD retrieval programme that aligns with the requirements of the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fisheries Standard to ensure that the vessels may enter into the assessment progress within the next few years.