Atlantic Ocean tuna and swordfish - longline

(Ying Sheng Hsiang)

Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) Workplan

Prepared by

Key Traceability Ltd.

November 2024

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

Introduction

The Atlantic Ocean tuna and swordfish longline fishery operates in the high seas of the Atlantic Ocean and lands its catch in the port of Dakar, Senegal. The longline vessels are flagged to both China and Namibia and the fishery is managed by Ying Sheng Hsiang (YSH). The fishery is regionally managed by the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT). The longline gears are set in the upper pelagic zone of the ocean and are not expected to interact with any habitats or vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs), however, at the pre-assessment stage, specific information regarding the vessels' areas of operation has not been disclosed. The main information about this fishery was provided by the fishery itself, and included examples of logbook data to identify any bycatch species that could be associated with the fishery. There was no independent data (i.e., observer reports) provided at the pre-assessment stage so information on bycatch was largely estimated from similar fisheries that operate using the same gears and in the same areas. More specific information about this can be found in the pre-assessment report. An online search of the management measures and monitoring from ICCAT, China, and Namibia.

The results of the pre-assessment highlighted several performance indicators (PIs) that were deemed to either pass (with conditions) or fail at the MSC assessment level. The FIP workplan overview can be found in **Error! R eference source not found.**, below.

Table 1: FIP workplan overview

Workplan Version and Date	December 2024
Start date (expected)	**End date** (anticipated month/year)
January 2025	January 2030
FIP Lead (organization/individual responsible for Action Plan)	**Improvements recommended by** (meeting/group that supported the development)
Ying Sheng Hsiang Fishery Co.	Key Traceability
FIP Coordinator (organization/individual responsible for reporting on FisheryProgress)	**Workplan developed by** (consultant or person)
Key Traceability (KT) Key Traceability Asia (KTA)	Tom Evans – KT Emily Wardrop – KT Ming-Jhang Chen - KTA

Glossary

Table 2: Glossary

Acronym	Definition
ETP	Endangered, Threatened, Protected
FIP	Fishery Improvement Project
ISSF	International Seafood Sustainability Foundation
MSC	Marine Stewardship Council
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
PI	Performance Indicator
RFMO	Regional Fisheries Management Organisation
UoA	Unit of Assessment
YSH	Ying Sheng Hsiang

Unit of Assessment(s)

Table 3: Unit(s) of Assessment (UoA)

UoA 1	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Albacore tuna *(Thunnus alalunga)*
Stock	Northern Atlantic Ocean
Geographical area	Atlantic Ocean
Fishing method or gear type	Longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Commercial fishing fleet from Namibia and China

UoA 2	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Albacore tuna *(Thunnus alalunga)*
Stock	Southern Atlantic Ocean
Geographical area	Atlantic Ocean
Fishing method or gear type	Longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Commercial fishing fleet from Namibia and China
UoA 3	**Description**
Target species (common and scientific name)	Yellowfin tuna *(Thunnus albacares)*
Stock	Atlantic Ocean
Geographical area	Atlantic Ocean
Fishing method or gear type	Longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Commercial fishing fleet from Namibia and China
UoA 4	**Description**
Target species (common and scientific name)	Bigeye tuna *(Thunnus obesus)*
Stock	Atlantic Ocean
Geographical area	Atlantic Ocean
Fishing method or gear type	Longline

Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Commercial fishing fleet from Namibia and China
UoA 5	**Description**
Target species (common and scientific name)	Swordfish *(Xiphias gladius)*
Stock	Northern Atlantic Ocean
Geographical area	Atlantic Ocean
Fishing method or gear type	Longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Commercial fishing fleet from Namibia and China
UoA 6	**Description**
Target species (common and scientific name)	Swordfish *(Xiphias gladius)*
Stock	Southern Atlantic Ocean
Geographical area	Atlantic Ocean
Fishing method or gear type	Longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Commercial fishing fleet from Namibia and China

Executive summary

This report serves as a pre-assessment of the Ying Sheng Hsiang (YSH) tuna longline fishery operating in the Atlantic Ocean (AO). The scope of the pre-assessment involves vessel flagged to Namibia and People's Republic of China. The UoA vessels fish in high seas areas of the Atlantic Ocean. The main strengths of the fishery are:

- Target species stocks are largely aligned with the requirements of either a conditional or unconditional pass at the MSC Fisheries Standard level. This is particularly true of Atlantic yellowfin and albacore tuna, and north Atlantic swordfish, which have positive stock assessments
- There are established management frameworks for cooperation between countries that fish for tuna.
- The efficacy of management frameworks for achieving environmental sustainability outcomes are strong

The main weaknesses of the fishery are:

- Bigeye tuna harvest strategies are not precautionary, and yellowfin tuna also lacks official harvest control rules;
- Fishery/UoA specific catch and observer data to effectively determine UoA catch composition and primary, secondary, and ETP species and main and minor species designations have been estimated using similar MSC fishery assessment reports and are not considered to be exhaustive of the interacted species.
- On-board operational practices (such as training and handling) and Codes of Conduct to mitigate risks to ETP and Secondary species are absent and should be improved.

However, in total, only six Performance Indicators (PIs) are reported to be failing MSC assessment at this pre-assessment stage (<60) as a result, largely, of the lacking third-party observer data that can be used to demonstrate and verify the types of species interacted with as bycatch by the vessels in the fleet. Whilst we were able to draw comparisons with similar MSC certified fisheries to estimate the types of species thought to be interacted with, this is not indicative of the fishery-specific impacts on the populations of these stocks. Therefore, it was a decision by the assessment team to use the precautionary approach with the scoring of these particular elements. Furthermore, upon receiving observer data reports and/or more robust logbook records, the failing PIs may be able to improve in score and meet a pass at MSC level. This will be considered when developing the workplan for this fishery.

The remaining PIs all scored either a conditional or unconditional pass at this pre-assessment stage and therefore only those that have conditions associated with the pass will be considered in the fishery workplan when it is being produced.

FIP Pre-assessment outcomes

The results of the pre-assessment demonstrated clear areas required to be improved upon in order for the fishery to meet the requirements of the MSC Fisheries Standard Version 2.01 and pass the assessment process. The following tables (4-6) demonstrate a brief summary of the total score provided to each performance indicator (PI) at the pre-assessment stage. More information about the specific scoring can be found in the pre-assessment report.

Table 4 – Summary PI scores for Principle 1

PI number	PI name	North Atlantic Albacore	South Atlantic albacore	Yellowfin	Bigeye	North Atlantic swordfish	South Atlantic swordfish
1.1.1	Stock Status	≥ 80	≥ 80	≥ 80	60-79	≥ 80	60-79
1.1.2	Stock Rebuilding	N/a	N/a	N/a	60-79	N/a	60-79
1.2.1	Harvest Strategy	≥ 80	≥ 80	≥ 80	60-79	≥ 80	60-79
1.2.2	Harvest Control Rules and Tools	≥ 80	60-79	60-79	60-79	≥ 80	60-79
1.2.3	Information Monitoring	≥ 80	≥ 80	≥ 80	≥ 80	≥ 80	≥ 80
1.2.4	Assessment of Stock Status	≥ 80	≥ 80	≥ 80	≥ 80	≥ 80	≥ 80

Table 5 – Summary PI scores for Principle 2

PI number	PI name	Score
2.1.1	Primary species outcome	< 60
2.1.2	Primary species management	60-79
2.1.3	Primary species information	60-79
2.2.1	Secondary species outcome	≥ 80
2.2.2	Secondary species management	< 60
2.2.3	Secondary species information	< 60
2.3.1	ETP species outcome	< 60
2.3.2	ETP species management	< 60
2.3.3	ETP species information	< 60

2.4.1	Habitats outcome	≥ 80
2.4.2	Habitats management	≥ 80
2.4.3	Habitats information	≥ 80
2.5.1	Ecosystems outcome	≥ 80
2.5.2	Ecosystems management	60-79
2.5.3	Ecosystems information	60-79

Table 6 – Summary PI scores for Principle 3

PI number	PI name	Score
3.1.1	Legal and customary framework	≥80
3.1.2	Consultation, roles & responsibilities	≥80
3.1.3	Long-term objectives	≥80
3.2.1	Fishery specific objectives	≥80
3.2.2	Decision making processes	60-79
3.2.3	Compliance & enforcement	60-79
3.2.4	Monitoring & management performance evaluation	≥80

FIP Workplan Overview

The table below outlines the relevant PIs required for improvement by the fishery under assessment in order to meet the requirements of the MSC Fisheries Standard Version 2.01.

Table 7: Performance indicators currently failing or conditionally passing the requirements of the MSC Fisheries Standard version 2.01, as determined by the pre-assessment.

Performance indicator number and name	Priority
1.1.1 – Stock status (bigeye tuna and south Atlantic swordfish)	Medium
1.1.2 – Stock rebuilding (bigeye tuna and south Atlantic swordfish)	Medium
1.2.1 – Harvest strategy (bigeye tuna and south Atlantic swordfish)	Medium
1.2.2 – Harvest control rules (south Atlantic albacore, yellowfin and bigeye tuna, and south Atlantic swordfish)	Medium
2.1.1 – Primary species outcome	High
2.1.2 – Primary species management	Medium
2.1.3 – Primary species information	Medium
2.2.2 – Secondary species management	High
2.2.3 – Secondary species information	High
2.3.1 – ETP species outcome	High
2.3.2 – ETP species management	High
2.3.3 – ETP species information	High
2.5.2 – Ecosystems management	Medium
2.5.3 – Ecosystems information	Medium
3.2.2 – Decision making processes	Medium
3.2.3 – Compliance and enforcement	Medium

FIP Workplan Actions

The following tables (8-15) demonstrate the specific actions and activities that the FIP must undergo to improve the current scores for the fishery against the MSC Fisheries Standard version 2.01 in order to successfully enter into MSC assessment.

Principle 1

Table 8 – Action 1.1 – Stock status and rebuilding for Atlantic bigeye and south swordfish

Action Number and Name	1.1 – Stock Status and Rebuilding for Atlantic Bigeye Tuna and south Swordfish
Action Goal	Evidence of Atlantic bigeye and southern swordfish stock rebuilding plans exist within a specified timeframe and fishing mortality is reduced to achieve MSY.
Action Description	This action has two SIs associated with it for each two stocks. 1. SIa – a rebuilding timeframe is specified for the stock that is the shorter of 20 years or 2 times its generation time. 2. SIb – There is evidence that the rebuilding strategies are rebuilding 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. The FIP must be able to meet these two scoring issues to enable a score of a pass. The FIP must advocate to the RFMO to be able to provide evidence of Atlantic bigeye and southern swordfish stock rebuilding plans within a specified timeframe and fishing mortality is reduced to achieve MSY.
Expected Completion Date	2030
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	Year 1: $2,500 for time collecting advocacy and developing positions, using it to lobby RFMO. Expenses to attend RFMO meeting estimated at a further $2,000 per year. Year 2: As per year 1 plus undertaking the stock status review, $3,500. Year 3: As per year 2 Year 4: As per year 2

	Year 5: As per year 2
Responsible Parties	FIP Participants, FIP Coordinator, RFMO Flag states of FIP vessels, NGOs
MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action	1.1.1, 1.1.2

Action	Tasks / Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.1 – Stock Status and Rebuilding for Atlantic bigeye and south swordfish	1.1a: Lobbying RFMO and flag states to conduct re-building scenarios. Independent scientific assistance to support the RFMO in developing bigeye and south swordfish re-building scenarios.	FIP coordinator	Coastal states, NGOs, RFMO	January 2025	Recurring (January 2030)	Improved understanding of the current health status of bigeye tuna and south Atlantic swordfish stocks
	1.1b: Lobbying RFMO and flag states for robust, comprehensive bigeye and south swordfish rebuilding strategy developed to enable fishing to be at MSY levels.	FIP coordinator	Coastal states, NGOs, RFMO	January 2025	Recurring (January 2030)	Regular advocacy letters to the RFMO ahead of the annual plenary meeting
	1.1c: Lobbying RFMO and flag states to adopt the above rebuilding strategy.	FIP coordinator	Coastal states, NGOs, RFMO	January 2025	Recurring (January 2030)	Regular advocacy letters to the RFMO ahead of the annual plenary meeting requesting the adoption of a rebuilding plan

	1.1d: Re-evaluation of the re-building plan at end of Yr. 3. Short-term technical assistance to the RFMO. Fishing mortality (F) is <FMSY.	FIP coordinator	Coastal states, NGOs, RFMO	January 2028	January 2029	Evaluation of the rebuilding plan when announced by RFMO
	1.1e: Review Stock status relative to reference points annually.	FIP coordinator	Coastal states, NGOs, RFMO	January 2025	Recurring (January 2030)	Review of current stock status of both species

Table 9 – Action 1.2 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for bigeye and southern swordfish.

Action Number and Name	1.2 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for bigeye and southern swordfish
Action Goal	There is a robust and precautionary harvest strategy in place for Atlantic bigeye and southern swordfish.
Action Description	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. This action has two tasks associated with it. 1. To address SIa, explicit harvest strategies for bigeye and south swordfish are to be designed. 2. To address SIb, a formal evaluation procedure for the harvest strategies is to be put in place for bigeye and south swordfish.
Expected Completion Date	2030
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 $5,000 per flag per year is estimated in order to cover the necessary fees and expenses involved in undertaking this activity. Year 2: As per year 1 Year 3: As per year 1 Year 4: As per year 1 Year 5: No associated costs
Responsible Parties	FIP Participants, FIP Coordinator, RFMO, Flag state of FIP vessels, NGOs

MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action	1.2.1

Action	Tasks / Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.2 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for bigeye and south swordfish	1.2a: Engage with RFMO scientists and CCM delegations to advocate for Management Strategy Options (MSEs) for controlling Atlantic bigeye and south swordfish harvest developed.	FIP coordinator	Coastal states, NGOs, RFMO	January 2025	January 2030	Regular advocacy letters to the RFMO ahead of the annual plenary meeting
	1.2b: FIP participants to hold meetings with flag state delegation members at least once per year with the following purpose: 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.	FIP coordinator	Coastal states, NGOs, RFMO	January 2025	Recurring (January 2030)	Meeting agenda and attendee list of annual stakeholder meeting

	iii. Request that delegates support HS at RFMO meetings. 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.					
	1.2c: RFMO briefing Document on Harvest Strategies. Prior to RFMO plenary meetings, 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.	FIP coordinator	Coastal states, NGOs, RFMO	January 2025	Recurring (January 2030)	Formal briefing document

Table 10 – Action 1.3 – Develop Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for south Atlantic albacore, bigeye, yellowfin tuna.

Action Number and Name	1.3 - Develop HCRs and tools for south Atlantic albacore, bigeye and yellowfin tuna, and south Atlantic swordfish.
Action Goal	There are well-defined and effective HCRs in place for south Atlantic albacore, bigeye and yellowfin tuna, and south Atlantic swordfish.
Action Description	To reach SG80 for SIa, 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. 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 amend 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.
Expected Completion Date	2030
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	Year 1: Undertaking an initial review and forming recommendations is expected to cost around $15,000. Thereafter there will be a need to update the review and implement the recommendations including gaining support for catch strategies. Year 2: $10,000 for implementing the actions and updating the review. Year 3: Same as Year 2 Year 4: Same as Year 2 Year 5: Same as Year 2
Responsible Parties	FIP Participants, FIP Coordinator, RFMO, Flag state of FIP vessels, NGOs

MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action	1.2.2

Action	Tasks / Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.3 – Develop HCRs and tools for south Atlantic albacore, bigeye and yellowfin tuna, and south Atlantic swordfish	1.3a: Building regional consensus on the need for robust HCRs. Intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded RFMO members and organisations and formally at meetings at each RFMO meeting. Options for HCRs and tools for managing south ALB, YFT, BET tuna, and south SWO harvest strategies are developed.	FIP coordinator	Coastal states, fishery, RFMO NGOs	January 2025	Recurring (January 2030)	Meeting agenda and attendee list of annual stakeholder meeting
	1.3b: Ensure a holistic implementation HCRs development. Monitor work plan to ensure the development, evaluation, and agreement of a HCRs for the four species, alongside the development of the tools required for implementation.	FIP coordinator	Coastal states, fishery, RFMO NGOs	January 2025	January 2030	Monitoring report of the HCRs
	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 four species for submission to RFMO. Will include an evaluation of current (candidate) HCRs and tools for their effectiveness, and the main uncertainties identified and considered. Options for HCRs	FIP coordinator	Coastal states, fishery, RFMO NGOs	January 2025	January 2028	Independent paper on scope and needs of HCRs for these species.

	and tools for managing ALB, YFT and BET tuna, and south SWO harvest developed.					
	1.3d: On-going engagement with Coastal states and RFMO over HCRs 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 RFMO meeting process. To include Intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded RFMO members and organisations and formally at meetings at each RFMO meeting.	FIP coordinator	Coastal states, fishery, RFMO NGOs	January 2025	Recurring (January 2030)	Meeting agenda and attendee list of annual stakeholder meeting
	1.3e: Independent evaluation of HCRs robustness and effectiveness. Conduct further study to evaluate progress made in developing HCRs, focusing on their potential effectiveness in reducing exploitation levels when required, and their ability to account for uncertainties that might affect their implementation. HCRs for all four species discussed and agreed within RFMO and formally adopted as part of the harvest strategy implementation approach. The main uncertainties are considered and discussed inter-sessionally and formally though RFMO meeting processes. RFMO records reflect discussions and progress.	FIP coordinator	Coastal states, fishery, RFMO NGOs	January 2025	January 2028	Evaluation of the HCR robustness and effectiveness (if employed by the RFMO)

Principle 2

Table 11 – Action 2.1 – Primary, secondary, and ETP species outcome management and information

Action Number and Name	2.1 – Primary, secondary, and ETP species outcome, management, and information
Action Goal	Ensure that all primary, secondary, and ETP species interacted with are considered and the fishery causes minimal impact on these species.
Action Description	Obtain fishery-independent (observer) data to give an accurate score for the bycatch species interacted with by the fishery. This will help to understand how management measures for these species are being adhered to, as well as estimate the potential outcome of the species as a result of the fishery operations.
Expected Completion Date	2030
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 1: The initial task of collecting and reviewing logbook and observer data from flag states and RFMOs is estimated to be $5,000 over the course of the first few months of the FIP. A brief report explaining the findings will be created and shared with the FIP Participants highlighting gaps and recommending changes to the FIP documents as well as amended improvement actions. A budget of $15,000 is recommended for this review to be undertaken. Year 2: $5,000 Year 3: No associated costs Year 4: A subsequent data review and update will be undertaken in year 4, a budget for this activity is estimated at $15,000. Year 5: No associated costs

Responsible Parties	FIP Participants, FIP Coordinator, Flag state of FIP vessels, NGOs
MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action	2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3

Action	Tasks / Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.1 – Primary, secondary, and ETP species outcome, management, and information	2.1a: Regularly collect fishery specific data from fisheries and states. This must be in the form of both fishery-dependent data (vessel logbooks), and fishery independent data (observers).	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants	January 2025	Recurring (January 2030)	Collection of observer data reports.
	2.1b: In lieu of fishery independent data, the FIP shall either: i. Work with the vessel flag states and/or NGOs to implement an observer programme into fishery operations; OR ii. Collaborate with NGOs and companies that will help to implement electronic monitoring (EM) systems onboard that constantly monitor vessel operations .	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants, Flag states, NGOs	January 2025	January 2026	Implementation of an observer programme (human or electronic).

	2.1c: If the observer data provided by tasks 2.1a and/or 2.1b is deemed to be insufficient or is missing crucial records, the FIP shall work with the observer ministry to improve the data collection from these sources. This could include: i. Writing a new template for the observers to use ii. Hosting and conducting workshops for the observers to teach them how to improve the records iii. Providing training in species identification techniques iv. Providing species ID materials such as posters, leaflets that can help ensure that the species ID is accurate and reliable.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants, Flag states	June 2026	June 2027	New observer data reports and templates. Workshops and training materials.
	2.1d: Following the actions listed in either 2.1a, 2.1b, or 2.1c, the FIP shall conduct regular analysis of the vessel logbooks and observer data reports to better understand the contribution to total catch composition of primary, secondary, and ETP species for this fishery.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants	June 2026	Recurring (January 2030)	Observer data analysis.
	2.1e: Produce regular reports outlining the findings of the observer data analysis, including any fishery-specific impacts on primary, secondary, and ETP species and any evidence that management measures are being implemented or reviewed. Use the findings to inform the fishery of further improvements needed in terms of	FIP coordinator	Flag states, fishery	June 2026	Recurring (January 2030)	Report demonstrating the results of the data analysis and recommendations for improvements (if necessary)

	robustness of data collection, and/or reducing the amount of bycatch.					
	2.1f: Validate that shark finning is not taking place through a review of the observer data, combined with interviews with fisheries officials and flag states to provide sufficient certainty as to whether shark finning may be occurring or not. Additional policies and management strategies may be required.	FIP coordinator	Flag states, fishery	January 2025	Recurring (January 2030)	Report demonstrating the results of the data analysis and recommendations for improvements (if necessary)
	2.1g: Use the observer data results to build an ETP species management plan, including materials for onboard vessels on best practices and buy any equipment needed.	FIP coordinator	Flag states, fishery	January 2025	January 2028	ETP species management policies
	2.1h: Use the observer reports to verify that the vessels are implementing the required ETP mitigation devices to prevent the bycatch of such species. Where verification cannot be made by observer reports alone, consider alternative methods to ensuring that these mitigation devices are being used.	FIP coordinator	Flag states, fishery	January 2028	Recurring (January 2030)	Evidence that the mitigation devices are in use and functional
	2.1i: Implement a skipper training programme, using guidance from the International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF), to ensure best practice handling and release techniques are routinely used onboard the vessels.	FIP coordinator	Flag states, fishery	January 2025	January 2026	Skipper training workshop certificates and attendance lists

	2.1j: Before the end of the first year of the FIP the catch data will be reviewed and FIP workplan revised relating to indicators reliant on this data. Milestone: by the end of year 1 data report completed and FIP workplan updated.	FIP coordinator	FIP participants	January 2025	December 2025	Using information obtained from the fishery, new workplan actions may be recommended and the workplan will be updated accordingly
	2.1k: Engage with RFMO and flag states regarding improving the management of primary, secondary, and ETP species - such as adopting the precautionary approach to the Japanese sardine (Tsushima) stock (primary).	FIP coordinator	RFMO, Coastal states	January 2025	January 2030	Regular advocacy letters to the RFMO ahead of the annual plenary meetings and Panel 2 meetings
	2.1l: Develop monitoring programmes to address any data gaps concerning primary, secondary, and ETP species.	FIP coordinator	Coastal states, fishery	January 2025	January 2030	Improved data collection process (if necessary) by observer authorities

Table 12: Action 2.2 – Ecosystems management and information

Action Number and Name	2.2 – Ecosystems management and information
Action Goal	Ensure that there is quantitative evidence available to reflect that a management strategy or partial strategy is being implemented successfully, and that full ecosystem interaction information is available
Action Description	Use observer data reports to reflect the bycatch interaction within the fishery to better understand the potential impact on the larger ecosystem.
Expected Completion Date	2030
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	Year 1: The initial task of collecting and reviewing logbook and observer records of bycatch is estimated to be $5,000 over the course of the first few months of the FIP. If no logbooks or observer reports are available, the FIP coordinator will work with the fishery management team to prepare and implement such observer systems on the vessels to ensure all incidents are appropriately reported. A budget of $15,000 is recommended for this review to be undertaken. Year 2: $5,000 Year 3: No associated costs Year 4: A subsequent data review and update will be undertaken in year 4, a budget for this activity is estimated at $15,000. Year 5: No associated costs
Responsible Parties	FIP Participants, FIP Coordinator, Flag state of FIP vessels, NGOs
MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action	2.5.2, 2.5.3

Action	Tasks / Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.2 – Ecosystems management and information	2.2a: Collect observer data that verify the bycatch composition to better understand the direct interaction and impact on key species in the ecosystem.	FIP coordinator	FIP participants, Flag state	January 2025	Recurring (January 2030)	Collection of observer data reports
	2.2b: In lieu of fishery independent data, the FIP shall either: i. Work with the vessel flag states and/or NGOs to implement an observer programme into fishery operations; OR ii. Collaborate with NGOs and companies that will help to implement electronic monitoring (EM) systems onboard that constantly monitor vessel operations .	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants, Flag states, NGOs	January 2025	January 2026	Implementation of an observer programme (human or electronic).
	2.2c: If the observer data provided by tasks 2.2a and/or 2.2b is deemed to be insufficient or is missing crucial records, the FIP shall work with the observer ministry to improve the data collection from these sources. This could include: i. Writing a new template for the observers to use	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants, Flag states	June 2026	June 2027	New observer data reports and templates. Workshops and training materials.

	ii. Hosting and conducting workshops for the observers to teach them how to improve the records iii. Providing training in species identification techniques iv. Providing species ID materials such as posters, leaflets that can help ensure that the species ID is accurate and reliable.					
	2.2d: Produce a report on the observer data analysis that demonstrates the key ecosystem engineers associated with this fishery, and relate to the potential impacts of the fishery on the wider ecosystem.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants, Flag states	January 2025	Recurring (January 2030)	Observer data analysis report
	2.2e: If necessary, conduct an Ecosystem Risk Assessment (ERA) to determine if the fishery is having any negative direct or indirect effects on the ecosystem.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants, Flag states, NGOs	January 2025	January 2028	ERA report (if necessary)
	2.2f: Depending on the outcome of the report in 2.2d, the fishery will improve the policies and management measures related to reducing total impact on the ecosystem and associated key ecosystem engineers.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants, Flag states	January 2025	Recurring (January 2030)	Policies to reduce total impact on the ecosystem

Principle 3

Table 13 – Action 3.1 – Decision making processes

Action Number and Name	3.1 Decision making processes (Namibia)
Action Goal	To ensure that decision-making processes for Namibia respond to serious and other important issues identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation, and consultation, in a transparent, timely and adaptive manner and take account of the wider implications of decisions
Action Description	Discussions with the Namibian Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR) to learn more about the current approach to disputes and how these are handled in a timely action.
Expected Completion Date	2030
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	Year 1: $2,000 Year 2: $2,000 Year 3: No associated costs Year 4: $1,000 Year 5: $1,000
Responsible Parties	FIP Participant, FIP coordinator, Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR) representative
MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action	3.2.2

Action	Tasks / Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.1 Decision making processes (Namibia)	3.1a: Introduce the fishery and FIP coordinator to the relevant authorities in Namibia (MFMR)	FIP coordinator	FIP Participant, MFMR	January 2025	January 2030	Introductory letter to the MFMR
	3.1b: Host a meeting with the MFMR to learn more about their current processes in place to approach disputes and if this is done so in a timely manner	FIP coordinator	FIP Participant, MFMR	January 2026	January 2030	Meeting agenda, attendee lists, meeting summary
	3.1c: Request more information and evidence of prior disputes to assess their timelines	FIP coordinator	FIP Participant, MFMR	Sep 2026	January 2030	Evidence of policies and relevant information for Namibian overseas fisheries
	3.1d: Implement finalised plan where necessary, allocating the necessary resources to ensure successful implementation of improved decision-making processes	FIP coordinator	FIP Participant	January 2028	January 2030	Plan of action

Table 14: Action 3.2 Compliance and enforcement for ICCAT, Namibia, and China

Action Number and Name	3.2 Compliance and enforcement for ICCAT, Namibia, and China
Action Goal	Have sufficient evidence to conclude that sanctions are consistently applied and provide an effective deterrence.
Action Description	Based on the information available, sanctions to deal with non-compliance exist and there is some evidence that they are applied, SG60 requirements are therefore met. However, there is not sufficient evidence to conclude they are consistently applied and provide an effective deterrence. The FIP will need to provide this evidence and if lacking work with authorities to improve enforcement.
Expected Completion Date	2030
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	Year 1: $2,000 Year 2: $2,000 Year 3: No associated costs Year 4: $1,000 Year 5: $1,000
Responsible Parties	FIP Participant, FIP coordinator, RFMO, MFMR, China Overseas Fishing Authority (COFA)
MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action	3.2.3

Action	Tasks / Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.1 Compliance and enforcement for ICCAT, Namibia, and China	3.2a: Review MCS systems in place in the MFMR, and COFA. This should include: i. MCS plans and strategies. ii. Information on MCS mechanisms in place (VMS, logbooks, landed catch documentation etc.).Interviews with enforcement personnel. iii. Records of previous infringements, penalties, sanctions, and/or court proceedings. iv. Any previous reviews or evaluations of MCS systems. A report should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.	FIP coordinator	FIP participant, MFMR, COFA	January 2025	January 2026	Report of the review conducted on the MCS systems in place in Namibia and China
	3.2b: Develop plan to combat the gaps identified in the national MCS systems based on findings of report in.	FIP coordinator	FIP participant	January 2026	January 2028	Plan to combat gaps identified in 3.2a
	3.2c: 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,	FIP coordinator	FIP participant, MFMR, COFA, NGOs	June 2026	January 2028	Agendas and summaries from ministry meetings

	opinions, difficulties, and progress to be recorded and monitored for all affect parties.					
	3.2d: Implement finalised plan where necessary, allocating the necessary resources to ensure successful employment of improved MCS system	FIP coordinator	FIP participant, MFMR, COFA, NGOs	January 2028	January 2030	Finalised plan across MFMR and COFA.

Next steps for the FIP

The FIP pre-assessment and workplan have both been finalised and presented to the client for confirmation. Following this, the FIP development team will use the information from both documents to populate the FIP profile on FisheryProgress, or another host website. This will then initiate the FIP and the first actions on the workplan will be started.

Typically, a FIP environmental workplan is designed to assist the fishery in the actions and essential outcomes required to improve the fishery's alignment with the MSC Fisheries Standard version 2.01 requirements. These actions can include engagement with multiple stakeholders, obtaining fishery data, and improving elements of the fishery's own management. The actions described in this workplan have varying degrees of priority due to their associated scoring during the pre-assessment. High priority actions relate to the elements of the pre-assessment that failed. The aim of this is to identify which actions need to be addressed soonest in order to ensure that they are able to pass MSC assessment.

Typically, the first step for FIP initiation is to host introductory meetings with all relevant stakeholders (e.g., vessel owners, flag state authority, industry) as the FIP will require continuous support from these members through its duration.

The FIP is expected to use the five years generally provided for these projects in entirety as there are many areas that are anticipated to require large changes and improvements that can take a long time to enforce. During this time, the FIP will make every effort to complete all actions described in this workplan, or if some actions are deemed redundant because the data and information is already available, these will be closed out at the annual and six-monthly reporting deadlines accordingly.