

# **Workplan addendum for the Pacific Ocean tuna – longline (Fue Shin) fishery**

**Confidential Report  
Version 1.0**

*Prepared by*

**by Key Traceability Ltd.  
June 2021**



Key Traceability Ltd.  
+44 7505 122728  
[info @keytraceability.com](mailto:info@keytraceability.com)  
England Registered Company 09730288  
70 Londesborough Road, Portsmouth, PO4 0EX

*Project ref. 0090*

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Overview of Preassessment Addendum Results .....	4
Introduction to FIP Workplan .....	5
Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks.....	6
Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts .....	14
Principle 3: Effective management.....	17
Additional Impacts .....	25
Social impacts .....	25
Actions By Priority.....	26
Budget.....	27
Glossary.....	28
Appendix A – Scoring of the Pacific Ocean tuna – longline (Fue Shin) fishery .....	29

## Introduction

This document presents the updated workplan taking into account the P1 scope extension to the original pre-assessment against the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) Fisheries Standard for sustainable fishing (Version 2.01). The fishery being assessed is the FSF Pacific Ocean longline tuna fishery. The fishery targets albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*) and catches bigeye (*T. obesus*) and yellowfin (*T. albacares*) and skipjack (*Katsuwonus pelamis*). The pelagic longline vessels are flagged to Taiwan and fish on the high seas in the Pacific. The fishery is managed regionally by the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) and by the Inter American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) in the Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO). The aim of the document is to give guidance on gaps against the MSC fisheries standard that could be improved by a Fisheries Improvement Project (FIP) in relation to the skipjack element of the fishery and to also update scoring for EPO yellowfin. The aim of the document is to give guidance on gaps against the MSC fisheries standard that could be improved by a Fisheries Improvement Project (FIP) in relation to the skipjack element of the fishery.

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

- The target species is not an amphibian, reptile, bird or mammal.
- The fishery does not use poisons or explosives.
- The fishery is not conducted under a controversial unilateral exemption to an international agreement.
- The client or client group does not include an entity that has been successfully prosecuted for a forced labour violation in the last two years.
- The fishery has in place a mechanism for resolving disputes, and disputes do not overwhelm the fishery.
- The fishery is not an enhanced fishery as per the MSC FCP 7.4.6; and
- The fishery is not an introduced species-based fishery as per the MSC FCP 7.4.7.

Pelagic longline gear is used throughout the world's oceans to capture tuna and tuna-like species. Longline gear is typically deployed from a single vessel across many miles of ocean. The vessel deploys a single mainline that is periodically buoyed with floatation devices and thinner branch lines (with baited hooks) are then attached to the mainline between the floats. Within this simple framework, a variety of configurations and operational practices can be employed to specifically target different depths and species of fish. A single set by vessels in the client fleet usually consists of a mainline around 135 - 150km in length with ca. 20 - 50 m long branch lines attached at intervals along the length of the line. The distance between floats is about 1km, with about 17 - 30 hooks between floats. The depth of main line ranges between 220 – 260 metres in the water column. The use of circle hooks is encouraged by ICCAT but not mandatory, to reduce the catch of marine turtles and other bycatch such as Atlantic sailfish, white and blue marlin.

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

- North Pacific stocks of albacore fished in western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) and eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) by Taiwanese flagged vessels and managed jointly by WCPFC and IATTC (high seas).
- South Pacific stocks of albacore fished in western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) and eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) by Taiwanese flagged vessels and managed by WCPFC (high seas).
- Western and central Pacific bigeye fished in the western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) by Taiwanese flagged vessels and managed by WCPFC (high seas).
- Eastern Pacific bigeye fished in the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) by Taiwanese flagged vessels and managed by IATTC (high seas).
- Western and central Pacific yellowfin fished in the western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) by Taiwanese flagged vessels and managed by WCPFC (high seas).
- Eastern Pacific yellowfin fished in the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) by Taiwanese flagged vessels and managed by IATTC (high seas).

The addendum now includes the UoAs:

- Western and central Pacific skipjack fished in the western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) by Taiwanese flagged vessels and managed by WCPFC (high seas).
- Eastern Pacific skipjack fished in the eastern Pacific Ocean (WCPO) by Taiwanese flagged vessels and managed by IATTC (high seas).

*Table 1 - UoAs considered for this FIP*

Species	Gear Type	Stock	Flag
Albacore	Longline	North Pacific	Taiwan
Albacore	Longline	South Pacific	Taiwan
Bigeye	Longline	Western and Central Pacific	Taiwan
Bigeye	Longline	Eastern Pacific	Taiwan
Yellowfin	Longline	Western and Central Pacific	Taiwan
Yellowfin	Longline	Eastern	Taiwan
Skipjack	Longline	Western and Central Pacific	Taiwan
Skipjack	Longline	Eastern	Taiwan

#### **Overview of Preassessment Addendum Results**

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

For Principle 1, the addendum to the pre-assessment considered skipjack which predicted scores of passes for both stocks with two conditional passes regarding PI 1.2.1 - Harvest Strategy and 1.2.2 - HCR and Tools. In general, the key strengths of the skipjack fishery are that regular assessments of target tuna and tuna-like species are conducted. Therefore, the status of the stocks is known and regularly monitored. The key weaknesses in the skipjack fishery are that skipjack tuna are difficult to assess because of their high and variable productivity. Timely submissions and data accuracy from some member countries is a problem which mainly contributes to the significant uncertainties in the stock assessment results. In conclusion, there are several PIs in this assessment that would likely receive conditions on an MSC full assessment.

Along with this for Principle 1, in 2020 a benchmark assessment for EPO yellowfin was conducted that served as basis for a risk analysis of stock status relative to recruitment impairment. This benchmark assessment allows EPO yellowfin to meet SG  $\geq 80$  for PIs 1.1.1, 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 (updated scores from SG 60-79 to SG  $\geq 80$ ). This means that the original workplan action 1.1: Stock Status and Rebuilding for EPO Yellowfin Tuna can be deemed complete for now.

## Introduction to FIP Workplan

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

This workplan includes:

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

## Principle 1: Sustainability of fish stocks

Action Number and Name	<b>1.1 – Stock Status and Rebuilding for EPO Bigeye</b>
Action Goal	There is evidence of stock rebuilding within a specified timeframe and fishing mortality is reduced to achieve MSY.
Action Description	<p>This action has two goals associated with it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sla – Having a rebuilding timeframe is specified for the EPO bigeye 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 the stock, 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>Both require large levels of advocacy to the IATTC and flag state to conduct rebuilding scenarios and build robust, comprehensive rebuilding strategies to enable fishing to be at MSY levels.</p>
Expected Completion Date	January 2025
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: US\$ 8,000 for time collecting advocacy and developing positions, to lobby the IATTC and WCPFC. Expenses to attend WCPFC and IATTC meetings estimated at a further \$6,000 per year.</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: As per year 1</p>
Responsible Parties	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC, Flag state
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	1.1.1, 1.1.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.1a: Lobbying IATTC and flag state to conduct re-building scenarios. Independent scientific assistance to support the IATTC in developing EPO BET re-building scenarios.	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC	Flag state, NGOs, FIP co-ordinator	May 2020		
1.1b: Lobbying IATTC and flag state for robust, comprehensive EPO BET rebuilding strategy developed to enable fishing to be at MSY levels.	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC	Flag state, NGOs, FIP co-ordinator	April 2020		
1.1c: Lobbying IATTC and flag state to adopt the above rebuilding strategy.	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC	Flag state, NGOs, FIP co-ordinator	March 2021		
1.1d: Re-evaluation of the re-building plan at end of Yr. 3. Short-term technical assistance to the IATTC. Fishing mortality ( $F$ ) is $< F_{MSY}$	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC	Flag state, NGOs, FIP co-ordinator	January 2022		
1.1e: Review Stock status relative to reference points annually	FIP co-ordinator	IATTC	March 2021		

Action Number and Name	<b>1.2 - Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for all four tuna species</b>
Action Goal	There is a robust and precautionary harvest strategy in place
Action Description	<p>The fishery should detail how the performance of the harvest strategy is currently monitored, reviews and where necessary amended in response to the state of the stock. A harvest strategy can then be developed from this review.</p> <p>This action has two tasks associated with it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To address S1a, explicit harvest strategies for tuna are to be designed.</li> <li>2. To address S1b, a formal evaluation procedure for the harvest strategies is to be put in place for tuna.</li> </ol>
Expected Completion Date	January 2024
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: There will be costs involved in this action related to coordinating and holding meetings. Further, it will be necessary to create related FIP white papers and engagement strategies. A budget of US\$ 3,000 per flag per year is estimated in order to cover the necessary fees and expenses involved in undertaking this activity. Plus US\$ 3,000 for expenses</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>
Responsible Parties	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, RFMOs, Flag state
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	1.2.1

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results

1.2a: Monitor and report on the WCPFC workplan for the adoption of HCRs and monitor and report on, and if appropriate to participate with, existing advocacy activities such as the NGO Tuna Forum.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, NGOs	April 2020		
1.2b: Engage with RFMO scientists and CCM delegations to advocate for Management Strategy Options (MSEs) for controlling YFT, BET, SKJ tuna harvest developed.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, NGOs	April 2020		
1.2c: Hold meetings with delegation members with the following purpose:  i. Proposing practical ways that the governments could support the process, e.g. via liaison to support capacity-building with Flag state, or other activities. Reporting regularly to the delegations so that they are kept informed of current ideas and proposals at RFMO and within Flag state where the industry partners have links.  ii. Request that delegates support HS at RFMO meetings.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, NGOs	April 2020		
1.2d: RFMO briefing Document on Harvest Strategies (2020). Prior to RFMO plenary 2020 produce a formal briefing document regarding the status of the harvest strategy / stock rebuilding for each stock, the objective of RFMO, the position of key players and likely upcoming proposals, and the outcome preferred by the FIP, to brief the governments and other stakeholders.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, NGOs	April 2020		
1.2e: Position paper for a harvest control strategy and HCRs. Prepare a position paper to submit to plenary in support of making significant progress in developing a harvest strategy and control rules for all four species. 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 co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, NGOs	August 2020		
1.2f: Promote best practice for harvest strategy and stock rebuilding. 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 co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, NGOs	August 2020		
1.2g: Continue to advocate for progression of harvest strategy development. Intersessional discussions to progress the harvest strategies between like-minded RFMO members and organisations, and formally at the relevant RFMO meetings.	FIP co-ordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, NGOs	November 2020		



Action Number and Name	<b>1.3 – Develop Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for tuna</b>
Action Goal	There are well-defined and effective HCRs in place for all stocks of tuna
Action Description	<p>The seasonal closure is likely to be sufficient to control the exploitation rate to ensure that the PRI is not reached, meeting SG60 for S1c. However, it cannot be argued to be likely to achieve the exploitation rates set out in the HCR (i.e. the reference points). If there is a stock recruitment relationship, which is a common assumption in many other tuna stock assessments, then effort would have to be reduced significantly.</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 we 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.</p> <p>This action has two tasks associated with it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To address S1b, HCRs are determined to be robust to main uncertainties for bigeye.</li> <li>2. To address S1c, HCR tools are determined to be effective in achieving the exploitation levels under the HCRs for bigeye and yellowfin.</li> </ol>
Expected Completion Date	January 2025
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: An estimate of US\$ 6,000 to pay for associated fees and an additional \$3,000 in expenses should be budgeted to complete the year one tasks for this action.</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 3,000</p> <p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 3,000</p> <p>Year 5: No associated costs</p>
Responsible Parties	RFMOs, Flag state
MSC PIs Addressed by the Action	1.2.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
1.3a: Building regional consensus on the need for robust HCRs. Intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded IATTC members and organisations and formally at meetings at each IATTC meeting.  Options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing YFT and BET tuna harvest developed.	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	December 2020		
1.3b: Ensure a holistic implementation HCR development. Monitor work plan development for the implementation of Res. C-17-02 (or other proposal for a harvest strategy) (see action 1.2) to ensure the development, evaluation, and agreement of a HCR for the three species, alongside the development of the tools required for implementation.  Options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing YFT and BET tuna harvest developed.	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	December 2020		
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 species that meet the objective of action 3 for submission to the IATTC. Will include an evaluation of current (candidate) HCRs and tools for their effectiveness, and the main uncertainties identified and considered.  Options for harvest control rules (HCRs) and tools for managing ALB, YFT and BET tuna harvest developed.	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	December 2020		
1.3d: On-going engagement with Flag state and IATTC 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 IATTC meeting process. To include Intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded IATTC members and organisations and formally at meetings at each IATTC meeting.	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	December 2021		

HCR options considered and discussed inter-sessionally and formally though IATTC meeting processes. IATTC record reflect discussions and progress.  The main uncertainties for different HCR options are identified.					
1.3e: Independent evaluation of HCR robustness and effectiveness. Conduct further study to evaluate progress made in developing HCRs, focussing on their potential effectiveness in reducing exploitation levels when required, and their ability to account for uncertainties that might affect their implementation.  HCRs for all three species discussed and agreed within IATTC and formally adopted as part of the harvest strategy implementation approach.  The main uncertainties are considered and discussed inter-sessionally and formally though IATTC meeting processes. IATTC records reflect discussions and progress.	FIP Coordinator, FIP Participants, IATTC and WCPFC	Flag state, fishery, FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	June 2024		

## Principle 2: Minimising environmental impacts

Action Number and Name	<b>2.1 – ETP Species Outcome, Management and Information</b>
Action Goal	Ensure that all ETP species interacted with are taken into account and the fishery causes minimal harm to ETP species.
Action Description	<p>Due to the uncertainties highlighted in the pre-assessment and the needs of the FIP, one of the initial and immediate tasks is to obtain UoA logbook and observer data. This will be the first step to give an accurate score for ETP PIs. The data will be collected in coordination with the vessel owners and authorities. The data will be used to build a robust picture of the fishing mortality as well as species interactions and on which to base FIP activities related to attaining the MSC Standard. Should any additional data collection needs be identified then solutions to these (for example via EM) will be recommended and also subsequently added to the workplan.</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 even more so on the high seas (although it should be noted that some flag state are well-above the minimum 5% observer coverage for longline fleets, for example Fiji with 40% of fleet trips observed and American Samoa with 20% of the same). At best there will be information adequate to support measure to manage ETP species, but no higher score can be awarded, especially without fishery-specific data for this assessment.</p>
Expected Completion Date	March 2025
Priority	High
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: The initial task of collecting and reviewing logbook and observer data is estimated to be US\$ 5,000 per flag state over the course of the first few months of the FIP. A brief report explaining the findings will be created and shared with the FIP Participants highlighting gaps and recommending changes to the FIP documents as well as amended improvement actions. A budget of \$7,000 is recommended for this review to be undertaken.</p> <p>Year 2: Further data analysis will need to be conducted in Year 2 around ETP species interaction and a budget of US\$ 7,000 is recommended.</p> <p>Year 3: Subsequently a budget of US\$ 5,000 is recommended per year to update and review data.</p> <p>Year 4: Same as year 3</p> <p>Year 5: Same as year 3</p>

<b>Responsible Parties</b>	Fishery, FIP coordinator, Fisheries consultant
<b>MSC PIs Addressed by the Action</b>	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
2.1a: Collect fishery specific data from fisheries and states and analyse this to better understand the impacts on ETP species and any evidence that the measures are being implemented or reviewed.  Collect and provide catch, discard and interaction data relating to the Fishery UoA. The data should be sufficient to determine performance against all relevant PIs including ETP and others such as P3 catch locations.	FIP co-ordinator	Flag state, fishery	April 2020		
2.1b: Use this information to build an ETP species management plan, including materials for on board vessels on best practices and buy any equipment needed, go to consultation if necessary.	FIP co-ordinator	NGO, fishery	September 2020		
2.1c: Collect evidence from FIP participants that shark finning is not taking place and validate the public shark finning policies.	FIP co-ordinator	NGO, fishery	May 2020		
2.1d: Deliver skipper training to teach best practices, safe handling and release, species identification and other elements consistent with ISSF guidance.	FIP co-ordinator	Fishery	September 2020		
2.1e: Engage with RFMOs and flag state regarding improving the management of ETP species.	FIP co-ordinator	RFMO, Flag state	September 2020		
2.1f: Enhance scientific observer coverage of FIP participants through engaging with the human observer schemes or Electronic Monitoring. The aim is to ensure a representative sample of catch, discard and species interaction data is collected, reviewed and shared with relevant fishery authorities.  The first milestone for this task is completion of an analysis of FIP vessels relating to human and electronic observers. This report should recommend	FIP co-ordinator, FIP participants	RFMO, Flag state, fishery	September 2020		

scientifically robust levels of human and electronic observer coverage and review and include associated costs. Subsequent milestones for this task will be defined once the analysis has been carried out. They should include target levels of observer coverage and review across the fleets.					
2.2g: If necessary, carry out an Ecosystem Risk Assessment to determine if the fishery is making negative direct and indirect impacts and if so how to address them	FIP co-ordinator	External Fisheries Consultant	March 2021		
2.2h: Develop monitoring programmes to address any data gaps concerning ETP species.	FIP co-ordinator	Flag state, fishery	January 2021		

## Principle 3: Effective management

Action Number and Name	<b>3.1 Decision-making processes for Taiwan</b>
Action Goal	<p>Decision-making processes for Taiwan 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 (S1b).</p> <p>Due primarily to limited information on the management process, we are unable to determine if the precautionary approach is to be applied in this fishery.</p> <p>For S1d, again the remote nature of this assessment meant it could not be determined whether information on the fishery's performance is available upon request and the management system is attempting to comply in a timely manner with judicial decisions. SG60 was not met for S1d.</p>
Action Description	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.
Expected Completion Date	March 2024
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: US\$ 3,000 plus expenses if in-person meeting is necessary</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 3,000 plus expenses if in-person meeting is necessary</p> <p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 1,000</p> <p>Year 5: No associated costs</p>
Responsible Parties	FIP Coordinator, National management bodies.
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.2.2

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results

<p>3.1a: Conduct review of the decision-making processes in Taiwan to fully understand gaps identified in pre-assessment. The reviews should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the process transparent, timely &amp; evidence-based?</li> <li>2. Does 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. 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 should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant		April 2020		
<p>3.1b: 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"> <li>1. Included (from research, monitoring, evaluation and consultation).</li> <li>2. Stakeholders consulted.</li> <li>3. Utilised from 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 relevant recommendations emerging from research, monitoring evaluation and review activity).</li> <li>5. Process for addressing legal challenges if necessary.</li> <li>6. Precautionary approach in management plan.</li> </ol>	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2021		
<p>3.1c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to incorporate above into decision-making processes. Multiple consultations may need to be held.</p>	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	December 2021		

3.1d: Implement the decision-making process, ensuring stakeholder are consulted and informed (for example via email, website, formal report etc.) best-available information (from RFMOs, research etc.) and the precautionary approach are included.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2023		
3.1e: Review the efficacy of the decision-making process.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	January 2024		

Action Number and Name	<b>3.2 Compliance and enforcement for Taiwan</b>
Action Goal	Have sufficient evidence to conclude that sanctions are consistently applied and provide an effective deterrence.
Action Description	Based on the information available, sanctions to deal with non-compliance exist and there is some evidence that they are applied, SG60 requirements are therefore met. However, there is not sufficient evidence to conclude they are consistently applied and provide an effective deterrence. The FIP will need to provide this evidence and if lacking work with authorities to improve enforcement.
Expected Completion Date	January 2025
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: Costs for the first year are estimated to be higher than later years in order to carry out the analysis for the country. Subsequent follow-ups and advocacy costs in later years should be lower. Budget for year one is estimated to be US\$ 3,000.</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 1,000</p> <p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 2,000 (performance review)</p> <p>Year 5: US\$ 1,000</p>
Responsible Parties	National management bodies.
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.2.3

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
<p>3.2a: 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> </ol>	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant	Fishery	April 2020		

<p>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> <p>A report should be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.</p>					
3.2b: Develop plan to combat the gaps identified in the national MCS systems based on findings of report in.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2021		
3.2c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to discuss implementation and potential adjustments to plan. Meeting minutes should be produced after each consultation to allow topics, actions, opinions, difficulties and progress to be recorded and monitored for all affected parties.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	December 2021		
3.2d: Implement finalised plan where necessary, allocating the necessary resources to ensure successful employment of improved MCS system.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2023		
3.2e: 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 (i.e. 9c).	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	FIP co-ordinator, NGOs	March 2024		

Action Number and Name	<b>3.3 Monitoring and management performance evaluation for Taiwan</b>
Action Goal	The fishery-specific management system of Taiwan is subject to regular internal and occasional external review.
Action Description	<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 SlA.</p> <p>There is no evidence of any external reviews, which is not to say that there haven't been any. In the absence of information SG80 cannot be met for SlB. 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 (SlB).</p>
Expected Completion Date	December 2024
Priority	Medium
Estimated Cost	<p>Year 1: US\$ 3,000</p> <p>Year 2: US\$ 1,000</p> <p>Year 3: No associated costs</p> <p>Year 4: US\$ 1,000</p> <p>Year 5: No associated costs</p>
Responsible Parties	National management bodies.
MSC PI Addressed by the Action	3.2.4

Tasks/ Milestones	Responsible (lead)	Responsible (supporting role)	Starting date	Actual completion date	Evidence of completion / results
3.3a: Review fishery-specific management processes currently in place. Ascertain whether these systems are subject to internal and/or external review, the format, the areas already reviewed (tuna management plan,	FIP co-ordinator/ FIP consultant		April 2020		

performance, decision-making, MCS, compliance to RFMO/international regulations etc.) and the frequency to which these occur.  A report will be produced for relevant and interested stakeholders and should detail the findings and identify the gaps.					
3.3b: Develop plan to combat the gaps identified in the national fishery-specific systems based on findings of report.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP co-ordinator	March 2021		
3.3c: Hold consultations with relevant stakeholders to discuss implementation and potential adjustments to plan. Meeting minutes should be produced after each consultation to allow topics, actions, opinions, difficulties and progress to be recorded and monitored for all affect parties.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP co-ordinator	December 2021		
3.3d: Implement finalised plan with binding commitment and requirements to undertake reviews where necessary, allocating the necessary resources to ensure regular internal and occasional external reviews from relevant bodies.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP co-ordinator	March 2023		
3.3e: Review effectiveness of review system implemented and adjust where necessary. A report should be produced and supplied to stakeholders and consultations re-opened if necessary.	Ministries/ FIP consultant/ fishery	Other national bodies/ agencies, FIP co-ordinator	March 2024		



## Additional Impacts

Some FIPs include objectives that go beyond the MSC PIs.

## Social impacts

As social issues become a larger issue within the fishery world, we view FIPs should take a holistic approach and include social elements. This additional impact can be seen below:

<b>Addition Impact Title</b>	Labour Rights
<b>Status Summary</b>	Currently labour conditions are unknown, an additional fact finding operation will take place to better understand any possible issues and how we could resolve them.
<b>Improvement Recommendation</b>	Await results from the fact finding to better understand improvements needed. Implement work to ensure compliance such as grievance procedures in place etc.

## Actions By Priority

**Table 1 - High Priority actions for the Fue Shin Fishery (FSF) Longline Tuna Fishery**

Action Number and Name	Priority	PI Addressed
2.1 ETP Species Outcome, Management and Information	High	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3

**Table 2 – Medium Priority actions for the Fue Shin Fishery (FSF) Longline Tuna Fishery**

Action Number and Name	Priority	PI Addressed
1.1 Stock Status and Rebuilding for EPO Bigeye	High	1.1.1, 1.1.2
1.2 Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for all four tuna species	Medium	1.2.1
1.3 Develop Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for tuna	Medium	1.2.2
3.1 Decision-making processes for Taiwan	Medium	3.2.2
3.2 Compliance and enforcement for Taiwan	Medium	3.2.3
3.3 Monitoring and management performance evaluation for Taiwan	Medium	3.2.4

## Budget

The below table lays out the budget as suggested in this workplan. 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 3 - Budget for the Pacific Longline (Fue Shin) fishery**

Action Number and Name		Year 1 (US\$)	Year 2 (US\$)	Year 3 (US\$)	Year 4 (US\$)	Year 5 (US\$)	Total (US\$)
<i>FIP Coordination</i>		31,200	32,136	33,100	25,000	25,750	<b>147,186</b>
1.1	Stock Status and Rebuilding for EPO Bigeye	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	<b>70,000</b>
1.2	Develop a well-managed harvest strategy for all four tuna species	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	<b>30,000</b>
1.3	Develop Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for tuna	9,000	3,000	0	3,000	0	<b>15,000</b>
2.1	ETP Species Outcome, Management and Information	7,000	7,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	<b>29,000</b>
3.1	Decision-making processes for Taiwan	3,000	3,000	0	1,000	0	<b>7,000</b>
3.2	Compliance and enforcement for Taiwan	3,000	1,000	0	2,000	1,000	<b>7,000</b>
3.3	Monitoring and management performance evaluation for Taiwan	3,000	1,000	0	1,000	0	<b>5,000</b>
<b>Total (US\$)</b>		<b>76,200</b>	<b>67,136</b>	<b>58,100</b>	<b>57,000</b>	<b>51,750</b>	<b>310,186</b>

## Glossary

**Pre-assessment:** A pre-assessment is a preliminary evaluation of a fishery against all MSC performance indicators to provide a picture of the fishery's baseline environmental performance and challenges. A pre-assessment allows a fishery to identify any areas that need to be improved to reach an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. A pre-assessment must be completed by someone experienced with applying the MSC standard (e.g., is a [registered MSC technical consultant](#) or [accredited auditing body](#)).

**Basic FIP:** A fishery improvement project with time bound objectives for addressing a specific set of the fishery's environmental challenges to improve its performance against the MSC standard. Basic FIPs complete a needs assessment to understand the challenges in the fishery.

**Comprehensive FIP:** A fishery improvement project with time bound objectives for addressing all of the fishery's environmental challenges necessary to achieve a level of performance consistent with an unconditional pass of the MSC standard. Comprehensive FIPs engage a party experienced with applying the MSC standard to complete an MSC pre-assessment to understand the challenges in the fishery and must have independent, in-person audits of progress against the MSC standard every three years.

**Performance indicator:** A performance indicator evaluates the success of a particular activity when compare against desired goals. In the case of FIPs that follow the MSC Standard, it measures the impact of the action in place against desired conditions or results.

## Appendix A – Scoring of the Pacific Ocean tuna – longline (Fue Shin) fishery

**Table 4 - Principle 1 list of scoring for WCPO and EPO longline fisheries for albacore, bigeye, yellowfin and skipjack tuna**

Component	PI	Performance Indicator	WCPO BET	WCPO YFT	EPO BET	EPO YFT	SP ALB	NP ALB	WCPO SKJ	EPO SKJ
<b>Outcome</b>	1.1.1	Stock Status				*				
	1.1.2	Stock Rebuilding	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Management</b>	1.2.1	Harvest Strategy				*				
	1.2.2	HCR and Tools				*				
	1.2.3	Information and Monitoring								
	1.2.4	Assessment of Stock Status				*				

\*Note for this addendum EPO YFT PIs 1.1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2 and 1.2.4 have changed scores from SG60-79 to SG  $\geq 80$ .

### Key

Pass without conditions	
Pass with conditions	
Fail	

N/A – Not Applicable

**Table 5 - Principle 2 list of scoring WCPO and EPO longline fisheries**

Principle 2 – Minimising Environmental Impacts			WCPO	EPO
Primary Species	2.1.1	Outcome		
	2.1.2	Management		
	2.1.3	Information		
Secondary Species	2.2.1	Outcome		
	2.2.2	Management		
	2.2.3	Information		
ETP Species	2.3.1	Outcome		
	2.3.2	Management		
	2.3.3	Information		
Habitats	2.4.1	Outcome		
	2.4.2	Management		
	2.4.3	Information		
Ecosystem	2.5.1	Outcome		
	2.5.2	Management		
	2.5.3	Information		

**Table 6 - Principle 3 list of scoring flag states involved in the fishery**

Principle 3 – Effective Management			WCPFC	IATTC	Taiwan
Governance and Policy	3.1.1	Legal and Customary Framework			
	3.1.2	Consultation, Roles & Responsibilities			
	3.1.3	Long Term Objectives			
Fishery Specific Management System	3.2.1	Fishery Specific Objectives			N/A
	3.2.2	Decision Making Process			
	3.2.3	Compliance and Enforcement			
	3.2.4	Management Performance Evaluation			