

Workplan of the US Pacific Tuna Group Purse Seine FSC and FAD Set Fishery

Prepared by

Tom Evans at Key Traceability Ltd.

March 2022



KEY TRACEABILITY

Key Traceability Ltd.

+44 7505 122728

Info@keytraceability.com

England Registered Company 09730288

Project ref. KT0153

Contents

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Units of Assessment.....	5
3.	Overview of Preassessment results	6
4.	Workplan Introduction	7
5.	Principle 1: Sustainability of stocks.....	8
6.	Principle 2 – Minimising Environmental Impacts	16
8.	Principle 3 – Effective Management.....	29
9.	Estimated Budget and Priority	42
10.	Appendix A	43
11.	Appendix B	47
12.	Appendix C	48

Glossary

Acronym	Definition
ACAP	Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels
CoC	Chain of Custody
COPESCAALC	Commission for Inland Fisheries and Aquaculture of Latin America and the Caribbean
CPPS	Permanent Commission for the South Pacific
CPUE	Catch per Unit Effort
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
FIP	Fishery Improvement Programme
IADCP	International Agreement on the Dolphin Conservation Program
IATTC	Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission
IUU	Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (fishing)
IWC	International Whaling Commission
MCS	Monitoring, Control and Surveillance
MSC	Marine Stewardship Council
NPOA	National Plan of Action
OLDEPESCA	Latin American Organization for Fisheries development
PI	Performance Indicator
RAA	The Aquaculture Network for the Americas
RFMO	Regional Fisheries Management Organisation
SPRFMO	South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation
TAC	Total Allowable Catch
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
UNFSA	United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement
USPTG	United States Pacific Tuna Group
UoA	Unit of Assessment
UoC	Unit of Certification
VMS	Vessel Monitoring System

1. Introduction

The US Pacific Tuna Group Purse Seine Fishery targets yellowfin (*Thunnus albacares*) and skipjack tuna (*Katsuwonus pelamis*). The fishery operates using Fish Aggregation Devices (FADs), and seines are generally set on these FADs. Nets are also regularly set on free school tuna. The 13 US flagged vessels in the USPTG fleet operate primarily in the WCPO across the EEZs of PNA countries (Kiribati, Cook Islands, Tokelau, Tuvalu, Samoa, Fiji, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Nauru, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Papua New Guinea, and Palau). The vessels deliver the majority their catches directly to the StarKist Samoa tuna processing plant in Pago Pago, American Samoa, which they also use as their home port. Some of the vessels seasonally operate in the Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) within the IATTC Convention Area and EEZs of the US (Jarvis, Baker Island, American Samoa), delivering catches to canneries in Ecuador or Mexico. Additionally in the 2022 scope extension, this included two new vessels and fishery management systems including Ecuador and Nicaragua.

This document builds on the existing FIP workplan, the scope extension of the FIP, and the conditions received through the MSC process to build a concise single workplan to align them all.

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 convicted for a forced or child labour violation in the last two years.
- The fishery has not been convicted for a shark finning violation in the last two years.
- The fishery has in place a mechanism for resolving disputes, and disputes do not overwhelm the fishery.
- The fishery is not an enhanced fishery as per the MSC FCP 7.4.2.12; and
- The fishery is not an introduced species-based fishery as per the MSC FCP 7.4.2.13

The FIP Unit of Assessment (UoA) includes the target stock(s), fishing method or gear, and fleets, vessels, individual fishing operators and other eligible fishers pursuing that stock.

2. Units of Assessment

Note on MSC vocabulary: Unit of Certification (UoC) vs. Unit of Assessment (UoA)

The UoA is defined as consisting of the target stock(s), gear type(s), vessel type(s), and fishing fleets or groups of vessels, or individual fishing operators pursuing that stock, including any other eligible fishers that are outside the unit of certification.

The UoC is defined as consisting of the target stock(s), gear type(s), vessel type(s), and fishing fleets or groups of vessels, or individual fishing operators pursuing that stock including those client group members initially intended to be covered by the certificate.

In summary, the **UoA = UoC + any other eligible fishers identified at the start of assessment.**

For the purposes of this pre-assessment, **no other eligible fishers** were identified; **the UoA is therefore the same as the UoC.**

The fishery is within scope of the MSC Fisheries Standard. The report considers the following updated Units of Assessment as of December 2021:

Table 1 - Units of Assessment of the fishery

Item	UoA 1	UoA 2	UoA 3	UoA 4	UoA 5
Stock	Eastern Pacific Ocean skipjack tuna	Eastern Pacific Ocean yellowfin tuna	Western and Central Ocean Pacific skipjack tuna	Western and Central Ocean Pacific yellowfin tuna	Western and Central Ocean Pacific bigeye tuna
Geographical Area	Eastern Pacific Ocean within the IATTC Convention Area and EEZs of the US, Ecuador, and Nicaragua	Eastern Pacific Ocean within the IATTC Convention Area and EEZs of the US, Ecuador, and Nicaragua	WCPFC Convention Area and EEZs of the United States (Jarvis, Baker Island, American Samoa) and PNA member parties (Kiribati, Cook Islands, Tokelau, Tuvalu, Samoa, Fiji, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Nauru, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Papua New Guinea, and Palau)	WCPFC Convention Area and EEZs of the United States (Jarvis, Baker Island, American Samoa) and PNA member parties (Kiribati, Cook Islands, Tokelau, Tuvalu, Samoa, Fiji, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Nauru, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Papua New Guinea, and Palau)	WCPFC Convention Area and EEZs of the United States (Jarvis, Baker Island, American Samoa) and PNA member parties (Kiribati, Cook Islands, Tokelau, Tuvalu, Samoa, Fiji, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Nauru, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Papua New Guinea, and Palau)
Fishing gear type	Purse seine gear, all set types	Purse seine gear, all set types	Purse seine gear, all set types	Purse seine gear, all set types	Purse seine gear, all set types
Client group	US Pacific Tuna Group	US Pacific Tuna Group	US Pacific Tuna Group	US Pacific Tuna Group	US Pacific Tuna Group
Other eligible fishers	Vessels specified in ACDR	None at this time	None at this time	None at this time	None at this time

3. Overview of Preassessment results

This workplan is based on the MSC pre-assessment results and scoping document completed in March of 2019 by MRAG Americas and the assessment team including Jodi Bostrom, Mónica Valle-Esquivel, and Erin Wilson, the conditions received from the MSC assessment of components of the fishery and a scope extension to include Nicaraguan and Ecuadorian vessels. It covers the purse seine gear targeting tropical tunas using both FAD associated and unassociated sets in the Western and Central Pacific and Eastern Pacific Oceans. There are six potential Units of Assessment (UoA) to be posted on FisheryProgress.org, divided based on the fishing geography. An up-to-date list of the vessels participating in the FIP can be found on FisheryProgress.org. The UoA vessels are also listed on ISSF's Proactive Vessel Register (PVR) and shown to be in full compliance with all ISSF conservation measures.

A Principle 3 addendum to the pre-assessment was conducted by Key Traceability to change the scoring for some of the MSC indicators. The updated scope includes Ecuadorian and Nicaraguan management based on publicly available data on the RFMO websites and other studies, including existing MSC assessments. There were no site visits or consultations with stakeholders to find out this information.

Despite the addendum to Principle 3, there were still several PIs in this assessment that would likely receive a fail (<60) or conditions on an MSC full assessment, specifically from Principle 2, therefore this document aims to outline the actions required to progress the FIP and take it to MSC certification.

4. Workplan Introduction

Based on the assessment, scoping document, and participant input, the fishery improvement project has developed this workplan addendum with activities that will help it correct the deficiencies necessary to achieve its objectives. This addresses all the gaps between fishery performance and the MSC Standard identified in the pre-assessment.

This workplan includes:

- FIP coordination to run the FIP by carrying out the actions listed below. Further to these actions, there are necessary FIP coordination tasks that need to be arranged such as hosting steering group and stakeholder meetings, updating FisheryProgress.org and supporting action implementation.
- Objectives - We recommend objectives focus on a time frame of five years (or less). Objectives will address all the fishery's environmental challenges necessary to achieve a level of sustainability consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. We also recommend all fishery improvement projects work toward including traceability and addressing social issues as part of their objectives.
- A list of actions - Actions are major activities that must be completed to address the deficiencies identified in the pre-assessment. The workplan also includes tasks, which break actions down into specific steps that describe how the action will be accomplished.
- Responsible parties - Organisations/people responsible for completing each action.
- Timeframes - An estimate of the timeframe needed to complete each action and/or task.
- An associated budget that estimates the main costs for the FIP.

5. Principle 1: Sustainability of stocks

Action Number and Name	1.1 - Stock Status – EPO Yellowfin
Action Goal	To maintain stock at a healthy level with low probability of overfishing. Stock is at a level which maintains high productivity and has a low probability of recruitment overfishing
Action Description	<p>Support and advocate for the further review of stock status, HCRs and interim reference points to maintain stock at a healthy level with low probability of overfishing. The base-case scenario showed that the stock has been fluctuating around MSY, but sensitivity runs show more pessimistic results. The stock just recovered to MSY levels recently, so fishing mortality should not increase.</p> <p>It's precautionary to keep in mind that sensitivity tests have showed more pessimistic stock status, and the stock has just recovered to MSY levels. Increasing fishing mortality would not produce a significant long-term increase in catches, but the spawning stock could be reduced considerably.</p> <p>The 2018 update assessment estimated SSB_{recent}/SSB_{MSY} at 1.08, indicating that the stock is not overfished, and the ratio of F_{recent}/F_{MSY} at 1.01, indicating that slight overfishing is occurring. Biomass appeared to be above the PRI under the base case and alternative $h=0.75$ scenarios, but evidence for a stock-recruitment relationship is weak.</p> <p>As a precautionary approach, further review of the stock status, HCRs and interim reference points is needed.</p>
Expected Completion Date	2024
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	\$USD 15,000
Responsible Parties	<p>Decision-making: IATTC</p> <p>Research & information: IATTC scientific staff/researchers</p> <p>Advocacy: WWF, ISSF, USPTG Stakeholders to their delegation, and coordination with overlapping FIP UoAs</p>

MSC PI Addressed by the Action	PI 1.1.1
---------------------------------------	----------

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>Support further review of Stock Status, HCRs and Interim Reference Points through advocacy efforts including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of position statements and letters to IATTC, USG, other national governments and flag state delegations. Position statements to be aligned with ISSF, WWF and over-lapping FIP's with similar UoA's. Joint position statements may be submitted in some cases. • Other lobbying efforts aligned with others including the USG and overlapping FIP's. 	IATTC with support of US Pacific Tuna Group FIP	US Pacific Tuna Group FIP, ISSF, WWF, and flag state delegations	March 2022	September 2024	<p>Updated IATTC YF stock assessments, HCRs and Interim Reference Points.</p> <p>Copies of Position Statements and Advocacy Letters.</p>

Action Number and Name	1.2 - Harvest Strategies - Western Pacific yellowfin, skipjack and bigeye and Eastern Pacific yellowfin, skipjack and bigeye
Action Goal	Develop a harvest strategy that is responsive to the state of the stock and achieves its stock management objectives. By the first surveillance audit (Extended to June 2023), demonstrate that the harvest strategy for certified skipjack, yellowfin, and bigeye tuna is responsive to the state of the stock and the elements of the harvest strategy work together towards achieving management objectives reflected in the target and limit reference points.
Action Description	To support and advocate for the adoption of a Harvest Strategy for tuna species that includes stock assessments and target reference points that can be reviewed and improved so specific management actions can be triggered if needed. Ensure that the tuna is responsive to the harvest strategies and achieves the management objectives, target reference points, and limit reference points of the strategy.
Expected Completion Date	2024
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	\$USD 69,000
Responsible Parties	US Pacific Tuna Group (USPTG), NFMS/NOAA
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	1.2.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
USPTG support and advocacy will largely be through active participation in WCPFC meetings as part of the US delegations. Such participation will include communicating specific desired policies to support meeting this condition.	US Pacific Tuna Group (USPTG), NFMS/NOAA		March 2022	March 2023	Harvest strategy for skipjack tuna is responsive to the state of the stock and the elements of

					<p>the harvest strategy work together towards achieving management objectives reflected in the target and limit reference points. USPTG engaged in and supportive of the process for the development of a harvest strategy for skipjack.</p> <p>Expected Score: 80</p>
<p>USPTG through NOAA/NFMS delegation will also advocate and support these conditions being met through active participation in PNA, FFA and WCPFC initiatives/proposals regarding the harvest strategies.</p>	<p>US Pacific Tuna Group (USPTG), NFMS/NOAA</p>		<p>March 2022</p>	<p>March 2027</p>	
<p>USPTG will seek opportunities to co-sign joint letters to WCPFC that advocate for a robust harvest strategy for skipjack, yellowfin, and bigeye tuna. For example, those organized in the past by the NGO Tuna Forum.</p>	<p>US Pacific Tuna Group (USPTG), NFMS/NOAA</p>		<p>March 2022</p>	<p>March 2027</p>	
<p>USPTG through NOAA/NFMS to work with the other PNA parties, FFA parties to have the sub-regional and regional workplan progressed.</p>	<p>US Pacific Tuna Group (USPTG), NFMS/NOAA</p>		<p>March 2022</p>	<p>March 2027</p>	

<p>UPSTG to meet during WCPFC Regular Sessions and other relevant meetings with MSC representatives and overlapping fisheries sharing the same conditions to discuss opportunities to a harmonised approach to activities to address Principle 1 conditions, for example as had been organized previously by the WCPO Tuna MSC Alignment Group.</p>	<p>US Pacific Tuna Group (USPTG), NFMS/NOAA</p>		<p>March 2022</p>	<p>March 2027</p>	
<p>NFMS/NOAA to inform of its country level workplan to Scientific Committee (SC) and Technical Compliance Committee (TCC). And work with the sub-regional groups to make recommendations.</p>	<p>US Pacific Tuna Group (USPTG), NFMS/NOAA</p>		<p>March 2022</p>	<p>March 2027</p>	
<p>Progress of these actions to meet the condition will be shown to the CAB during the year 1 surveillance audit. Evidence/minutes of meetings attended, and their expected March 2022 outcomes will be collected, as will any advocacy work completed through ministry or NGO routes during the year. These will be presented by USPTG to the CAB during the audit. Actions are expected to improve the performance of the UoA by achieving a responsive harvest strategy to ensure cohesive management of the stock around MSY.</p>	<p>US Pacific Tuna Group (USPTG), NFMS/NOAA</p>		<p>March 2022</p>	<p>March 2023</p>	

Action Number and Name	1.3 Harvest Control Rules - Western Pacific yellowfin, skipjack and bigeye, Eastern Pacific yellowfin, skipjack and bigeye
Action Goal	By the first surveillance audit (Extended to June 2023) Harvest Strategy for bigeye in place.
Action Description	<p>By the first surveillance audit (Extended to June 2023):</p> <p>SI a) demonstrate that well defined HCRs are in place for skipjack, yellowfin, and bigeye tuna that ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as the PRI is approached, are expected to keep the stock fluctuating around a target level consistent with (or above) MSY.</p> <p>SI b) provide evidence that the selection of the harvest control rules for skipjack, yellowfin, and bigeye tuna are robust to the main uncertainties.</p> <p>SI c) provide evidence that indicates that the tools in use for skipjack, yellowfin, and bigeye tuna are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.</p> <p><i>Via the 2019 MSC-approved Mega Variation CABs agreed to align the condition milestones for the WCPO stocks with the Proposed Revisions to Harvest Strategy Work plan (WCPFC14-2017-DP27_rev2), which indicates the harvest control rule will be adopted in 2021. Consistent with MSC COVID 19 derogation, the proposed timeline has been extended by 6 months to June 2022. Following the second MSC Covid 19 derogation, the condition timeline is extended 12 additional months to June 2023.</i></p> <p><i>Given the current timeline assessment, the fishery is set to be certified by Q3 2021, to align with the harmonized milestones SCS will aim to either (a) conduct surveillances in June, a few months prior to the anniversary date or (b) conduct an expedited audit outside of the surveillance cycle to assess progress on Principle 1 conditions by June 2023.</i></p> <p>1) Support the WCPFC in their efforts to review, improve, and put into place HCRs that are robust, precautionary, and responsive to the WCPO SKJ stock.</p> <p>2) To establish well-defined WCPO Harvest Control Rules with appropriate Yellowfin and Bigeye exploitation levels that address the biomass declines.</p>
Expected Completion Date	Surveillance: Milestone Year 1
Priority	Medium

Estimated Cost	\$USD 10,000
Responsible Parties	Responsible Party/Parties: US Pacific Tuna Group (USPTG), NFMS/NOAA.
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	PI 1.2.2, PI 1.2.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>To advocate that the WCPFC staff:</p> <p>a) Obtain a SKJ stock assessment to help adopt SKJ Harvest Control Rules that includes management action responses for changes in stock status aimed at maintaining the stock. Reference points in place that trigger management actions.</p> <p>b) Establish a better understanding of the effect of controlling exploitation in order to establish well-defined robust HCRs for Yellowfin and Bigeye and define the appropriate YF exploitation levels.</p>	WCPFC Staff	<p>US Pacific Tuna Group, ATA, US Delegation, TUNACONS FIP, OPAGAC FIP, over-lapping UoAs and MSC certified fisheries</p> <p>ISSF & WWF</p>	March 2022	March 2023	<p>WCPFC Harvest Control Rules put in place for Skipjack with reference and trigger points</p> <p>WCPFC Harvest Control Rules reviewed, improved and put in place for Yellowfin and Skipjack with reference and trigger points</p>
<p>The UoA fishery supports the timely adoption by the WCPFC of Harvest Control Rules that are consistent with the MSC requirements.</p> <p>Coordinate position and advocacy letters with TUNACONS and OPAGAC FIPs</p>	US Pacific Tuna Group	<p>ATA, US Delegation, TUNACONS FIP, OPAGAC FIP,</p> <p>ISSF & WWF</p>	March 2022	March 2023	<p>WCPFC Harvest Control Rules reviewed, improved and put in place for Yellowfin and Skipjack with reference and trigger points</p>

					Copies of Advocacy Letters and Position Statements
--	--	--	--	--	--

6. Principle 2 – Minimising Environmental Impacts

7. Action Number and Name	2.1 Primary Species Outcome – Bigeye Tuna
Action Goal	SI a) By the fourth surveillance audit, demonstrate that EPO bigeye tuna is highly likely to be above the PRI, or if bigeye tuna is below the PRI, there is either evidence of recovery or a demonstrably effective strategy in place between all MSC UoAs which categorise bigeye tuna as main, to ensure that they collectively do not hinder recovery and rebuilding.
Action Description	<p>At present there are no overlapping fisheries with this condition. USPTG will consult with NFMS/NOAA to formulate a plan to ensure that EPO bigeye tuna is highly likely to be above the PRI, or if bigeye tuna is below the PRI.</p> <p>The plan shall:</p> <p>Undertake a catch profiling trial for the fishery. This will be independent, scientifically robust, and spatially and seasonally representative</p> <p>Redetermine catch proportions of each species (including P1 target species). Allocate those non P1 species that are greater than 5% as main. For these determine whether management tools and measures are in place, expected to achieve stock management objectives reflected in either limit or target reference points.</p> <p>Maintain contact with stock status assessments in the EPO of bigeye tuna annually and advocate for the IATTC to adopt measures to see bigeye tuna above PRI.</p>
Expected Completion Date	<p>Surveillance: Milestone Year 2</p> <p>Client provides evidence of implementing the plan as presented in Year 1 (including any revisions).</p> <p>Expected score: 75</p>
Priority	Low
Estimated Cost	N/A
Responsible Parties	US Pacific Tuna Group (USPTG), NFMS/NOAA, IATTC.

MSC PI Addressed by the Action	PI 2.1.1 (a)
---------------------------------------	--------------

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>USPTG will consult with NFMS/NOAA to formulate a plan to ensure that EPO bigeye tuna is highly likely to be above the PRI, or if bigeye tuna is below the PRI.</p> <p>The plan shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Undertake a catch profiling trial for the fishery. This will be independent, scientifically robust, and spatially and seasonally representative ii. Redetermine catch proportions of each species (including P1 target species). Allocate those non P1 species that are greater than 5% as main. For these determine whether management tools and measures are in place, expected to achieve stock management objectives reflected in either limit or target reference points. iii. Maintain contact with stock status assessments in the EPO of bigeye tuna annually and advocate for the IATTC to adopt measures to see bigeye tuna above PRI. <p>If the stock is below PRI, an effective recovery strategy will be required to be implemented across all UoAs that categorize bigeye tuna as a main species.</p>	Pacific Tuna Group (USPTG), NFMS/NOAA, IATTC.		March 2022	March 2023	<p>Be able to present a plan to show what actions will be taken to either ensure that EPO bigeye tuna are highly likely to be above the PRI</p> <p>Expected score: 75</p>
<p>Refer to available stock assessments to determine whether main and minor primary species are above the PRI and the degree of confidence in this.</p> <p>Where stock assessments are available for main primary species, but these assessments do not provide the level of robustness to be able to draw</p>	Responsible Party/Parties: US Pacific Tuna Group			March 2024	Expected score: 75

<p>conclusions with high degree of confidence, refine the assessment methodology to address uncertainties.</p> <p>Explore appropriate management measures to ensure that the fishery (and other MSC fisheries where applicable) do not hinder the recovery of any species below the PRI (whether main or minor). This could include reduced exploitation levels (through licensing, quota or effort restrictions), gear modifications, seasonal or area closures.</p>	<p>(USPTG), NFMS/NOA A, IATTC.</p>				
<p>Put in place appropriate management measures to ensure that the fishery (and other MSC fisheries where applicable) do not hinder the recovery of any species below the PRI (whether main or minor). This could include reduced exploitation levels (through licensing, quota or effort restrictions), gear modifications, seasonal or area closures to limit operations in the EPO to bring the total catch of EPO BET to <5% of the total EPO UoA catch?</p> <p>Where depleted stocks are caught but not retained (i.e., discarded), undertake post-capture mortality trials to demonstrate whether the fishery is contributing to overall mortality levels.</p> <p>Ascertain the level of fishing mortality on any stock below the PRI attributable to the fishery under assessment, in comparison with that from other fleets.</p>	<p>US Pacific Tuna Group (USPTG), NFMS/NOA A, IATTC.</p>		<p>March 2022</p>	<p>March 2025</p>	<p>Expected score: 75</p> <p>Have appropriate management measures in place</p>
<p>Introduce a system of on-going periodic recording of catch profiling, plus any other data gathering as required.</p> <p>Review the effectiveness of the management to identify if the bigeye stock is healthier and is now highly likely to be above PRI.</p>	<p>Responsible Party/Partie s: US Pacific Tuna Group (USPTG), NFMS/NOA A, IATTC.</p>		<p>March 2023</p>	<p>March 2026</p>	<p>Be able to demonstrate that EPO bigeye tuna is highly likely to be above the PRI, or if bigeye tuna is below the PRI</p> <p>Expected score: 80</p>

Action Number and Name	Action 2.2 - ETP species outcome, management, and information for WCPO and EPO Regions
Action Goal	<p>For ETP species outcome, the FIP will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify, quantify, and classify UoA fishery interactions with ETP species and determine UoA impacts on the relevant species 2. Develop and implement ETP bycatch management strategies to mitigate negative impacts and support stock recovery <p>For ETP species management, the FIP will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement a strategy that ensures the UoA does not hinder the recovery of ETP species in the WCPO and EPO regions. 2. Evidence that the measures/strategy is being implemented successfully for all ETP species in the WCPO and EPO regions. <p>For ETP species information, the FIP will provide evidence that some quantitative information is adequate to assess the UoA related mortality and impact and to determine whether the UoA may be a threat to the protection and recovery of ETP species</p> <p>There is a regular review of the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimize UoA-related mortality of ETP species in the WCPO and EPO regions and they are implemented as appropriate.</p>
Action Description	<p>The FIP will collect data to determine the stock status for the UoA on ETP species and ETP species' bycatch rates including their respective fates after being captured by the fishery and provide information on the factors contributing to interactions with ETP species in the WCPO region and options to reduce their frequency.</p> <p>To understand more about the regional and international management regulations for relevant ETP species, the FIP will research and collaborate with regional and national managerial bodies. For ETP species that do not have national or international limits, protections, or adequate management strategies, support, and advocate for the development and implementation of robust management strategies to mitigate negative impacts and build stock status. Develop and implement a comprehensive ETP bycatch policy and best practices based on the best available science and guidance.</p> <p>Develop a plan including procedures, protocols, and schedule for implementing CMM 2019-05 regulations in the WCPO, and C-15-04 and C-19-01 regulations in EPO regions. Skipper and crew training and education should be part of the plan and protocol to ensure that all members can record reliable and accurate data regarding ETP species incidents.</p>

	<p>Provide evidence to demonstrate the compliance of the vessels with the CMM 2019-05 regulations in the WCPO, and the C-15-04 and C-19-01 regulations in the EPO.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demonstrate there is a strategy in place that is expected to ensure the UoA does not hinder the recovery of ETP species in the WCPO and EPO regions. 2. Demonstrate there is some evidence that the measures/strategy is being implemented successfully for all ETP species in the WCPO and EPO regions.
Expected Completion Date	March 2024 and ongoing
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	\$USD 25,000
Responsible Parties	<p>USPTG and FIP coordinator</p> <p>Decision-making: WCPFC and IATTC Commissions</p> <p>Research & information: RFMO scientists, national-level scientists, other 3rd party science providers, NGO and consultants</p> <p>Advocacy: WWF, ISSF, USPTG Stakeholders to their RFMO delegations, and coordination with overlapping FIPs and MSC assessed fisheries</p>
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	PI 2.3.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
Develop a comprehensive list of ETP species' DPSs and/or stocks that have interactions with the UoA, other MSC UoAs, and overlapping fisheries.	USPTG with FIP Coordinator,	RFMO scientific bodies, overlapping	March 2022	March 2023	List of ETP species with fishery interactions. Summary report

	NMFS and PIRO	FIPs, and fisheries			of available information and data. VMS data confirming the exact fishing range of the USPTG fleet.
Disaggregate species interactions data to clarify the types of encounters (sightings vs interactions, onboard or in net), fate, including live release, and species mortalities.	USPTG with FIP Coordinator, NMFS and PIRO	RFMO Scientific Bodies	March 2022	March 2023	Summary report of disaggregated data.
Conduct training for skippers and crew members about the importance of data collection and the proper procedures for data recording. ISSF best practice handling for ETP species should also be taught and adhered to ensure the survival of bycatch. Training on CMM 2019-05 and C-19-01 and C-15-04 requirements for WCPO and EPO, respectively.	USPTG with FIP coordinator, NMFS, and PIRO	RFMO Scientific Bodies	March 2022	March 2023	Photographic evidence of skipper/crew training and a signed form of training completion.
Support and advocate for new and updated stock assessments of relevant ETP species with fishery interactions.	USPTG with FIP Coordinator,	RFMOs, national delegations, NGO and overlapping FIPs	March 2022	March 2027	Position statements and letters to national RFMO delegations. Joint position statements with NGOs and other FIPs in some cases. New and updated stock assessment of ETP species.
Develop a list and summary of relevant ETP species with national or international limits, protection, or management strategies.	US Pacific Tuna Group with FIP Coordinator	RFMO Scientific Bodies and Overlapping FIPs	March 2022	March 2023	Written list and summary.

Support and advocate for the development and implementation of robust bycatch and FAD management strategies that contribute to the recovery of ETP stocks. Implement procedures and protocols following the regulations of the CMM 2019-05 for WCPO and C-19-01 and C-15-04 for EPO.	USPTG with FIP coordinator	RFMOs, national delegations, NGO and overlapping FIPs	March 2022	March 2027	Position statements and letters to national RFMO delegations. Joint statements with NGOs and other FIPs, RFMO resolutions.
Develop, adopt, and implement a comprehensive ETP bycatch policy and best practices based on the best available science and ISSF guidance, including further mitigation efforts for Silky and Oceanic White Tip sharks.	USPTG, UoA Fleet, and FIP coordinator	RFMOs, national delegations, NGO and overlapping FIPs	March 2022	March 2023	Adopted policy and best practices for ETP bycatch. Post policy and best practices on each vessel in the UoA.
Identify and describe any changes in ETP species catches and interactions by the UoA fishery due to changes in fishing operation and fishing locations (for example high seas fishing and fishing on the 150-degree line of EPO).	USPTG with FIP Coordinator, NMFS and PIRO	RFMO scientific bodies, 3 rd party science provider	March 2022	September 2023	Report summarizing the findings.
Conduct a review of the results after a year of the new management methods (CMM 2019-05, C-15-04, and C-19-01) have been implemented to understand if they are effective at reducing the number of interactions with ETP species.	USPTG, FIP coordinator	FIP participant	March 2026	March 2027	A report highlighting the differences, if any, between before the management plan for ETP species was implemented, and the current status.
Update the regulations and measures, if necessary, where they are deemed to be ineffective during the annual review.	USPTG with FIP Coordinator,	RFMOs, national delegations, NGOs and overlapping FIPs	March 2022	March 2027	Amendment to the management plan and further investigation into the compliance of the FIP.

<p>Provide evidence that some quantitative information is adequate to assess the UoA related mortality and impact to determine if the UoA will provide a mortal threat to the protection and recovery of ETP species.</p>	<p>USPTG with FIP coordinator, NMFS, and PIRO</p>	<p>RFMO Scientific Bodies</p>	<p>March 2022</p>	<p>March 2023</p>	<p>A report that highlights the difference between when the FIP wasn't complying with the regulations, and the current state of the management plan.</p>
---	---	-------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	--

Action Number and Name	2.3 - Habitats and Ecosystem Outcome, Management, and Information WCPO and EPO regions
Action Goal	<p>Evidence that FAD sets by the UoA are highly unlikely to reduce the structure and function of the VME habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm.</p> <p>Provide evidence that in the WCPO and EPO regions, there are partial strategies in place for VMEs (including coral reefs) and there is some objective basis for confidence that the measures/partial strategy will work, based on the habitats that are directly involved.</p>
Action Description	<p>Support and advocate for the improvement of FAD management strategies based on the best available science to mitigate FAD impacts on VMEs, sensitive habitats, and ETP species.</p> <p>Gather data to improve information on the distribution and impact of FADs on VMEs and sensitive habitats. More information is also needed to determine the UoA fleets' specific impact on the ecosystem and sensitive habitats if any.</p> <p>Increase quantitative evidence that existing partial strategies are being implemented successfully.</p> <p>Confirm that the UoA is following other fisheries measures best practices to protect VMEs.</p> <p>Support and advocate for the improvement of FAD management strategies based on the best available science to mitigate FAD impacts on VMEs, sensitive habitats, and ETP species.</p> <p>Collaborate and share information on best practices for FAD management with overlapping FIPs and NGOs.</p> <p>Following the precautionary approach, develop and implement a comprehensive and auditable FAD management plan for the UoA fishery based on the best available science to mitigate potential FAD impacts on VMEs, sensitive habitats, and ETP species.</p> <p>Conduct research and testing on potential best practices for FAD management.</p>
Expected Completion Date	March 2027
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	\$USD 25,000
Responsible Parties	USPTG, Fleet level: vessel owners, captains, and crew

	<p>Decision Making: WCPFC and IATTC Commissions</p> <p>Research & information: RFMO scientists, national-level scientists, NGOs, 3rd party science providers, overlapping MSC fisheries, and FIPs</p> <p>Advocacy: USPTG, WWF, ISSF, other USPTG Stakeholders, and overlapping FIPs</p>
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	PIs 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.4.3, and 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
The two RFMOs support and advocate for the continued collection of data to better understand and detect any increase in risk levels from FADs on VMEs and sensitive habitats.	USPTG and FIP Coordinator	Overlapping FIPs and NGOs including ISSF and WWF	March 2022	March 2027	Position statements and letters to national RFMO delegations. Joint statements with NGOs and other FIPs in some cases
Design a logbook and data collection system to quantify the number of lost or abandoned FADs, their fate, and location. Data should also include an estimate of the number of FADs that are transferred or retrieved. The data should also record the materials used in the FAD construction and highlight where there are entangling/plastic-based materials.	USPTG, UoA Fleet, and FIP Coordinator		March 2022	September 2023	Documented logbook and data collection system
Participate in voluntary programs to track FAD status and to retrieve lost, abandoned, or derelict FADs, at sea or on land. Initiate a database of onshore landings of derelict FADs, damaged gears, and plastic materials.	USPTG, UoA Fleet	Overlapping FIPs and NGOs including ISSF and WWF	March 2022	September 2023	Proof of Participation in voluntary programs in form of MOUs and participation agreements

Support and advocate for research on FAD impacts and the effectiveness of existing partial strategies including limits on the number of active FADs deployed or FAD sets. Existing and proposed limits are arbitrary and should be based on the best available science.	USPTG and FIP Coordinator	RFMO and national scientific bodies, NGOs, and overlapping FIPs	March 2022	March 2027	A written summary of existing studies
Hold a meeting with all interested parties and stakeholders to discuss and establish a plan for investigating the impact of lost FADs on the structure and function of VMEs. Develop a work plan using the information discussed in the meeting to highlight the specific areas that need to be addressed. Collaborate with other FIPs and FAD fisheries seeking MSC certification to produce broader surveys and studies on the impacts of FADs on VMEs and sensitive habitats.	USPTG and FIP Coordinator	RFMO and national scientific bodies, NGOs, and overlapping FIPs	March 2022	March 2027	Participation in FIP Workshops and Scientific Working Groups
Conduct and coordinate research on the use of non-entangling and biodegradable materials in the construction of FADs	USPTG and FIP Coordinator, UoA fleet Captains, and crew	Overlapping FIPs, other FAD fisheries, RFMO scientists, NGOs, biodegradable and non-entangling material suppliers	March 2022	March 2027	List of non-entangling and biodegradable materials for testing. Studies and reporting of test results
Summarise the activities and analyses since the implementation of the FAD management plan to highlight the information collected from the FAD tracking task, including: 1. Number of FADs deployed	USPTG and FIP Coordinator		March 2024	March 2027	

<p>2. Number of FADs retrieved</p> <p>3. FAD tracking information</p> <p>4. Impacts on VMEs</p>					
<p>Encourage the progress and priority of WCPFC's current five-year strategic research plan and data collection to monitor and assess the WCPO's pelagic ecosystems, and the evaluation of potential management options.</p>	<p>USPTG and FIP Coordinator</p>	<p>Overlapping FIPs and NGOs including ISSF and WWF</p>	<p>March 2023</p>	<p>March 2027</p>	<p>Position statements and letters to national RFMO delegations. Joint statements with NGOs and other FIPs in some cases</p>
<p>Support and advocate for IATTC developing a five-year strategic research plan to incorporate and prioritize several ecosystem components and improve the integration of existing research programs and catch trophic levels for three purse-seine fishing methods that are being monitored as a proxy of ecosystem integrity.</p>	<p>USPTG and FIP Coordinator</p>	<p>IATTC, overlapping FIPs, and NGOs including ISSF and WWF</p>	<p>March 2022</p>	<p>March 2027</p>	<p>Position statements and letters to national RFMO delegations. Joint statements with NGOs and other FIPs in some cases</p>
<p>Using the information collated from the RFMOs, write a report about its adequacy in identifying the main impacts of the UoA on the main habitats, ensuring it is reliable.</p> <p>Collaborate and share information on best practices for FAD management with overlapping FIPs and other FAD fisheries seeking MSC certification and ensure it is being adhered to within the fishery.</p>	<p>USPTG and FIP coordinator</p>	<p>Overlapping FIPs and FAD fisheries</p>	<p>March 2022</p>	<p>March 2027</p>	<p>Meetings and workshops with participants in FIPs and other FAD fisheries</p>
<p>Develop and adopt a comprehensive and auditable FAD management plan and code of best practices for the UoA based on the best available science and guidance, including a formal FAD recovery, transfer, and sharing strategy for the UoA fleet and other FAD fisheries in the Pacific.</p>	<p>USPTG, fleet, and FIP coordinator</p>	<p>RFMO and national scientific bodies, overlapping FIPs and NGOs</p>	<p>March 2022</p>	<p>September 2023</p>	<p>Documented FAD management plan with best practices</p>

		including ISSF and WWF			
--	--	---------------------------	--	--	--

8. Principle 3 – Effective Management

Action Number and Name	3.1 Legal and customary framework for Ecuador
Action Goal	To have a strong legal and customary framework for Ecuador in place.
Action Description	This IPG has two actions associated with it. Information could not be found during the pre-assessment to evidence meeting SG80 for both SIb and SIc for PI 3.1.1. This could be a product of the remote pre-assessment that was conducted, which led to precautionary scoring against the MSC Fisheries Standard.
Expected Completion Date	December 2024
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	Year 3: \$ 5,000USD Year 4: \$ 5,000USD Year 5: \$ 2,500USD
Responsible Parties	National management bodies.
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.1.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Estimated completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.1a: Conduct a review of the fishery dispute mechanisms of Ecuador 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 coordinator/ FIP consultant	Ministry, fishery	March 2022	March 2023	
3.1b: Conduct a review of customary fishery rights of Ecuador 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 coordinator/ FIP consultant	Ministry, fishery	September 2022	September 2023	
3.1c: Hold regular stakeholder meetings to develop dispute mechanisms where absent. Minutes should be kept of each meeting, topics discussed, outcomes, and appropriate timelines for implementation.	Ministries/FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP coordinator, NGOs	March 2023	September 2024	
3.1d: Hold regular stakeholder meetings to develop a mechanism to integrate and observe customary rights into the management system where absent. Minutes should be kept of each meeting, topics discussed, outcomes, and appropriate timelines for implementation.	Ministries/FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP coordinator, NGOs	September 2023	September 2024	
3.1e: Ensure appropriate transparent and effective dispute resolution is enshrined in legislation	FIP coordinator		March 2024	September 2024	
3.1f: Ensure appropriate dispute resolution and respect for rights is enshrined in legislation	FIP coordinator		March 2024	September 2024	

Action Number and Name	3.2 Fishery-specific objectives for Ecuador and Nicaragua
Action Goal	Have short- and long-term fishery-specific objectives that are demonstrably consistent with achieving the outcomes expressed by MSC's P1 and P2 and are explicit within the fishery-specific management system.
Action Description	At both the international and national level, the management objectives apply to all tuna species, therefore, there are no specific fishery objectives for yellowfin tuna, mahi-mahi, or swordfish in the EPO, and Ecuadorian waters.
Expected Completion Date	December 2024
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	Year 3: \$ 10,000USD Year 4: \$ 10,000USD Year 5: \$ 5,000USD
Responsible Parties	FIP coordinator, FIP participants, and the national management bodies.
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.2.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.2a: Conduct a review of fishery-specific objectives of Ecuador and Nicaragua 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 coordinator/ FIP consultant	Ministry, fishery	March 2022	September 2022	
3.2b: Hold regular stakeholder meetings to develop fishery-specific objectives where absent. Minutes should be kept of each meeting, topics discussed, outcomes, and appropriate timelines for implementation.	Ministries/FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2022	September 2024	

<p>3.2c: Ensure appropriate transparent and effective fishery-specific objectives are enshrined in legislation through the development, agreement, and implementation of a fishery-specific management plan.</p>	<p>FIP coordinator</p>	<p>Ministry</p>	<p>March 2024</p>	<p>September 2024</p>	
<p>3.2d: Periodically review the appropriateness of objectives to ensure that they are achieving the management aims.</p>	<p>FIP coordinator</p>		<p>March 2024</p>	<p>September 2024</p>	

Action Number and Name	3.3 Decision-making processes for Ecuador and Nicaragua
Action Goal	To fully understand the Ecuadorian and Nicaraguan decision-making processes to show that it is an established, adaptive process that considers the precautionary approach and is wholly transparent.
Action Description	<p>The decision-making process within the IATTC is highly participatory and each member state can vote on all decisions and rulings. However, the conservation measures are often not up to par with the recommendations made by scientific staff and may not include explanations of their actions. In Ecuador, however, it is unclear whether decision-making is a participatory process.</p> <p>The action potentially covers four scoring issues from PI 3.2.2. This could be a product of the remote pre-assessment that was conducted, which led to precautionary scoring against the MSC Fisheries Standard.</p>
Expected Completion Date	December 2024
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 3: \$ 10,000USD</p> <p>Year 4: \$ 10,000USD</p> <p>Year 5: \$ 2,000USD</p>
Responsible Parties	FIP coordinator, national management bodies.
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.2.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.3a: Conduct a review of the decision-making processes in Ecuador and Nicaragua to fully understand gaps identified in the pre-assessment. The reviews should include:	FIP coordinator/ FIP consultant		March 2022	March 2023	

<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 the best science available? 4. Input from management authorities and other relevant stakeholders. 5. If there are/have been any legal challenges and how these have been addressed by the management system and/or fishery. <p>A report should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>					
<p>3.3b: Define decision-making processes in the management plan. The process shall include, if necessary, how will evidence be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Included (from research, monitoring, evaluation, and consultation). 2. Stakeholders be consulted. 3. Utilised from best-available information to ensure the precautionary approach. 4. Outcomes be communicated (information should be made available on request and explanations are provided for any actions or lack of action associated with findings and relevant recommendations emerging from research, monitoring evaluation, and review activity). 5. Process for addressing legal challenges if necessary. 6. Precautionary approach in the management plan. 	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2022	September 2024	
<p>3.3c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to incorporate the above into decision-making processes. Multiple consultations may need to be held.</p>	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	September 2022	September 2024	

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 RFMOs, research, etc.) and the precautionary approach are included.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	September 2023	September 2024	
3.3e: Review the efficacy of the decision-making process.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	September 2024	March 2025	

Action Number and Name	3.4 Compliance and enforcement for WCPO Ecuador and Nicaragua
Action Goal	Have sufficient evidence to conclude that sanctions are consistently applied and provide effective deterrence any the third surveillance audit provides evidence that monitoring, control, and surveillance system has been implemented in the FAD fishery and demonstrate that relevant WCPFC management measures, strategies, and/or rules for FAD construction, FAD limits and other requirements for FAD management contained in WCPFC CMMs are being enforced.
Action Description	<p>Evidence is provided to show that action by the USA is planned to ensure monitoring, control, and surveillance measures are implemented in the FAD fishery that meets relevant WCPFC management measures, strategies, and/or rules for FAD construction, FAD limits, and any other requirements for FAD management contained in WCPFC CMMs.</p> <p>Evidence is provided to show that the USA has taken action to ensure monitoring, control, and surveillance measures are implemented in the FAD fishery to enforce WCPFC management measures, strategies, and/or rules for FAD construction, FAD limits, and other requirements for FAD management contained in WCPFC CMMs.</p> <p>Evidence is provided to show that the USA has taken action to ensure monitoring, control, and surveillance measures are implemented in the FAD fishery to enforce WCPFC management measures, strategies, and/or rules for FAD construction, FAD limits, and other requirements for FAD management contained in WCPFC CMMs and that these actions are being enforced. There is little information at the national level on compliance within the longline fleets of Ecuador and Nicaragua, although there is no evidence of systematic non-compliance. There is also illegal fishing at the international level; information on international infractions is registered by the IATTC.</p>
Expected Completion Date	December 2024
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 3: \$ 10,000USD.</p> <p>Year 4: \$ 10,000USD</p> <p>Year 5: \$ 7,500USD</p>
Responsible Parties	National management bodies, NFMS/NOAA

MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.2.3
---------------------------------------	-------

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Expected completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>3.4a: 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 coordinator/ FIP consultant	Fishery	March 2022	March 2023	
3.4b: Develop a plan to combat the gaps identified in the national MCS systems based on the findings of the report.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2022	March 2023	
<p>3.4c: USPTG to meet with NFMS/NOAA to discuss this issue and formally request action to address this milestone.</p> <p>USPTG to provide evidence that FADs deployed by the vessels are compliant with CMM 2020-01.</p>	USPTG, NFMS/NOAA	FIP coordinator	March 2022	March 2023	Minutes and records of meetings held to be collated and presented to the CAB during the first surveillance audit.

USPTG demonstrates a willingness to actively cooperate with inspections and protocols implemented by the NFMS/NOAA.					Meetings to have been held with NFMS/NOAA to discuss the issue and the options for remedy. Expected score: 75
3.4d: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to discuss implementation and potential adjustments to the 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.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	September 2022	September 2024	
3.4d: Summary of activities undertaken by NFMS/NOAA on effecting this change in management to be documented and presented by NFMS/NOAA to the WCPFC TCC or Regular Session depending on appropriateness. NFMS/NOAA will implement inspections of vessels in addition to current MCS and observer programs to ensure compliance as necessary to meet the CMM. Evidence of inspections to be kept by NFMS/NOAA, including any penalties or sanctions issued as a result of non-compliance with CMM 2020-01.	NFMS/NOAA	FIP coordinator	March 2023	March 2024	Domestic regulations for vessels to comply with CMM 2020-01 (or its successors) and other relevant CMMs are in place and affect the fishery. Expected score: 75
3.4e: Implement finalized plan where necessary, allocating the necessary resources to ensure successful employment of improved MCS system.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP coordinator, NGOs	September 2023	September 2024	
3.4f: Records of enforcement measures taken by NFMS/NOAA to be presented to the CAB and WCPFC TCC or Regular Session depending on appropriateness.	NFMS/NOAA	FIP coordinator	March 2024	September 2024	Domestic regulations for vessels to comply with CMM 2020-01 (or its successors) and other relevant CMMs are in a

					place affected in the fishery and are demonstrably enforced by NFMS/NOAA. Expected score: 80
3.4g: 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 coordinator, NGOs	September 2024	March 2025	

Action Number and Name	3.5 Monitoring and management performance evaluation for Nicaragua
Action Goal	The fishery-specific management systems of Nicaragua are subject to regular external review.
Action Description	The IATTC is subject to periodic internal reviews. In 2016, the first external audit was carried out and marked the beginning of formal monitoring of the management system. However, there is no regular external review procedure. It is unknown if regular and ongoing reviews have been maintained for local and national topics related to longline fisheries management.
Expected Completion Date	December 2024
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	Year 3: \$ 5,000USD Year 4: \$ 5,000USD Year 5: \$ 2,000USD
Responsible Parties	National management bodies.
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.2.4

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Estimated completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>3.5a: Review fishery-specific management processes currently in place. Ascertain whether these systems are subject to 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 will be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>	FIP coordinator/ FIP consultant		March 2022	March 2023	

3.5b: Develop a plan to combat the gaps identified in the national fishery-specific systems based on the findings of the report.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP coordinator	March 2022	September 2022	
3.5c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to discuss implementation and potential adjustments to the 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.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP coordinator	September 2022	March 2024	
3.5d: Implement the finalized plan with binding commitment and requirements to undertake reviews where necessary, allocating the necessary resources to ensure regular external reviews from relevant bodies.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP coordinator	September 2023	March 2025	
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.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP coordinator	September 2024	March 2026	

9. Estimated Budget and Priority

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

Table 2 - Budget for the updated work plan of the Pacific Ocean tropical tuna - purse seine (US Pacific Tuna Group)¹

Action number and name		Priority	Year 3 (2022) (\$USD)	Year 4 (2023) (\$USD)	Year 5 (2024) (\$USD)	Total (US\$)
FIP Coordination		NA	10,000	10,000	10,000	30,000
1.1	Stock Status – EPO Yellowfin		5,000	5,000	5,000	15,000
1.2	Harvest Strategies – WPO yellowfin, skipjack and bigeye, EPO yellowfin, skipjack, and bigeye		23,000	23,000	23,000	69,000
1.3	Harvest Control Rules - WPO yellowfin, skipjack, and bigeye, EPO Pacific yellowfin, skipjack, and bigeye		-	10,000	-	10,000
2.1	Primary Species Outcome – Bigeye Tuna		N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
2.2	ETP species outcome, management, and information		10,000	10,000	5,000	25,000
2.3	Habitats and Ecosystems Outcome, Management, and Information		10,000	10,000	5,000	25,000
3.1	Legal and customary framework for Ecuador		5,000	5,000	2,500	12,500
3.2	Fishery specific objectives for Ecuador and Nicaragua		10,000	10,000	5,000	25,000
3.3	Decision-making Processes for Ecuador and Nicaragua		10,000	10,000	5,000	25,000
3.4	Compliance and enforcement for WCPO Ecuador and Nicaragua		10,000	10,000	7,500	27,500
3.5	Monitoring and management performance evaluation for Nicaragua		5,000	5,000	2,000	12,000
Total (\$USD)			98,000	108,000	70,000	276,000

¹ No expenses are included in this budget.

10. Appendix A

Pass with conditions explanations

Principle 1

Eastern Pacific Stocks

Skipjack Tuna

- **PI 1.2.1 Harvest strategy**

Explanation: IATTC Res C-16-02 sets HCRs for tropical tunas. The HCR focuses on the most vulnerable stock (YFT, BET, or SKJ) and is implemented via time/area closures and catch limits. SKJ is more resilient, but it is unclear how the HCR can be responsive to SKJ stock status without ref. pts. The HS for SKJ including stock assessments and ref. values, need to be reviewed, improved, and adapted to SKJ, so specific management action can be triggered if needed.

- **PI 1.2.2 Harvest control rules and tools**

Explanation: The HCR for EPO tropical tunas (IATTC Res C-16-02) is expected to maintain biomass above the LRP, above the PRI, and fluctuate around the MSY level. The application of the HCR to skipjack is not clear because stock assessments have not provided reliable results or MSY-ref pts. The use of RBF or the status of more vulnerable stocks as a basis does not provide a 'well defined' HCR. Also, the main tools to implement HCR (closures and FAD limits per Res. C-17-02), are not linked to the HCR or SKJ status, so it is not clear that they will be effective. A trigger value for taking management action needs to be defined for SKJ.

Western Central Pacific Stocks

Skipjack Tuna

- **PI 1.2.1 Harvest strategy:**

Explanation: The harvest strategy for skipjack (CMM 2016-01) states that F should be maintained at or below FMSY. The current CMM 2018-01 states that the spawning biomass of skipjack tuna should be maintained at a level consistent with the interim target reference point of 50% of the spawning biomass in the absence of fishing. This interim HS has been applied since 2013, but a formal HS and HCR for skipjack is in development, including an updated stock assessment, a review of TRPs, MSE, and HCR evaluation. A robust and precautionary strategy for WCPO SKJ will be accomplished once the HCR is reviewed and improved (expected completion in 2020).

- **PI 1.2.2 Harvest control rules and tools**

Explanation: Only generally understood HCRs are available for SKJ (through CMM 2014-06) and have maintained the stock above the MSY level through 2015. These HCRs do not take uncertainties into account. Although there is some evidence that the main tools of the HS for SKJ (temporal/ spatial limits on purse seine setting on FADs, restrictions on effort (days)) are effective in controlling exploitation, the exploitation levels required are not yet established. Progress toward a formal harvest strategy and HCR need to be demonstrated.

Yellowfin Tuna

- **PI 1.2.1 Harvest strategy**

Explanation: The objective of the current HS (CMM 2018-01) for WCPO YFT is to maintain the spawning biomass depletion ratio ($SB/SBF=0$) at or above the average for 2012-2015. Management measures (set for years 2018-2021) include limits of FAD sets and fishing days for the purse-seine fleet and catch limits on longlines. Since 2013 the HS has consisted of a series of ad hoc measures (focused more on bigeye) that are achieving the objectives, but the HS is not necessarily responsive to the state of the stock, even if sufficient monitoring is in place. A harvest strategy for YFT needs to be adopted that includes management action responses to changes in (yellowfin) stock status and harvest control rules aimed at maintaining the stock at or near target reference points.

- **PI 1.2.2 Harvest control rules and tools**

Explanation: Only generally understood HCRs are available for WCPO-YFT (through CMM 2014-06), but they have maintained the stock above the MSY and the PRI, according to the 2017 assessment. However, biomass shows a consistent decline over the time series. Elements of the HCR for YFT are in progress, and CMM-2018-01 sets out the detail of interim management measures between 2018 - 2021, pending the establishment of an HS. The interim HCR is not robust to uncertainties. The main tools of the HS for YFT (temporal/ spatial limits on purse seine setting on FADs, restrictions on effort (days), capacity limits, and longline limits on BET. The effect of controlling exploitation is not yet known, but biomass has shown a steady decline. Appropriate exploitation levels are not well defined.

Bigeye Tuna

- **PI 1.2.1 Harvest strategy**

Explanation: The objective of the current HS (CMM 2018-01) for WCPO-BET is to maintain $SB/SBF=0$ at or above the average for 2012-2015. Management measures (2018-2021) include limits of FAD sets and fishing days for the purse-seine fleet and catch limits on longlines. Since 2013 the HS has consisted of ad hoc measures targeted at BET. The BET status has improved, possibly due to different assumptions in growth and spatial structure in the assessment. Thus, the (ad hoc) HS is achieving the objectives, but it is not necessarily responsive to the state of the stock, and it has not been evaluated. The HS has

monitoring in place (recording catch, effort, estimation of CPUs, stock assessment) to determine if it is working. The HS has provisions for annual review and improvement. CMM-14-06 sets out a plan to develop a formal HS for BET.

- **PI 1.2.2 Harvest control rules and tools**

Explanation: Only generally understood HCRs are available for WCPO-BET (through CMM 2014-06), but according to the 2018 assessment update, stock biomass has been above MSY throughout the time series, with a ~0% probability that $SB < LRP$. It is worth noting that the bigeye stock had been overfished up until the results of the 2017 assessment, which put it in the green zone of the Kobe plot. This is a function of the new growth model assumptions rather than the effect of management action, which has not reduced fishing mortality and is still at record high levels (even if stable). Thus, the current HCR is not expected to reduce the exploitation rate as the PRI is approached. Elements of the HCR for BET are in progress, and CMM-2018-01 sets out the detail of interim management measures between 2018 - 2021, pending the establishment of a formal HS. The effect of controlling exploitation is not yet known, but biomass has shown a steady decline and fishing mortality is high. Appropriate exploitation levels are not well defined under the current HCR.

Principle 2

- **PI 2.3.1 ETP species outcome**

Explanation: Without knowing the exact fishing range of the UoA, the team cannot accurately score this PI since it cannot determine (1) which species' DPSs and/or stocks are relevant to be able to consider stock status compared to the UoAs' catch of that species, (2) which species have national and/or international limits to know which scoring issue (a or b) should be scored, or (3) if there are combined effects of MSC UoAs (scoring issue a at SG80 and SG100) to be considered.

- **PI 2.3.2 ETP species management strategy**

Explanation: Without knowing the exact fishing range of the UoA, the team cannot accurately score this PI since it cannot determine which species have national and/or international limits to know which scoring issue (a or b) should be scored and which SGs are met. Additionally, without more information directly about the fishery and/or the species involved, it cannot be said that there is an objective basis for confidence that the measures/strategy will work. More information is also needed to determine the frequency and breadth of the review.

- **PI 2.3.3 ETP species information**

Explanation: There is some quantitative information, which is adequate to assess the UoA-related mortality and impact and to determine whether the UoA may be a threat to ETP species recovery. The available information does not speak to the magnitude of UoA-related impacts, mortalities, and injuries; the consequences for the status of ETP species; or the adequacy of that information to support a strategy.

- **PI 2.4.2 Habitats management strategy**

Explanation: Both WCPFC and IATTC have and continue to consider various FAD management options. These measures can be considered partial strategies for both RFMOs, and there is an objective basis for confidence that these partial strategies will work. However, there is a lack of quantitative evidence that the partial strategies are being implemented successfully and that the UoA complies with other fisheries' measures to protect VMEs.

- **PI 2.4.3 Habitats information**

Explanation: The fishing operations and their location are recorded via VMS and observer coverage. All larger vessels operate a VMS, and thus there is accurate, near real-time monitoring of the spatial extent of interaction and the timing and location of use of the fishing gear. WCPFC and IATTC require 100% coverage for large-scale purse seine vessels. However, there is a lack of information on the distribution and impact of FADs and on any increases in risk to habitats, particularly VMEs.

- **PI 2.5.1 Ecosystem outcome**

Explanation: Ecosystem impacts from FADs are thought to be minimal but are uncertain. Natural FADs (e.g., logs) are unlikely to cause serious or irreversible harm since they have a limited lifespan since they become waterlogged and sink. It is unclear if and how these impacts vary for man-made FADs since they have a longer lifespan through the use of floats and PVC frames to keep them buoyant. Overall, tropical tuna purse seine fisheries probably do not cause significant changes in marine ecosystems. However, the potential of FADs to act as ecological traps, as well as the potential impact of derelict FADs on ecosystem components are still not well understood.

- **PI 2.5.2 Ecosystem management strategy**

Explanation: IATTC is developing a five-year strategic research plan that will incorporate several ecosystem components and improve the integration of existing research programs and catch trophic levels for three purse-seine fishing methods that are being monitored as a proxy of ecosystem integrity. WCPFC's current five-year strategic research plan includes research and data collection priorities, one of which is to monitor and assess the WCPO's pelagic ecosystems, and the evaluation of potential management options. However, there is a lack of evidence that the partial strategies are being implemented successfully.

- **PI 2.5.3 Ecosystem information**

Explanation: RFMOs are working to collect data and monitor the ecosystem to support potential management measures. Information on the key elements of the ecosystem is broadly understood and the main functions of the ecosystem components are known, but further research is needed to be able to infer the UoAs' main impacts on the ecosystem, particularly about FADs. There is also a lack of information on the UoAs' impacts of the UoA on these ecosystem components to allow for some of the main consequences to be inferred. There is also a need for the continued collection of data to be able to detect any increase in risk level.

11. Appendix B

Harmonization with any overlapping MSC certified fisheries

In the assessment and certified fisheries targeting yellowfin, skipjack, and/or bigeye in the WCPO and/or EPO (Table 5). In some cases, these fisheries are utilizing purse seine nets, meaning they would also potentially need to harmonize in Principle 2 not just in Principle 1 and/or 3. Harmonization was not undertaken as part of the pre-assessment, but if the fishery were to proceed to full assessment, the MSC requirements (FCR 7.4.16 and Annex PB) outline what harmonization processes and activities should take place when harmonizing the relevant scores and conditions.

Table 5. Potential overlapping fisheries

Fishery Name	Species	Gear Types	Locations	MSC Status
Panama Tropical Pacific yellowfin and skipjack purse seine tuna	Yellowfin, skipjack	Purse seine	Eastern Central Pacific, Southeast Pacific	In Assessment
Pan Pacific yellowfin, bigeye and albacore longline	Albacore, yellowfin, bigeye	Longline	Eastern Central Pacific, Southwest Pacific, Western Central Pacific	In Assessment
PT Citraraja Ampat, Sorong pole and line skipjack and yellowfin tuna	Yellowfin, skipjack	Pole and line	Western Central Pacific	Certified
SZLC, CSFC, FZLC, and MIFV RMI EEZ longline yellowfin and bigeye tuna	Yellowfin, bigeye	Longline	Western Central Pacific	In Assessment
Northeastern Tropical Pacific purse seine yellowfin and skipjack tuna	Yellowfin, skipjack	Purse seine	Eastern Central Pacific	Certified
Tri Marine Western and Central Pacific skipjack and yellowfin tuna	Yellowfin, skipjack	Purse seine	Eastern Central Pacific, Western Central Pacific	Certified
PNA Western and Central Pacific skipjack and yellowfin, unassociated/non-FAD set, tuna purse seine	Yellowfin, skipjack	Purse seine	Eastern Central Pacific, Western Central Pacific	Certified
French Polynesia albacore and yellowfin longline	Albacore, yellowfin	Longline	Western Central Pacific	Certified
Fiji albacore and yellowfin tuna longline	Albacore, yellowfin	Longline	Eastern Central Pacific, Western Central Pacific	Certified
SZLC, CSFC, and FZLC Cook Islands EEZ South Pacific albacore and yellowfin longline	Albacore, yellowfin	Longline	Eastern Central Pacific, Southwest Pacific	Certified
WPSTA Western and Central Pacific skipjack and yellowfin free school purse seine	Yellowfin, skipjack	Purse seine	Eastern Central Pacific, Western Central Pacific	Certified
Japanese pole and line skipjack and albacore tuna	Skipjack, albacore	Pole and line	Western Central Pacific	Certified
SZLC, CSFC, and FZLC FSM EEZ longline yellowfin and bigeye tuna	Yellowfin	Longline	Western Central Pacific	Certified
Ishihara Marine Products albacore and skipjack pole and line	Skipjack, albacore	Pole and line	Northwest Pacific, Western Central Pacific	In Assessment
Tropical Pacific yellowfin and skipjack free-school purse seine	Yellowfin, skipjack	Purse seine	Western Central Pacific	In Assessment
Solomon Islands skipjack and yellowfin tuna purse seine and pole and line	Yellowfin, skipjack	Purse seine, pole and line	Western Central Pacific	Certified

12. Appendix C

List of existing actions, conditions, and title of new action

Workplan	Conditions	New Action
Principle 1		
Action 1 - Healthy Stock Status – EPO Yellowfin		1.1 Healthy Stock Status – EPO Yellowfin
Action 2 - Harvest Strategies – EPO Skipjack	Condition 1- Harvest Strategy -Skipjack Tuna	1.2 Harvest Strategies - Western Pacific yellowfin, skipjack and bigeye, Eastern Pacific yellowfin, skipjack, and bigeye
Action 3 - Harvest Strategy - EPO Yellowfin	Condition 5: Harvest Strategy – Bigeye Tuna	
Action 4 - Harvest Strategy - EPO Bigeye	Condition 3: Harvest Strategy- Yellowfin Tuna	
Action 7 - Harvest Strategy - WCPO Skipjack		
Action 8 - Harvest Strategy - WCPO Yellowfin		
Action 9 - Harvest Strategy - WCPO Bigeye		
Action 5 – Harvest Control Rules - EPO Skipjack, Yellowfin, and Bigeye	Condition 2: Harvest Control Rules - Skipjack Tuna	1.3 Harvest Control Rules - Western Pacific yellowfin, skipjack and bigeye, Eastern Pacific yellowfin, skipjack and bigeye
Action 10 – Harvest Control Rules – WCPO Skipjack	Condition 4 Harvest Control Rules - Yellowfin Tuna	
Action 11 – Harvest Control Rules - WCPO Yellowfin	Condition 6: Harvest Control Rules – Bigeye Tuna	
Action 12- PI 1.2.2 Well defined and effective HCRs in place for WCPO Bigeye		
Action 6 - Stock Status Assessment - All Species		Close – shouldn't be needed to align with other certifications
Principle 2		
Action 13 - ETP species outcome, management, and information	Condition 8: ETP Species Outcome, Direct Effects – WCPO Region	2.1 ETP species outcome, management, and information
	Condition 9: ETP Species Outcome, Direct Effects – EPO Region	
	Condition 10: ETP Species Management Strategy – WCPO Region	
	Condition 11: ETP Species Management Strategy – EPO Region	

	Condition 12: ETP Species Information – WCPO Region	
	Condition 13: ETP Species Information – EPO Region	
	Condition 7 Primary Species Outcome – Bigeye Tuna	2.2 Primary Species Outcome – Bigeye Tuna
Action 14 - Habitats and Ecosystem Outcome, Management and Information	Condition 14: Habitat Outcome; VME Habitat Status – WCPO Region	2.3 Habitats Outcome, Management, and Information
	Condition 15: Habitat Outcome; VME Habitat Status – EPO Region	
	Condition 16: Habitat Management Strategy – WCPO Region	
	Condition 17: Habitat Management Strategy – EPO Region	
	Condition 18: Habitat Information – WCPO Region	
	Condition 19: Habitat Information – EPO Region	
Principle 3		
3.1 Legal and customary framework for Ecuador		3.1 Legal and customary framework for Ecuador
3.2 Fishery-specific objectives for Ecuador and Nicaragua		3.2 Fishery-specific objectives for Ecuador and Nicaragua
Action 15 - Compliance and Enforcement	Condition 20: Compliance and enforcement (MCS) – UOA 2,3,4 (WCPO)	3.4 Compliance and enforcement for WCPO, Ecuador, and Nicaragua
3.4 Compliance and enforcement for Ecuador and Nicaragua		
3.3 Decision-making processes for Ecuador and Nicaragua		3.3 Decision-making processes for Ecuador and Nicaragua
Action 16 - Management Performance Evaluation		3.5 Monitoring and management performance evaluation for Nicaragua
3.5 Monitoring and management performance evaluation for Nicaragua		