

Summary of actions

Annual review - May 2023

Author: Key Traceability

This annual review concerns the [Western Central Pacific Ocean tuna – purse seine \(Kiribati Fish Limited\) FIP](#). The fishery targets skipjack (*Katsuwonus pelamis*), yellowfin (*Thunnus albacares*) and bigeye tuna (*Thunnus obesus*) through free-school and FAD-associated purse seine sets. The original fleet of 15 purse seine vessels are flagged to China and Nauru and operate mainly in the Kiribati EEZ, other PNA countries’ EEZs, and potentially the high seas. With this update, 3 vessels flagged to Kiribati are joining the FIP.

The fishery is managed regionally by the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC).

In summary, this annual update includes:

The FIP advocated for the adoption of a harvest strategy for skipjack and interim TRPs for yellowfin and bigeye tuna. These position statements were sent to the various flag states.

Regarding bigeye and yellowfin tuna in the WCPO, a limit reference point has been agreed upon, but TRPs are yet to be set. The current workplan aims to establish management procedures by 2024/2025. Pending the agreement on TRPs, interim measures require the maintenance of spawning biomass at or above the average of 2012-2015. The harvest control rules for these species are still under development.

For skipjack tuna in the WCPO, a limit reference point has been agreed upon, and an interim management procedure has been established. The PI score for WCPO skipjack has increased from 60-79 to >80.

Observer data from 10 vessels is available. There are no main secondary species, and minor species are assessed at the 100 level. The FIP has implemented an updated FAD policy that requires non-entangling FADs to be deployed immediately. Skippers will receive training on these changes, and the FIP will work on FAD recovery and engagement with other FIPs. Compliance monitoring schemes have been developed by the WCPFC, leading to increased scoring in that area.

The FIP also sent position statements to flag states advocating for improved FAD management, including the transition to FADs without nets and made from biodegradable materials.

1 – Promote the development of a well-managed harvest strategy for all three tuna species by the WCPFC
<i>1a: 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.</i>
<i>1b: Engage with WCPFC scientists and CCM delegations to advocate for Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) options for controlling SKJ, YFT and BET tuna harvest developed.</i>
<i>1c: Hold meetings with delegation members with the following purpose: I. Continuing to emphasise the importance of the harvest strategy and harvest control rule process to the FIP industry partners and other fisheries in the western and central Pacific.</i>
<i>1d: WCPFC briefing document on Harvest Strategies (2020). Prior to WCPFC plenary 2020 produce a formal briefing document regarding the status of the current harvest strategy, the objective of WCPFC, the position of key players and likely upcoming proposal.</i>
<i>1e: Position paper for a harvest 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 three species.</i>

1f: Promote best practice for harvest strategy. Promote through the governments a process of consultation to inform WCPFC members about best practice for harvest strategy and stock rebuilding, to build consensus towards support of proposals of management.

1g: Continue to advocate for progression of harvest strategy and MSE development. Intersessional discussions to progress the harvest strategies between like-minded WCPFC members and organisations, and formally at the relevant WCPFC meetings.

Update as of August 2020

Due to COVID 19, progress of the FIP and these actions have not been possible. Therefore, all timelines have been delayed until the global pandemic has eased and the pressures on fisheries have subsided.

Update as of February 2021

As a FIP we provided advocacy letters to all FIP flag states ahead of the WCPFC meeting detailing our requirements and needs for the RFMO. We are grateful for those that enabled us to attend the remote WCPFC meeting that took place this December (2020).

Evidence:

- *RFMO Position Statements*

Update as of August 2021

As a FIP we provided advocacy letters to all FIP flag states ahead of the WCPFC meeting detailing our requirements and needs for the RFMO. We shall be sending more and attending the annual meeting in December 2021.

Evidence:

- *NA*

Update as of February 2022

Work progressed on stage 3 results in the form of position statements (workplan action 1b, 1e, 1f and 1g) to flag states and the FIP coordinator attending the 18 Regular Session of the WCPFC to monitor the WCPFC workplan for the adoption of HCRs (workplan action 1a). From the position statements distributed to the flag states, the FIP is appreciative to have seen a response and acknowledgement of shared positions from the CEO of Nauru Fisheries and Marine Resources Authority, Mr. Charleston Debye.

As in previous years, we are grateful for those that enabled us to attend the remote WCPFC meeting.

Evidence:

- *RFMO position statements to flag states (China and Nauru)*

Update as of August 2022

The FIP coordinator was present during the WCPFC 18th Regular Session of the Scientific Committee to keep informed on the progression of multiple issues, including the development of harvest strategies, harvest control rules, and stock assessments, which will inform the FIPs position statement ahead of the WCPFC annual meeting later in the year.

Along with this, the FIP coordinator was present during the WCPFC Harvest Strategy Capacity Building Seminars (1 and 2). Being present at these meetings allows for understanding if the FIPs advocacy is in line with others and if the targets are being met with the FIP workplan timelines.

As this update does not coincide with the WCPFC annual meeting, the FIP will provide evidence during the next update in Feb 2023 of its position statement.

Evidence:

- WCPFC 18th Regular Session of the Scientific Committee – Agenda
- WCPFC Harvest Strategy Capacity Building Seminar 1 and 2 – Agenda

Update as of May 2023

The FIP provided advocacy letters to all flag states ahead of the WCPFC annual meeting detailing our asks from the RFMO, including adoption of a harvest strategy for skipjack and Northern albacore and adoption of interim TRPs for yellowfin and bigeye tuna.

RFMO documents subsequent to the meeting can be found here - <https://meetings.wcpfc.int/node/16862>

WCPO BET

There are a series of measures that can be seen together as a harvest strategy and it is expected these will achieve management objectives given stocks are currently above limit points (achieving SG 60). It does not reach SG80 as the elements of the harvest strategy do not yet work fully together in being responsive to the stock. WCPFC has developed a conservation and management measure (CMM 2022-03) which requires the development of harvest strategies for key stocks (including big-eye tuna and yellowfin). While a Limit Reference Point (LRP) of 20% of spawning biomass has been agreed in principle along with 20% maximum acceptable risk of breaching LRP; Target Reference Points (TRP) have not yet been agreed but the current indicative workplan sets a target of 2024/5. In the meantime, the interim Conservation and Management Measures CMM 2021-01, states that pending agreement on TRPs, the spawning biomass should be maintained at or above average 2012-2015. Within CMM 2021-01 there are also a range of management measures for purse seine vessels including: effort and FAD controls, requirements to land all tuna, and have 100% observers coverage (SG 60).

The harvest strategy is likely to work based on stock status indicators although this needs to be reviewed in 2023 (SG60-80) .

Stock assessments take place every three years and therefore monitoring is in place to determine if the harvest strategy is working (SG 60).

There is no formal harvest strategy that is periodically reviewed and updated (does not achieve SG100).

WCPO yellowfin

The same rationale for bigeye tuna applies to yellowfin tuna.

WCPO skipjack tuna

WCPFC19 adopted CMM 2022-01 Conservation and Management Measure on a Management Procedure for WCPO Skipjack Tuna. (attachment G). This has increased the scoring of PI 1.2.1 WCPO skipjack from 60-79 to >80.

Evidence:

- WCPFC Annual Plenary Meeting Position Statement Nov2022 China
- WCPFC Annual Plenary Meeting Position Statement Nov2022 Nauru
- WCPFC Annual Plenary Meeting Position Statement Nov2022 Kiribati Fish Limited
- <https://meetings.wcpfc.int/node/16862>
- Kiribati Three-year evaluation

<p>2 – Promote the development of Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) and tools for bigeye and yellowfin tuna by the WCPFC</p>
<p><i>2a: Building consensus on the need for robust HCRs. Intersessional discussions on HCRs and tools between like-minded WCPFC members and organisations and formally at meetings at each WCPFC meeting.</i></p>
<p><i>2b: 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 IPG 1.2) to ensure the development, evaluation, and agreement of an HCR for the three</i></p>
<p><i>2c: If necessary, provide an independent paper on the scope and needs of HCRs. Conduct a study to identify candidate HCRs and tools for BET and YFT (candidate HCRs already tested for SKJ) that meet the objective of IPG 3 for submission to the WCPFC.</i></p>
<p><i>2d: On-going engagement with Coastal states and WCPFC over HCR development. Discussions held with like-minded WCPFC members and organisations regarding the assessment of HCRs and tools for all stocks</i></p>
<p><i>2e: 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</i></p>
<p>Update as of August 2020 Due to COVID 19, progress of the FIP and these actions have not been possible. Therefore, all timelines have been delayed until the global pandemic has eased and the pressures on fisheries have subsided.</p>
<p>Update as of February 2021 As a FIP we provided advocacy letters to all FIP flag states ahead of the WCPFC meeting detailing our requirements and needs for the RFMO. We are grateful for those that enabled us to attend the remote WCPFC meeting that took place this December.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>RFMO Position Statements</i>
<p>Update as of August 2021 As a FIP we provided advocacy letters to all FIP flag states ahead of the WCPFC meeting detailing our requirements and needs for the RFMO. We shall be sending more and attending the annual meeting in December 2021.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>NA</i>
<p>Update as of February 2022</p> <p>Related to action 1, work progressed on stage 3 results in the form of position statements (workplan action 2a and 2b) to flag states and the FIP coordinator attending the 18 Regular Session of the WCPFC to monitor the WCPFC workplan for the adoption of HCRs and tools (workplan action 2a and 2b). From the position statements distributed to the flag states, the FIP is appreciative to have seen a response and acknowledgement of shared positions from the CEO of Nauru Fisheries and Marine Resources Authority, Mr. Charleston Deiye.</p> <p>As in previous years, we are grateful for those that enabled us to attend the remote WCPFC meeting.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>RFMO position statements to flag states (China and Nauru)</i>
<p>Update as of August 2022</p> <p>The FIP coordinator was present during the WCPFC 18th Regular Session of the Scientific Committee to keep informed on the progression of multiple issues, including the development of harvest strategies, harvest control rules, and stock assessments, which will inform the FIPs position statement ahead of the WCPFC annual meeting later in the year.</p>

Along with this, the FIP coordinator was present during the WCPFC Harvest Strategy Capacity Building Seminars (1 and 2). Being present at these meetings allows for understanding if the FIPs advocacy is in line with others and if the targets are being met with the FIP workplan timelines.

As this update does not coincide with the WCPFC annual meeting, the FIP will provide evidence during the next update in Feb 2023 of its position statement.

Evidence:

- WCPFC 18th Regular Session of the Scientific Committee – Agenda
- WCPFC Harvest Strategy Capacity Building Seminar 1 and 2 – Agenda

Update as of May 2023

The FIP provided advocacy letters to all flag states ahead of the WCPFC annual meeting detailing our asks from the RFMO, including the adoption of a harvest strategy for skipjack and Northern albacore and the adoption of interim TRPs for yellowfin and bigeye tuna.

RFMO documents subsequent to the meeting can be found here - <https://meetings.wcpfc.int/node/16862>

WCPO bigeye and yellowfin tuna

A limit reference point has been agreed in principle. Target Reference Points (TRP) have not yet been set although the current workplan requires management procedures by 2024/2025. In the meantime, an evaluation of candidate approaches to setting TRPs for bigeye and yellowfin tuna have been presented at the annual WCPFC Commission meeting (WCPFC, 2022: WCPFC-19-2022-12). Pending agreement on TRPs, the interim Conservation and Management Measures CMM 2021-01 states that the spawning biomass should be maintained at or above average 2012-2015. Harvest Control Rules are therefore available that are expected to reduce the exploitation rate as the point of PRI approaches but are not well defined or in place (SG60).

The harvest control rules have not been finalized, but the analysis on candidate target reference points provides some evidence of the main uncertainties

WCPO skipjack tuna

A limit reference point has been agreed in principle and an interim management procedure has been agreed that detailed the target reference point and harvest control rule (CMM 2022-2). Increase of PI 1.2.2 WCPO skipjack tuna from 60-79 to >80.

Evidence:

- WCPFC Annual Plenary Meeting Position Statement Nov2022 China
- WCPFC Annual Plenary Meeting Position Statement Nov2022 Nauru
- WCPFC Annual Plenary Meeting Position Statement Nov2022 Kiribati Fish Limited
- <https://meetings.wcpfc.int/node/16862>
- Kiribati Three-year evaluation

<p>3 – Data collection, review and analysis relating to the FIP vessels (UoA)</p>
<p><i>3a: 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, FAD management and others such as P3 catch locations.</i></p>
<p>Update as of August 2020 Due to COVID 19, progress of the FIP and these actions have not been possible. Therefore, all timelines have been delayed until the global pandemic has eased and the pressures on fisheries have subsided.</p>
<p>Update as of February 2021 We have provided catch data templates to the fishery to collect fishery specific data. We are currently awaiting these to be compiled and returned.</p> <p>FAD questionnaires have been completed and we have received sufficient information including the Kiribas FAD management plan to help us understand FAD use and management already in the fishery.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NA
<p>Update as of August 2021 Fishery dependant data has been collected and compiled to build a solid view and understanding of the fishery. All vessels are listed on the ISSF PVR and comply with the new CMMS regarding public FAD management policies.</p> <p>Due to problems out of the FIPs control, obtaining independent fishery data is now proving to be a challenge and we shall continue to try our best to obtain data. The vessel list is changing and a new one being created; this will enable us to push again to obtain all necessary observer data.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NA
<p>Update as of February 2022 Since the last update in August 2021, the vessel list has been finalised to 10 vessels, 8 flagged to China and 2 flagged to Nauru. Currently the FIP is still trying to obtain independent third-party observer data for these vessels to close out this workplan action.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NA
<p>Update as of August 2022 Contrary to the February 2022 update, the FIP now consists of 15 purse seine vessels, flagged to China and Nauru. All of these vessels are under charter to Kiribati Fish Limited.</p> <p>The FIP has spoken to the Ministry of Fisheries & Marine Resources Development (MFMRD) who has stated that no observer coverage is available from the end of 2019-present. The FIP is trying to obtain timelines for when observers will be onboard the vessels in the future, or if EM is a possibility for the fishery.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NA
<p>Update as of May 2023 Observer data for 10 vessels (2013-2018) is available. [1 vessel with data from 2014-2020; 2 vessels from 2015-2020; 2 vessels 2016-2020 and 5 vessels 2019-2020]. Across all datasets, Skipjack, Yellowfin and Bigeye make up 99.3% of catches. There are no main P2 species that make up more than 5% of the catch (or 2% for more vulnerable species). The minor primary species are: Blue marlin Makaira mazara (0.013%); Albacore Thunnus alalunga (0.007%); Striped Marlin Kajikia audax (0.002%) and Swordfish Xiphias gladius (<0.001%).</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kiribati three-year evaluation

<p>4 – Secondary species management</p> <p><i>4a: UoA observer data with associated Gen 3 forms obtained over at least a 3-year period and analysed for shark finning incidents. Based on the findings of this analysis, a management strategy should be implemented by the UoA to prevent shark finning</i></p> <p><i>4b: Analyse, if necessary, the need for EM in the fleet to provide third party coverage of fleet activities with regard to secondary species.</i></p> <p><i>4c: Development of a fleet-level generic bycatch reduction strategy to minimise bycatch levels, especially for associated sets. Strategy should include best practice handling procedures.</i></p> <p><i>4d: Put in place additional management measures and data collection, if required.</i></p> <p><i>4e: Review effectiveness of management strategy.</i></p> <p>Update as of August 2020 Due to COVID 19, progress of the FIP and these actions have not been possible. Therefore, all timelines have been delayed until the global pandemic has eased and the pressures on fisheries have subsided.</p> <p>Update as of February 2021 Data requests to release human observer data have been created to be sent to Nauru and China, these are currently being signed by vessel owners before the flag states can then approve them and release the data via SPC.</p> <p>The purse seine fleet has 100% human observer coverage (naturally not currently during the COVID pandemic). Therefore, no EM is required as human observer coverage is sufficient. There is still space for EM potentially to allow the human observer to spend more time carrying out additional tasks.</p> <p>We have created a shark finning policy that has been agreed upon, has been translated into Chinese and is being rolled out across the fleet.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Shark Finning Policy</i> <p>Update as of August 2021 Policies are all on vessels and being adhered to. This shall be audited when an in-person trip is possible. An ETP Management strategy has been developed which takes the policies further and uses fishery specific data. This is currently being reviewed by the fishery for additional comments.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Draft ETP Management strategy</i> <p>Update as of February 2022 The FIP has completed a stage 4 result in the form of a fishery ETP management policy and strategy that was adopted across the fleet of 10 vessels on the 1st of February 2022. This has allowed workplan action 4, task 4c to be closed out. The FIP is still actively working on obtaining observer data from the flag states in the FIP.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ETP Management Policy and Strategy</i> <p>Update as of August 2022 The border closure to Kiribati due to the Covid-19 pandemic has recently been lifted. The FIP coordinator is now scheduling a trip to Kiribati to hold a FIP stakeholder meeting, conduct vessel visits (ensure ETP management policy is being implemented, for example), and conduct ISSF best practice skipper training.</p> <p>The FIP has received evidence in the interim while a site visit is coordinated on the ETP management policy being posted on vessels.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>On board photos of ETP management policy (multiple photos)</i>

Update as of May 2023

Observer data from 10 vessels is available. There are no main Secondary species, and minor species only need to be assessed at the 100 level.

The minor secondary species that make up more than 0.01% of the total catch include: Rainbow runner (*Elagatis bipinnulata*) (0.16%); Mackerel scad (*Decapturus macarellus*) (0.06%); Ocean triggerfish (*Canthidermis maculatus*) (0.02%); Common dolphin fish (*Coryphaena hippurus*) (0.02%); Black Marlin (*Makaira indica*) (0.01%).

These stocks are not assessed, but given the low catch values it is expected that the UoA does not hinder recovery and rebuilding of minor secondary species.

The FIP has developed an updated FAD policy which requires all FADs deployed to be non-entangling, effective immediately. Skippers will attend training to ensure they understand the reasoning for these changes and agree to the best practices. The FIP will develop a FIP strategy for FAD recovery to retrieve and replace any own or foreign entangling FADs when possible and to engage with other FIPs for harmonised implementation. All vessels in the FIP will comply with ISSF Best Practices for FAD Management Plans, including the ISSF Guide for Non-Entangling FADs and be listed on the Proactive Vessel Register (PVR). The FIP will engage in trials for the adoption of a FIP Biodegradable FAD configuration with guidelines based on ISSF's recommendation.

Evidence:

- **Three-year evaluation**
- **Updated Non-entangling and Biodegradable FAD policy**

<p>5 – FAD management</p> <p><i>5a: Review current literature to understand the ‘ecological trap hypothesis’ of FADs on behaviour, feeding and migration of key elements of the ecosystem, including ETP sharks, indication of other potential impacts of FADs on key elements of the ecosystem</i></p> <p><i>5b: Define the approach to investigate the ‘ecological trap hypothesis’ of FADs on behaviour, feeding and migration of key elements of the ecosystem, including ETP species such as sharks, indication of other potential impacts of FADs on key elements</i></p> <p><i>5c: The fishery formally adopts best practice non-entangling FADs.</i></p> <p><i>5d: Species identification training for skippers is needed to improve the accuracy of fishery-dependent recordings of non-target species interacting with the fishery and make sure best practice on board is happening.</i></p> <p><i>5e: ETP species recording needs to be improved to allow cross-checking with observer data and EMS analysis to build a more accurate picture of fishery-specific impacts and identify potential ‘hot-spots’ for ETP interactions.</i></p> <p><i>5f: Define a fishery specific FAD management plan aimed at reducing the risk of derelict and impact of entangling FADs and to make sure best practice on board is happening.</i></p> <p><i>5g: Implement investigation approach as outlined in 4b</i></p> <p><i>5h: Align work with relevant e-NGOs to the fishery to test the difference in the impacts of biodegradable and traditional non-entangling FADs in selected locations.</i></p> <p><i>5i: Reach out to e-NGOs in other countries to determine the potential risk to corals from derelict FADs and entanglement of ETP species. This information will be included to the assessment, and possible additional actions shall be added at a later date.</i></p> <p><i>5j: Analyse fishery reporting on ETP species in conjunction with observer data to quantify direct effects of the fishery operations and FAD-use (entanglement). This analysis should be done annually to build an information base on the fishery.</i></p> <p><i>5k: Improve FAD management strategies at the fishery level, where necessary to fill gaps through advocacy to necessary states. Further advocate for the implementation of sustainable FAD management strategies at the RFMO level.</i></p> <p><i>5l: Implement a specific fishery FAD management plan and ensure sure best practice (covering points described in 4f).</i></p> <p><i>5m: Verify use in the fishery of non-entangling FADs through an observer programme.</i></p> <p><i>5n: Present a report that provides evidence that the collected information has been analysed with the identification of the main impacts of derelict FADs on coral reefs, and an understanding of the spatial extent and timing of the interactions</i></p> <p><i>5o: Present a report on investigation as outlined in 4b. Report will cover: (i) the potential impact of the UoAs FADs on the behaviour, feeding and migration of key elements of the ecosystem (including ETP species);</i></p> <p><i>5p: The most recent Chinese FAD management plan dates from 2013. If necessary, the FIP shall advocate to the authorities to update this document to include the latest guidelines on FAD design as well as other FAD measures.</i></p> <p>Update as of August 2020 Due to COVID 19, progress of the FIP and these actions have not been possible. Therefore, all timelines have been delayed until the global pandemic has eased and the pressures on fisheries have subsided.</p> <p>Update as of February 2021 We have created a literature review focusing on the ecological trap hypothesis of FADs to ensure the necessary actions are incorporated into the workplan.</p> <p>A non-entangling FAD policy has been created and is being implemented into the FIP fleet.</p> <p>Skipper training has been created and translated to be delivered, however, we are unable to deliver the training. We shall continue to stay on top of science and amend it as necessary.</p> <p><i>Evidence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ecological Trap Hypothesis Paper</i> • <i>Non Entangling FAD Policy</i>
--

Update as of August 2021

All vessels are listed on the ISSF PVR and comply with the new CMMS regarding public FAD management policies.

Skipper training is still yet to be delivered. All FADs are currently already using fully biodegradable and non-entangling FADs. This shall be verified through in person meetings when possible.

Evidence:

- NA

Update as of February 2022

The FIP has progress on this workplan action, particularly task 5k, advocating at the RFMO level for better FAD management strategies for the Purse Seine fishery in the WCPO.

Evidence:

- *FIP position statements to flag states for RFMO advocacy*

Update as of August 2022

The border closure to Kiribati due to the Covid-19 pandemic has recently been lifted. The FIP coordinator is now scheduling a trip to Kiribati to hold a FIP stakeholder meeting, conduct vessel visits (ensure ETP management policy is being implemented, for example), and conduct ISSF best practice skipper training.

Related to FADs and other potential marine debris that would impact marine ecosystems, the FIP has implemented a waste management policy as of August 2022. This policy is live as of August 2022 and adopted across all vessels in the FIP

Evidence:

- *FIP waste management policy*

Update as of May 2023

The FIP has developed an updated FAD policy which requires all FADs deployed to be non-entangling, effective immediately. Skippers will attend training to ensure they understand the reasoning for these changes and agree to the best practices. The FIP will develop a FIP strategy for FAD recovery to retrieve and replace any own or foreign entangling FADs when possible and to engage with other FIPs for harmonised implementation. All vessels in the FIP will comply with ISSF Best Practices for FAD Management Plans, including the ISSF Guide for Non-Entangling FADs and be listed on the Proactive Vessel Register (PVR). The FIP will engage in trials for the adoption of a FIP Biodegradable FAD configuration with guidelines based on ISSF's recommendation.

Information on ETP interaction is available from the observer data.

The FIP sent position statements to flag states ahead of the WCPFC Annual Plenary Meeting in November 2022 advocating for improved FAD management by implementing a workplan for FADs with a timeframe to transition to FADs without nets and made primarily from biodegradable materials. Develop recovery policies, a marking scheme and ownership rules and require FAD position and acoustic data.

Evidence:

- ***Updated Non-entangling and Biodegradable FAD policy***
- ***Three-year evaluation***
- ***WCPFC Annual Plenary Meeting Position Statement Nov2022 China***
- ***WCPFC Annual Plenary Meeting Position Statement Nov2022 Nauru***
- ***WCPFC Annual Plenary Meeting Position Statement Nov2022 Kiribati Fish Limited***

<p>6 – Collect evidence on the performance of Compliance and Enforcement of the fishery, develop policies where necessary</p>
<p><i>6a: Investigate and evaluate compliance and enforcement of Chinese flagged purse seiners operating on the High Seas. Collect sufficient evidence for full compliance of these vessels with Principle 3.</i></p>
<p><i>6b: Verify that the design and construction of any FAD to be deployed in or that drifts into, the WCPFC Convention Area shall comply with the non-entangling and biodegradable design currently specified in CMM 2018-01.</i></p>
<p><i>6c: If not, create and adopt a formal policy to ensure they are.</i></p>
<p><i>6d: Work with the fishery to ensure all designs are compliant and adhere to the newly implemented policy. Advocate for action by the authority where necessary.</i></p>
<p><i>6e: Annually monitor and evaluate the design and construction of new FADs.</i></p>
<p><i>6f: Confirm there is no systematic non-compliance in Kiribati and on the High seas. Advocate for action by the authority where necessary.</i></p>
<p>Update as of August 2020 Due to COVID 19, progress of the FIP and these actions have not been possible. Therefore, all timelines have been delayed until the global pandemic has eased and the pressures on fisheries have subsided.</p>
<p>Update as of February 2021 We have made large strides in working with local Chinese organisations especially the East China Sea Fisheries Research Institute in which we hope to work with to work on the necessary PIs to ensure principle 3 scores improve. We are sharing the P3 review template to ensure we have all known evidence.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P3 Review Template
<p>Update as of August 2021 Unfortunately, due to positions outside of the FIPs control, engagement with China has become difficult. We shall continue to push to engage with the Chinese authorities.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NA
<p>Update as of February 2022 Likewise, to the August 2021 update, there has been no update to this workplan or its associated tasks. The FIP is actively looking for a consultant experienced with Chinese high seas fisheries to help with this work.</p> <p><i>Evidence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NA
<p>Update as of August 2022 No consultant has been found and the FIP coordinator will conduct this assessment internally. There have been various MSC assessments with Chinese flagged vessels since the pre-assessment of this report, so it is likely PI scoring can be updated which will mean an update to this workplan action and task.</p> <p><i>Evidence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NA
<p>Update as of May 2023 For WCPFC scoring of 3.2.3 has increased from 60-79 to >80 as the WCPFC has now developed a comprehensive Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMS) – CMM 2015-07. Blacklisting of non-member vessels ((IUU) lists) has become a widespread practice among all RFMOs including the WCPFC. Sanctions to deal with non-compliance exists and there is some evidence that they are applied.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three-year evaluation