

# Indian Ocean tuna - longline (Star Trading)

## Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) Workplan

### **Introduction**

*Developing a fishery improvement project (FIP) workplan is an important, required step in the FIP process. The purpose of this document is to outline the information that must be included in a FIP workplan. The FIP workplan should be developed in collaboration with FIP stakeholders. This template includes the important components of a workplan and provides the information needed to report progress on FisheryProgress.org. Upon completion, FIP workplans should be translated from the local language into English or from English into the local language to ensure adequate understanding among all stakeholders. **Text in italics provides additional guidance about information that should be included in each section and should be removed from the final version of this document.** Highlighted text should be replaced to reflect the information for your fishery.*

### **Guidance on how to use the workplan template**

*The workplan template aims to help stakeholders develop a clear plan for implementing the fishery improvements that need to be made and ensures that information needed for reporting on FisheryProgress.org is included in the workplan. For Comprehensive FIPs, each performance indicator (PI) that has a scoring category of <60 (i.e., red) or 60-79 (i.e., yellow) must have at least one action directly linked to it, that would, when completed, result in a score of >80 (i.e., meeting the requirements of the >80 guidepost for that PI). For Basic FIPs, there must be at least one action directly linked to a PI that has a scoring category of <60 (i.e., red) or 60-79 (i.e., yellow). The actions, when completed, must lead to at least one increased score change (i.e., meeting the requirements of the next scoring guidepost for that PI).*

*The critical elements that need to be included in the FIP workplan are:*

- 1) **Actions:** Defined as a major activity in the FIP's workplan that must be completed to address specific deficiencies identified in the needs assessment (for basic FIPs) or MSC pre-assessment (for comprehensive FIPs). For comprehensive FIPs, actions should clearly link to the PIs of the MSC Fisheries Standard. For FIPs reporting their progress on [FisheryProgress.org](https://fisheryprogress.org), both basic and comprehensive FIPs need to report progress against the MSC Principles.*
- 2) **Completion dates:** To ensure accountability, an expected completion date should be included for each action.*
- 3) **Priority:** High, medium or low priority taking into account scoring in the needs assessment or MSC pre-assessment and sequencing of actions (output of one action needed to begin another action).*

- 4) **Estimated Cost:** Costs for each action.
- 5) **Responsible parties:** Organizations/individuals responsible for completing the actions as agreed upon by FIP stakeholders.
- 6) **MSC PIs:** All PIs that will be addressed by the action.
- 7) **Tasks:** This section breaks the actions identified above into specific steps that describe how the action will be accomplished. Tasks provide more clarity on how the FIP intends to complete each action. This allows participants to better track progress over time and communicate about progress being made in the FIP.

**Table 1: Workplan Overview**

<b>Workplan Version and Date</b>	<b>February 2025 – v1</b>
<b>Start date</b> (expected)	<b>End date</b> (anticipated month/year)
<b>April 2025</b>	<b>April 2030</b>
<b>FIP Lead</b> (organization/individual responsible for Action Plan)	<b>Improvements recommended by</b> (meeting/group that supported the development)
<b>Key Traceability (KT)</b>	<b>Star Trading and KT</b>
<b>FIP Coordinator</b> (organization/individual responsible for reporting on FisheryProgress)	<b>Workplan developed by</b> (consultant or person)
<b>KT</b>	<b>Tom Evans - KT</b>

**Table 2 - Number of vessels by flag included in the FIP.**

<b>Flag</b>	<b>Number of Vessels</b>
Malaysia	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>

## Acronyms

<b>EEZ</b>	Exclusive economic zone
<b>ETP</b>	Endangered, threatened, protected
<b>FIP</b>	Fishery improvement project
<b>HCRs</b>	Harvest control rules
<b>HS</b>	Harvest strategy
<b>IOTC</b>	Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
<b>MCS</b>	Monitor, control, surveillance
<b>MSC</b>	Marine Stewardship Council
<b>MSY</b>	Maximum sustainable yield
<b>PI</b>	Performance indicator
<b>RFMOs</b>	Regional Fisheries Management Organisations
<b>SI</b>	Scoring indicator
<b>UoA</b>	Units of Assessment
<b>VMEs</b>	Vulnerable marine ecosystems
<b>VMS</b>	Vessel monitoring system

## Unit of Assessment(s)

Fill in the following table, which will be considered the scope against which the fishery is assessed against the MSC Fisheries Standard.

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

UoA 1	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Albacore ( <i>Thunnus alalunga</i> )
Stock	Indian Ocean
Geographical area	Indian Ocean
Fishing method or gear type	Longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Commercial fishing fleet flagged to Malaysia. These vessels fish in the EEZ's of Seychelles, Mauritius and Madagascar and the high seas (FAO 51 and 57) of the Indian Ocean
UoA 2	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Bigeye ( <i>Thunnus obesus</i> )
Stock	Indian Ocean
Geographical area	Indian Ocean
Fishing method or gear type	Longline
Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock	Commercial fishing fleet flagged to Malaysia. These vessels fish in the EEZ's of Seychelles, Mauritius and Madagascar and the high seas (FAO 51 and 57) of the Indian Ocean
UoA 3	Description
Target species (common and scientific name)	Yellowfin ( <i>Thunnus albacares</i> )
Stock	Indian Ocean
Geographical area	Indian Ocean

<b>Fishing method or gear type</b>	Longline
<b>Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock</b>	Commercial fishing fleet flagged to Malaysia. These vessels fish in the EEZ's of Seychelles, Mauritius and Madagascar and the high seas (FAO 51 and 57) of the Indian Ocean

## FIP Actions

**Table 4: Action 1.1 – Stock Status and Rebuilding for Bigeye Tuna**

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	1.1 – Stock Status and Rebuilding for Indian Ocean Bigeye Tuna
<b>Action Goal</b>	There is evidence of Indian ocean Bigeye stock rebuilding within a specified timeframe and fishing mortality is reduced to achieve MSY.
<b>Action Description</b>	<p>This action has two SIs associated with it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sla – a rebuilding timeframe is specified for the stock that is the shorter of 20 years or 2 times its generation time.</li> <li>2. Sib – There is evidence that the rebuilding strategies are rebuilding stocks, or it is likely based on simulation modelling, exploitation rates or previous performance that they will be able to rebuild the stock within the specified timeframe so that SG80 is met.</li> </ol> <p>The FIP must be able to meet these two scoring issues to enable a score of a pass. The FIP must advocate to the RFMO to be able to provide evidence of Atlantic Bigeye stock rebuilding within a specified timeframe and fishing mortality is reduced to achieve MSY.</p>
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	April 2030
<b>Priority</b>	Medium
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<p>Year 1: US\$ 2,500 for time collecting advocacy and developing positions, using it to lobby IOTC. Expenses to attend IOTC 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>
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP Participants, FIP Coordinator, IOTC, Flag states
<b>MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action</b>	1.1.1, 1.1.2

Action	Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<b>1.1 – Stock Status and Rebuilding for Atlantic Bigeye Tuna</b>	1.1a: Lobbying IOTC and flag states to conduct re-building scenarios. Independent scientific assistance to support the IOTC in developing Bigeye re-building scenarios.	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator	Flag states, IOTC	April 2025	April 2030	
	1.1b: Lobbying IOTC and flag states for robust, comprehensive BET rebuilding strategy developed to enable fishing to be at MSY levels.	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator	Flag states, IOTC	April 2025	April 2030	
	1.1c: Lobbying IOTC and flag states to adopt the above rebuilding strategy.	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator	Flag states, IOTC	April 2026	April 2030	
	1.1d: Re-evaluation of the re-building plan at end of Yr. 3. Short-term technical assistance to the IOTC. Fishing mortality (F) is < $F_{MSY}$	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator	Flag states, IOTC	April 2027	April 2030	
	1.1e: Review Stock status relative to reference points annually	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator	Flag states, IOTC	April 2026	April 2030	

**Table 5: Action 1.2 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for bigeye and albacore**

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>1.2 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for bigeye and albacore</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	There is a robust and precautionary harvest strategy in place for Indian ocean bigeye and albacore.
<b>Action Description</b>	<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 tasks associated with it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To address SIa, explicit harvest strategies for bigeye are to be designed.</li> <li>2. To address SIb, a formal evaluation procedure for the harvest strategies is to be put in place for bigeye.</li> </ol>
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	April 2030
<b>Priority</b>	High
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<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\$ 5,000 per flag per year is estimated in order to cover the necessary fees and expenses involved in undertaking this activity</p> <p>Year 2: As per year 1</p> <p>Year 3: As per year 1</p> <p>Year 4: As per year 1</p> <p>Year 5: none</p>
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP Participants, FIP Coordinator, IOTC, Flag states
<b>MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action</b>	1.2.1

Action	Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<b>1.2 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for bigeye and albacore</b>	1.2a: Engage with RFMO scientists and CCM delegations to advocate for Management Strategy Options (MSEs) for controlling BET and ALB tuna harvest developed.	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator	Flag states, IOTC	April 2025	April 2030	
	1.2b: FIP participants hold meetings with flag state delegation members at least once per year with the following purpose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>iii. Request that delegates support HS at RFMO meetings.</li> </ul> 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.	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator	Flag states, IOTC	April 2025	April 2030	
	1.2c: Prior to RFMO plenary 2025 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,	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator	Flag states, IOTC	April 2025	April 2030	

	and the outcome preferred by the FIP, to brief the governments and other stakeholders.					
	1.2d: Position paper for a harvest control strategy and HCRs. Prepare a position paper to submit to the plenary in support of making significant progress in developing a harvest strategy and control rules for BET. Work with the governments delegations to obtain their support for the paper, as well as that of other member states as far as possible.	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator	Flag states, IOTC	April 2025	April 2030	
	1.2e: Promote through the governments 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 Participants, FIP coordinator	Flag states, IOTC	April 2025	April 2030	
	1.2f: 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 Participants, FIP coordinator	Flag states, IOTC	April 2025	April 2030	

**Table 6: Action 1.3 – Develop Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for albacore, bigeye and yellowfin tuna**

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	1.3 – Develop Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for albacore, bigeye and yellowfin tuna
<b>Action Goal</b>	There are well-defined and effective HCRs in place for albacore, bigeye and yellowfin tuna
<b>Action Description</b>	<p>To reach SG80 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.</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 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.</p>
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	April 2030
<b>Priority</b>	Medium
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<p>Year 1: Undertaking an initial review and forming recommendations is expected to cost around US\$ 15,000. 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\$ 10,000 for implementing the actions and updating the review</p> <p>Year 3: Same as Year 2</p> <p>Year 4: Same as Year 2</p> <p>Year 5: Same as Year 2</p>
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP Participants, FIP Coordinator, IOTC, Flag states
<b>MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action</b>	1.2.2

Action	Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<b>1.3 – Develop Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for albacore, bigeye and yellowfin tuna</b>	<p>1.3a: Building regional consensus on the need for robust HCRs. Intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded IOTC members and organisations and formally at meetings at each IOTC meeting.</p> <p>Options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing southern ALB, YFT and BET tuna harvest developed.</p>	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator	Flag states, IOTC	April 2025	April 2030	
	<p>1.3b: Ensure a holistic implementation HCR development. Monitor work plan development for the to ensure the development, evaluation, and agreement of a HCR for the three species, alongside the development of the tools required for implementation.</p> <p>Options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing ALB, YFT and BET tuna harvest developed.</p>	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator	Flag states, IOTC	April 2025	April 2030	
	<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 IOTC. Will include an evaluation of current (candidate) HCRs and tools for their effectiveness, and the main uncertainties identified and considered.</p> <p>Options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing ALB, YFT and BET tuna harvest developed.</p>	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator	Flag states, IOTC	April 2025	April 2030	

	<p>1.3d: On-going engagement with Coastal states and IOTC 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 IOTC meeting process. To include Intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded IOTC members and organisations and formally at meetings at each IOTC meeting.</p> <p>HCR options considered and discussed intersessionally and formally through IOTC meeting processes. IOTC records reflect discussions and progress.</p> <p>The main uncertainties for different HCR options are identified.</p>	<p>FIP Participants, FIP coordinator</p>	<p>Flag states, IOTC</p>	<p>April 2025</p>	<p>April 2030</p>	
	<p>1.3e: Independent evaluation of HCR 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.</p> <p>HCRs for all three species discussed and agreed within IOTC and formally adopted as part of the harvest strategy implementation approach.</p> <p>The main uncertainties are considered and discussed intersessionally and formally through IOTC meeting processes. IOTC records reflect discussions and progress.</p>	<p>FIP Participants, FIP coordinator</p>	<p>Flag states, IOTC</p>	<p>April 2029</p>	<p>April 2030</p>	

**Table 7: Action 2.1 – Primary and Secondary Species Outcome and Management**

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	2.1 – Primary and Secondary Species Outcome and Management
<b>Action Goal</b>	Ensure that all Primary species interacted with are taken into account and the fishery causes minimal impact on these species.
<b>Action Description</b>	Obtaining fishery specific catch data will be the first step to give an accurate score for Primary and Secondary species PIs. There will be quantitative information collected from logbook entries and observer records. Longline fisheries are historically poorly observed when compared with the purse seine operations and even more so on the high seas so the FIP will need to establish data robustness.
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	April 2030
<b>Priority</b>	High
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<p>Year 1: The initial task of collecting and reviewing logbook and observer data from flag states and RFMOs is estimated to be US\$ 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</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 10,000</p> <p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: A subsequent data review and update will be undertaken in year 4, a budget for this activity is estimated at US\$15,000</p> <p>Year 5: No associated costs</p>
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator, Flag states, IOTC
<b>MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action</b>	2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3

Action	Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<b>2.1 – Primary Species Outcome and Management</b>	2.1a: Collect fishery specific data from fisheries and states and analyse this to better understand the impacts on primary species and any evidence that the measures are being implemented or reviewed.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants	April 2025	April 2030	
	2.1b: 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	April 2025	April 2026	
	2.1c: Engage with RFMOs and flag states regarding improving the management of primary species.	FIP coordinator	Flag states, FIP Participants, IOTC	September 2025	April 2030	
	2.1d: Develop monitoring programmes to address any data gaps concerning primary species.	FIP coordinator	Flag states, IOTC	January 2026	April 2030	

**Table 8: Action 2.2 – ETP Species Outcome, Management and Information**

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	2.2 – ETP Species Outcome, Management and Information
<b>Action Goal</b>	Ensure that all ETP species interacted with are taken into account and the fishery causes minimal harm to ETP species.
<b>Action Description</b>	<p>At best there will be information adequate to support measures to manage ETP species, but no higher score can be awarded. Due to the constraints of the FIP, no fishery specific data was provided. This will be the first step to giving an accurate score for ETP PIs.</p> <p>Understanding the species encountered will then enable the FIP to build a ETP management plan to ensure best practices are being used. This plan could include delivering skipper training etc. There will be some quantitative information through some logbook entries but particularly from observer records. Longline fisheries are historically poorly observed when compared with the purse seine operations and this is even more pronounced on the high. At best there will be information adequate to support measures to manage ETP species, especially turtles, cetaceans and shortfin mako, but no higher score can be awarded, especially without fishery-specific data for this assessment.</p>
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	April 2030
<b>Priority</b>	High
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<p>Year 1: US\$ 30,000</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 25,000 (but increasing observer coverage would need to be added to this value)</p> <p>Year 3: US\$ 5,000</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 5,000</p> <p>Year 5: US\$ 3,000</p>
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator, Flag states, IOTC
<b>MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action</b>	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
<b>2.2 – ETP Species Outcome, Management and Information</b>	2.2a: Use the vessel data collected from action 2.1 to build an ETP species management plan, including materials for onboard vessels on best practices and buy any equipment needed, go to consultation if necessary.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants	September 2025	April 2030	
	2.2b: 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	FIP Participants	September 2025	April 2030	
	2.2c: Undertake skipper training to teach best practices, safe handling and release. Species identification etc.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants	September 2025	April 2030	
	2.2d: Engage with RFMOs and flag states regarding improving the management of ETP species to have more complete management strategies at a RFMO level.	FIP coordinator	Flag states, FIP Participants, IOTC	September 2025	April 2030	
	2.2e: Improve observer coverage through engaging with the IOTC Regional Observer Programme or Electronic Monitoring.	FIP coordinator	Flag states, FIP Participants, IOTC	September 2025	April 2030	
	2.2f: If necessary, carry out an Ecosystem Risk Assessment to determine if the fishery is making negative direct and indirect impacts and if so how to address them.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants	April 2026	April 2030	
	2.2g: Develop monitoring programmes to address any data gaps concerning ETP species.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants	January 2026	April 2030	

**Table 9: Action 2.3 – Habitats management and information**

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	2.3 – Habitats management and information
<b>Action Goal</b>	Ensure that there is sufficient data available to demonstrate the specific fishing operations of the vessels within this fishery and verify that no VMEs are encountered.
<b>Action Description</b>	The fishery must provide detailed information on the vessel monitoring systems (VMS) to demonstrate where the fishing vessels specifically operate. This will also be confirmed using independent observer data that declares the coordinates wherein each set is made. Verify that all management measures related to VMEs are being adhered to by the fishery.
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	April 2030
<b>Priority</b>	Medium
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	Year 1: US\$ 30,000 Year 2: US\$ 25,000 (but increasing observer coverage would need to be added to this value) Year 3: US\$ 5,000 Year 4: US\$ 5,000 Year 5: US\$ 3,000
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator, Flag states, IOTC
<b>MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action</b>	2.4.2, 2.4.3

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

<b>2.3 – Habitats management and information</b>	2.3a: Use the vessel data collected from action 2.1 to determine where the vessels typically operate. This will be in the form of coordinates and can be assessed to verify operational areas.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants	September 2025	April 2030	
	2.3b: Obtain vessel monitoring system (VMS) data from each vessel in the fleet to determine the specific locations wherein the vessels operate.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants	September 2025	April 2030	
	2.3c: Verify that the vessels adhere to any and all management measures related to VMEs or other habitats by RFMOs or coastal states.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants	September 2025	April 2030	
	2.3d: Improve observer coverage through engaging with the IOTC Regional Observer Programme or Electronic Monitoring.	FIP coordinator	Flag states, FIP Participants, IOTC	September 2025	April 2030	
	2.3e: If necessary, carry out an Ecosystem Risk Assessment to determine if the fishery is making negative direct and indirect impacts and if so how to address them.	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants	April 2026	April 2030	

**Table 10: Action 2.4 – Ecosystems management and information**

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>2.4 – Ecosystems management and information</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	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.
<b>Action Description</b>	Use observer data reports to reflect the bycatch interaction within the fishery to better understand the potential impact on the larger ecosystem.
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	April 2030
<b>Priority</b>	Medium
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<p>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</p> <p>Year 2: \$5,000</p> <p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: A subsequent data review and update will be undertaken in year 4, a budget for this activity is estimated at \$15,000</p> <p>Year 5: No associated costs</p>
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP Participants, FIP coordinator, Flag states, IOTC
<b>MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action</b>	2.5.1

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

<b>2.4 – Ecosystems management and information</b>	2.4a: 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, IOTC	April 2025	Recurring (April 2030)	
	2.4b: In lieu of fishery independent data, the FIP shall either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Work with the vessel flag states and/or NGOs to implement an observer programme into fishery operations; OR</li> <li>2. Collaborate with NGOs and companies that will help to implement electronic monitoring (EM) systems onboard that constantly monitor vessel operations.</li> </ul>	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants, Flag states, IOTC	April 2025	April 2026	
	2.4c: If the observer data provided by tasks 2.4a and/or 2.4b 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Writing a new template for the observers to use</li> <li>2. Hosting and conducting workshops for the observers to teach them how to improve the records</li> <li>3. Providing training in species identification techniques</li> <li>4. Providing species ID materials such as posters, leaflets that can help ensure that the species ID is accurate and reliable.</li> </ul>	FIP coordinator	FIP Participants, Flag states, IOTC	September 2026	September 2027	

	2.4d: 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, IOTC	April 2025	Recurring (April 2030)	
	2.4e: 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, IOTC	April 2025	April 2028	
	2.4f: Depending on the outcome of the report in 2.4d, 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, IOTC	April 2025	Recurring (April 2030)	

**Table 11: Action 3.1 Legal and Customary Framework for Mauritius**

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>3.1 Legal and/or customary framework for Mauritius</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	To fully understand the Legal and/or customary fishery management framework for Mauritius and improve them to a level of PI 3.1.1 SG80 if necessary.
<b>Action Description</b>	No evidence could be found on its transparency nor effectiveness so an initial fact finding is required to understand the frameworks for Malaysia, if not, advocacy must take place and evidence collected.
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	April 2030
<b>Priority</b>	Medium
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<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 plus an extra US\$ 5,000 if direct consultation is required</p> <p>Year 1: US\$ 5,000 plus US\$ 5,000 extra if direct 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 if consultation is required</p>
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP Coordinator, FIP participants, National management bodies
<b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b>	3.1.1

<b>Action</b>	<b>Tasks/ Milestones</b>	<b>Responsible (lead)</b>	<b>Responsible (supporting role)</b>	<b>Starting date</b>	<b>Expected completion date</b>	<b>Evidence of completion / results</b>
<b>3.1 Legal and/or customary framework for Mauritius</b>	3.1a: Collect information and conduct a review of fishery dispute mechanisms of Mauritius with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. This is to be arranged by the FIP coordinator and supported by the FIP participants with influence (if any) over the particular flag state.	FIP coordinator FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2025	April 2027	

	Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary.					
	3.1b: Conduct a review of customary fishery rights of Mauritius with input from relevant stakeholders and produce a report of findings. This is to be arranged by the FIP coordinator and supported by the FIP participants with influence over the particular flag state. Any new information found will be used to update this workplan as necessary. Communication records should be kept.	FIP coordinator FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2025	April 2027	
	3.1c: Developing proposals of dispute mechanism where absent in Mauritius where absent, by consulting with stakeholders.. The proposal at a minimum shall include topics discussed, outcomes and appropriate timelines for implementation.	FIP coordinator FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2027	April 2029	
	3.1d: Developing proposals for a mechanism to integrate and observe customary rights in Mauritius into the management system where absent. The proposal at a minimum shall include topics discussed, outcomes and appropriate timelines for implementation.	FIP coordinator FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2027	April 2029	
	3.1e: Ensure appropriate transparent and effective dispute resolution is present in the Mauritian legislation/regulations.	FIP coordinator FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2028	April 2030	
	3.1f: Ensure appropriate dispute resolution and respect for rights is present in Mauritian legislation/regulations.	FIP coordinator FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2028	April 2030	

**Table 12: Action 3.2 Consultation, roles and responsibilities for Mauritius and Madagascar**

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>3.2 Consultation, Roles and Responsibilities for Mauritius and Madagascar</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	Demonstrate that fishery management systems for Mauritius and Madagascar meet the MSC Standard PI 3.1.2. Specifically, that it identifies and actively engages with all interested parties and all roles are understood.
<b>Action Description</b>	The pre-assessment did not find evidence on consultation, roles, and responsibilities for Mauritius and Madagascar so the FIP will need to undertake initial fact finding to understand these details. At which point the workplan will need reviewing and advocacy tasks added to promote these additions to fishery management. High priority is Scoring Issue b across these flag states, consultation processes.
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	April 2030
<b>Priority</b>	Medium
<b>Estimated Cos</b>	Year 1: US\$ 5,000 Year 2: US\$ 5,000 Year 3: US\$ 5,000 Year 4: US\$ 2,500 Year 5: US\$ 2,500
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP coordinator, FIP participants, National management bodies
<b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b>	3.1.2

<b>Action</b>	<b>Tasks/ Milestones</b>	<b>Responsible (lead)</b>	<b>Responsible (supporting role)</b>	<b>Starting date</b>	<b>Expected completion date</b>	<b>Evidence of completion / results</b>
<b>3.2 Consultation, Roles and Responsibilities for Mauritius and Madagascar</b>	3.2a: Conduct investigation and review the degree to which all roles and responsibilities within the relevant fishery system are clearly defined. Consult with industry and other stakeholders to ascertain how well the	FIP coordinator FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2025	April 2030	

	functions and responsibilities are understood.					
	3.2b: Identify all relevant stakeholders to the fishery	FIP coordinator FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2025	April 2030	
	3.2c: Ensure all agencies within the management framework are clearly identified and their roles are publicly transparent.	FIP coordinator FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2025	April 2030	
	3.2d: Lobby Fishery authorities to develop a procedure to meet the requirements mentioned in the rationale. This may focus on support of transparency and regularity of the consultation process directly, how output from these processes is inputted/considered in decisions related to domestic and regional management arrangements as well as wider engagement and representation in consultations.	FIP coordinator FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2025	April 2030	
	3.2e: Ensure that any/all relevant fishery management plan(s) clearly identifies which departments will undertake which roles in the fishery.	FIP coordinator FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2025	April 2030	
	3.2f: Review and comment on the efficacy of the consultation process.	FIP coordinator FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2025	April 2030	

**Table 13: Action 3.3 Decision making processes for Seychelles, Mauritius and Madagascar**

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>3.3 Decision-making processes for Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	<p>To ensure that decision-making processes for Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar respond to serious and other important issues identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation, and consultation, in a transparent, timely and adaptive manner and take account of the wider implications of decisions (SIb).</p> <p>Due primarily to limited information on the management process, we are unable to determine if the precautionary approach to be applied in this fishery.</p> <p>For SIb, again the remote nature of this assessment meant it could not be determined whether information on the fishery’s performance is available on request and the management system is attempting to comply in a timely manner with judicial decisions. SG60 was not met for SIb.</p>
<b>Action Description</b>	The action potentially covers four scoring issues from PI 3.2.2. This could be a product of the remote pre-assessment that was conducted, which led to precautionary scoring against the MSC Fisheries Standard.
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	April 2030
<b>Priority</b>	Medium
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<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\$ 20,000 of fees</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 5,000 plus expenses if an in-person meeting is necessary</p> <p>Year 3: US\$ 5,000 plus expenses if an in-person meeting is necessary</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 2,500</p> <p>Year 5: US\$ 2,500</p>
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP consultant, FIP participants, national management bodies
<b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b>	3.2.2

Action	Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<b>3.3 Decision-making processes for Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar</b>	<p>3.3a: Conduct review of decision-making processes in Seychelles, Mauritius, and Madagascar to better understand gaps identified in pre-assessment. The reviews should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the decision-making process transparent, timely &amp; evidence-based?</li> <li>2. Do the decision-making processes respond to serious and other important issues identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation, and consultation?</li> <li>3. Does it include the precautionary approach and use of best science available?</li> <li>4. Does it include input from management authorities and other relevant stakeholders?</li> <li>5. If there are/have been any legal challenges and how these have been addressed by the management system and/or fishery?</li> </ol> <p>A report will be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>	FIP coordinator FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2025	April 2028	
	<p>3.3b: Define decision-making processes in the management plan. The process shall include, if necessary, how the information will be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Included (from research, monitoring, evaluation, and consultation).</li> <li>2. Stakeholders be consulted.</li> <li>3. Support that the best-available information to ensure the precautionary approach.</li> <li>4. Outcomes be communicated (information should be made available on request and explanations are provided for any actions or lack of action associated with findings and</li> </ol>	FIP coordinator FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2026	April 2029	

	<p>relevant recommendations emerging from research, monitoring evaluation and review activity).</p> <p>5. Process for addressing legal challenges if necessary.</p> <p>6. A precautionary approach is encompassed as a key element of the management plan.</p>					
	<p>3.3c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to incorporate the above identified elements into decision-making processes. Multiple consultations may need to be held to fully address this action item.</p>	<p>FIP coordinator FIP participants</p>	<p>National management bodies</p>	<p>December 2028</p>	<p>April 2030</p>	
	<p>3.3d: Implement the decision-making process, ensuring stakeholders are consulted and informed (for example via email, website, formal report etc.) best-available information (from other RFMOs, research etc.) and that the precautionary approach is included.</p>	<p>FIP coordinator FIP participants</p>	<p>National management bodies</p>	<p>March 2029</p>	<p>April 2030</p>	
	<p>3.3e: Review the efficacy of the decision-making process.</p>	<p>FIP coordinator FIP participants</p>	<p>National management bodies</p>	<p>January 2030</p>	<p>April 2030</p>	

**Table 14: Action 3.4 Compliance and enforcement for IOTC, Malaysia, Seychelles, Mauritius and Madagascar**

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	3.4 Compliance and enforcement for IOTC, Malaysia, Seychelles, Mauritius and Madagascar
<b>Action Goal</b>	Have sufficient evidence to conclude that sanctions are consistently applied and provide an effective deterrence.
<b>Action Description</b>	Based on the information available, sanctions to deal with non-compliance exist and there is some evidence that they are applied, SG60 requirements are therefore met. However, there is not sufficient evidence to conclude they are consistently applied and provide an effective deterrence. The FIP will need to provide this evidence and if lacking work with authorities to improve enforcement.
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	April 2030
<b>Priority</b>	Medium
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	Year 1: US\$ 10,000 Year 2: US\$ 10,000 Year 3: No associated costs Year 4: US\$ 5,000 Year 5: US\$ 5,000
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP coordinator, FIP participants, National management bodies
<b>MSC Performance Indicator(s) Addressed by the Action</b>	3.2.3

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

<b>3.4 Compliance and enforcement for IOTC, Malaysia, Seychelles, Mauritius and Madagascar</b>	<p>3.4a: Review MCS systems in place in the fisheries. This should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MCS plans and strategies.</li> <li>2. Information on MCS mechanisms in place (VMS, logbooks, landed catch documentation etc.).</li> <li>3. Interviews with enforcement personnel.</li> <li>4. Records of previous infringements, penalties, sanctions and/or court proceedings.</li> <li>5. Any previous reviews or evaluations of MCS systems.</li> </ol> <p>A report should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>	FIP coordinator, FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2025	April 2030	
	<p>3.4b: Develop plans to combat the gaps identified in the national MCS systems based on findings of report in.</p>	FIP coordinator, FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2025	April 2030	
	<p>3.4c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to discuss implementation and potential adjustments to plan. Meeting minutes should be produced after each consultation to allow topics, actions, opinions, difficulties and progress to be recorded and monitored for all affected parties.</p>	FIP coordinator, FIP participants	National management bodies	December 2025	April 2030	
	<p>3.4d: Implement finalised plan where necessary, allocating the necessary resources to ensure successful employment of improved MCS system.</p>	FIP coordinator, FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2027	April 2030	

**Table 15: Action 3.5 Management and performance evaluation for Mauritius and Madagascar**

<b>Action Number and Name</b>	<b>3.5 Management Performance Evaluation for Mauritius, and Madagascar</b>
<b>Action Goal</b>	The fishery-specific management systems of Mauritius, and Madagascar are subject to regular internal and occasional external review.
<b>Action Description</b>	<p>The management system has internal processes to evaluate management performance. These include evaluations of policy, research, operations, compliance, and enforcement. These are carried out on a regular basis. SG80 is therefore met for SIa.</p> <p>In the absence of information regarding external reviews SG80 cannot be met for SIb. The action covers one scoring issue from PI 3.2.4. This could be a product of the remote pre-assessment that was conducted, which led to precautionary scoring against the MSC Fisheries Standard (SIb).</p>
<b>Expected Completion Date</b>	April 2030
<b>Priority</b>	Medium
<b>Estimated Cost</b>	<p>Year 1: US\$ 4,000</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 4,000</p> <p>Year 3: US\$ 4,000</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 4,000</p> <p>Year 5: US\$ 2,000</p>
<b>Responsible Parties</b>	FIP coordinator, FIP participants, National management bodies
<b>MSC PI Addressed by the Action</b>	3.2.4

<b>Action</b>	<b>Tasks/ Milestones</b>	<b>Responsible (lead)</b>	<b>Responsible (supporting role)</b>	<b>Starting date</b>	<b>Expected completion date</b>	<b>Evidence of completion / results</b>
<b>3.5 Management Performance</b>	3.5a: Review fishery-specific management processes currently in place. Ascertain whether these systems are subject to internal and/or external review, the format,	FIP coordinator,	National management bodies	April 2025	April 2027	

<b>Evaluation for Mauritius, and Madagascar</b>	<p>the areas already reviewed (e.g., tuna management plan, performance, decision-making, MCS, compliance to RFMO/international regulations etc.) and the frequency to which these reviews occur. Provide comment as to the degree to which reviews have led to change within each respective / cognizant organisation.</p> <p>A report will be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>	FIP participants				
	3.5b: Develop plans to correct for the gaps identified in the national fishery-specific systems based on findings of report.	FIP coordinator, FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2027	April 2029	
	3.5c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to discuss implementation and potential adjustments to plan. At a minimum meeting minute should be produced after each consultation in a timely fashion to allow topics, actions, opinions, difficulties, and progress to be recorded and monitored for all affected parties.	FIP coordinator, FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2027	April 2029	
	3.5d: 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.	FIP coordinator, FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2028	April 2029	
	3.5e: 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.	FIP coordinator, FIP participants	National management bodies	April 2029	April 2030	