Tuesday, 21 April 2015



Intertek Fisheries Certification (IFC)

2nd annual Surveillance Report Prepared for Fiji Tuna Boat Owners Association

Certificate code: MML-F-138

Authors: Kevin McLoughlin, Jo Akroyd



Contents

General Information1
Unit/s of assessment1
Background3
Changes since last published report3
Changes to Management systems3
Changes to Relevant Regulations3
Changes to personnel involved in science, management or industry
Changes to scientific base of information - including stock assessments
Any developments or changes within the fishery which impact traceability or the ability to segregate between fish from the Unit of Certification (UoC) and fish from outside the UoC (non-certified fish)
TAC Data8
Assessment Process9
Audit Process9
Scope and history of the assessments9
Surveillance activities9
Versions used
Results
Conclusion
Summary of Findings
References
Appendix 1. Re-scoring evaluation tables (if necessary)
Appendix 2. Stakeholder submissions (if any)1
Appendix 3. Surveillance audit information (if necessary)2
Appendix 4. Additional detail on conditions/ actions/ results (if necessary)
Appendix 5. Revised Surveillance Program (if necessary)1



General Information

Name of Fishery	Fiji Albacore Tuna Longline Fishery				
Date certified	13 December 2012Date of expiry12 December 2017				
Date of surveillance audit	February 2015 (site visit 9-10 February)				

Unit/s of assessment

Species	Albacore tuna (Thunnus alalunga)
Stock Name	Western Central Pacific albacore tuna
Geographical Area	Fiji's Exclusive Economic Zone, South Pacific Ocean (NB this UoC includes Fiji archipelagic waters and Territorial Seas)
Fishing Method/s	Pelagic Longline
Management System/s	Fiji Fisheries Department, Ministry of Fisheries and Forests, and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC)
Client Group	Fiji Tuna Boat Owners Association (FTBOA)
Other Eligible Fishers	A Memorandum of Understanding has been signed with Fiji Offshore Fisheries Association (see later comments)

Surveillance level and type	Level 6		Туре	On-site	
	Any changes since PCDR report	in surveillance activity / previous surveillance	1 auditor on-site 1 auditor off-site		
Surveillance number (tick	1st Surveillar	nce			
one)	2nd Surveilla	ince		\boxtimes	
	3rd Surveilla	nce			
	4th Surveillar	nce			
	Other (exped	lited etc)			
Surveillance program change	d?				
Surveillance team	Lead assessor:		Jo Akroyd		
	Assessor(s):		Kevin McLo	bughlin	
CAB name	Intertek Fi	isheries Certificatio	on Ltd (IFC	;)	
CAB contact details	Address		10a Victory Park		
			Victory Roa	ad	
			United Kind	ndom	
				90011	



	Phone/Fax	01332 275 741
	Email	fco@intertek.com
	Contact name(s)	Paul Knapman
Client contact details	Address	Fiji Tuna Boat Owner's Association Office of the Executive Secretary PO Box 178 Suva, Fiji
	Phone/Fax	Phone: +679 331 4819 Fax: +679 999 3281
	Email	FTBOA@connect.com.fj
	Contact name(s)	Charles Hufflett



Background

Changes since last published report

Changes to Management systems

The Fiji Tuna Development and Management Plan 2014-2018 (TDMP) was officially approved and adopted by the Fiji Government in 2014. The Plan sets out a cap on the number of vessels operating in the Fiji longline fishery, a total allowable catch (TAC) across all target tuna species, and a TAC for South Pacific albacore. The TDMP and the Ministry Of Fisheries and Forests circular letter of the 24th January 2014 confirm the licence cap within the EEZ as 60 vessels and that this will be reviewed after two years.

Changes to Relevant Regulations

There are changes to regulations relating to the Fiji Tuna Development and Management Plan 2014-2018.

Two Conservation and Management Measures adopted by WCPFC in 2014 are important for the fishery (WCPFC 2014a):

- CMM-2014-05 Conservation and Management Measure for Sharks.
- CMM-2014-06 Conservation and Management Measures to develop and implement a harvest strategy approach for key fisheries and stocks in the WCPO.

Changes to personnel involved in science, management or industry

The Fiji Fish Marketing Group Ltd is no longer operating to catch albacore tuna in Fiji waters and several vessels included in the original Unit of Certification are no longer operating in the fishery.

In December 2014, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was agreed between the Fiji Tuna Boat Owners Association (FTBOA) and the Fiji Offshore Fisheries Association (FOFA) to extend the FTBOA certification to albacore caught by FOFA vessels within the Fiji Exclusive Economic Zone. The MOU is at FTBOA Appendix One and a list of vessels covered by the MOU is at FTBOA Appendix Two. This MOU will be in place throughout 2015 and will require consideration of FOFA catches at the 3rd surveillance audit.

Changes to scientific base of information - including stock assessments

Stock assessments for South Pacific albacore tuna are conducted by the Oceanic Fisheries Programme of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), as science provider to the WCPFC. Fishery overviews and summary information on the status of tuna stocks are published periodically and are discussed at scientific meetings of the WCPFC. These reports are available on the WCPFC website (http://www.wcpfc.int/meetings/all). All countries operating fleets in the region report catch, effort and size frequency data if sampled. SPC maintains a central database for the catch, effort, size frequency, tagging, biological data, observer, sampling and other data from the fishery.

The most recent South Pacific albacore stock assessments are fully described in Hoyle *et al.* (2012) and Hoyle (2011). The 2012 assessment indicates that fishing mortality (exploitation) rates for adult albacore are moderately low from the early 1970s to the mid-1990s, and show a large increase since that time for adult fish (Hoyle *et al.*, 2012). Estimated fishing



mortalities for the fully recruited age classes have reached moderate levels since 2006, averaging about 0.25 for adults in the peak year 2010, and averaging about 0.25 for fully recruited age classes.

The WCPFC practice is that the Scientific Committee (SC) issues an agreed statement on the current status of the stock, management advice and implications, which is forwarded to the WCPFC annual session for consideration of any management measures recommended.

In the absence of an updated assessment, the 10th regular meeting of the WCPFC Scientific Committee (WCPFC-SC, 2014) adopted the stock status of South Pacific albacore as estimated by the 2012 assessment (Hoyle et al., 2012). Key conclusions, based on the median of the grid of alternative scenarios explored, are that **overfishing is not occurring** and the stock is **not in an overfished state**. Spawning potential depletion levels (SB_{curr} / $SB_{curr_{F=0}}$) of albacore were moderate at ~37%. However, the SC noted that depletion levels of the exploitable biomass is estimated to be between 10% and 60%, depending on the component fishery, having increased sharply in recent years. Current biomass is sufficient to support current levels of catch. The SC has noted for several years that any increases in catch or effort are likely to lead to declines in catch rates in some regions, especially for longline catches of adult albacore, with associated impacts on vessel profitability.

The median estimate of MSY from the structural sensitivity analysis (99,085 t, 46-560 - 215,445 t) is comparable to the recent levels of (estimated) catch from the fishery (Hoyle *et al.*, 2012).

Although current catches are estimated to be sustainable, in recent years longline fleets from Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs) targeting albacore have reported difficulties in maintaining profitability and there has been concern over increasing South Pacific albacore catches and the level of effort targeting the species. Many vessels based in Fiji have stopped fishing and are tied up at wharves. There is concern that older age classes of albacore are being depleted because they are taken in large numbers by longliners, with the result that vessels are chasing fewer fish and achieving lower catch rates although the overall population is at sustainable levels.

In 2010, while noting that catch levels from the South Pacific albacore stock appeared to be sustainable, the WCPFC applied a capacity limit because of the uncertainty in the assessment and potential economic effects of a declining CPUE. The Conservation and Management Measure (CMM) for South Pacific Albacore, CMM-2010-05, (replacing CMM-2005-02) was adopted, requiring that "Commission Members, Cooperating Non- Members, and participating Territories (CCMs) shall not increase the number of their fishing vessels actively fishing for South Pacific albacore in the Convention Area south of 20°S above current (2005) levels or recent historical (2000-2004) levels."

Annual catch estimates for albacore in the south Pacific (south of the equator) as a whole peaked in 2010 at just under 89,000 t (Pilling *et al.* 2014). Pilling *et al.* (2014) present a compendium of fishery indicators for south Pacific albacore tuna (the only principal target tuna species not subject to a full stock assessment in 2014). Recent trends include:

a) Total South Pacific albacore catch in 2013 was 84,698 t, the third highest on record. This was 3% lower than the catch in 2012 but 9% higher than the average over 2008–2012.

b) Total VMS effort information south of 10°S, which is considered to be more up to date than logsheet data, indicated that total effort had increased by 9% from 2012 to 2013. The rate of effort increase has been greater in the high seas area.



c) Stochastic stock projections (using 18 assessment model runs) presented at SC10 (Pilling *et al.* 2014) indicated a risk that recent fishing levels will reduce the adult biomass of South pacific albacore below the biological LRP by 2030 (a probability of 0.3 for assuming 2010 fishing levels and 0.35 assuming 2012 fishing levels). Additional analyses were presented to SC10 based upon a reduced range of 9 assessment model runs (as selected by SC10 to best capture uncertainty within the south Pacific albacore stock assessment). These projections indicated zero risk of falling below the LRP level, but decreases in median spawning biomass levels over 20 years to 65% SB_{F=0} and 59%SB_{F=0} under 2010 and 2012 conditions, respectively.

SC10 recommended that longline fishing mortality and longline catches be reduced to avoid further decline in the vulnerable biomass and possibly exceeding the biomass LRP, and so that economically viable catch rates can be maintained.

In 2013, some representatives at WCPFC10 expressed concern about the effectiveness of the existing CMM (CMM-2010-05) for South Pacific albacore in restricting increases in effort on the species. New Zealand, on behalf of some Forum Fisheries Agency members, presented a draft of a revised CMM for South Pacific albacore (WCPFC10-2013/DP-34). Management of this fishery is considered critical to Small Island Developing States domestic longline industries and it was noted with concern that catches have doubled in the last decade despite the adoption of CMMs in 2005 and 2010 designed to limit entry. The proposed CMM included provisions to deter the continuing influx of vessels to albacore fishing grounds south of the equator, limits on catches in the high seas and overlap areas to 2006-2010 levels, and zone-based catch limits for CCMs which prevent growth in some fisheries but allow for it in others. This proposed CMM was not adopted. FFA members stated that South Pacific albacore is a mainstay for many of their domestic longline fisheries but it does not receive the attention it deserves within the WCPFC.

In 2014, FFA members presented a proposal to WCPFC11 for a more comprehensive CMM for South Pacific albacore tuna, to replace CMM 2010-05 (WCPFC 2014b). FFA's preamble to the proposal indicates that although CMM 2010-05 is appropriate for achieving one of its purposes – of limiting the number of flag fishing vessels actively fishing for South Pacific albacore in the Convention Area south of 20°S – it does not enable cooperation to "ensure the long-term sustainability and economic viability of the fishery for South Pacific albacore". The FFA members' proposal covers the entire WCPO range of the stock, promotes cooperation with IATTC, and would limit catch rather than effort in part of this area. It defines a total catch limit for the stock, set at the latest assessed MSY level – around 100,000 t – an interim limit which would be replaced by a target reference level when one is agreed by WCPFC, and proposes that the total stock limit be divided into four different sub-limits. There are no flag limits for EEZs, with zone limits instead, so fishing nations are not limited by their flag state allocations, which only apply on the high seas. Access arrangements are still possible. No consensus was reached on adoption of this proposal.

With support from FFA, a number of South Pacific nations have been developing an agreement known as the Tokelau Arrangement. The Tokelau Arrangement is the formal expression of an existing cooperative understanding on individual zone limitations on catch of South Pacific albacore tuna developed at meetings of the FFA Sub-committee on South Pacific Tuna and Billfish. The Tokelau Arrangement provides a framework for the development of cooperative zone-based management of South Pacific albacore tuna fisheries. The final text of the Tokelau Arrangement was agreed at the 91st meeting of the Forum Fisheries Committee on 31st October 2014. Signatories as at 1 December 2014 were Australia, Cook Islands, Niue, New Zealand, Samoa, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. This move sets self-imposed limits on total allowable catches by countries. It highlights how Pacific nations intend to move forward with or without WCPFC consensus, noting that this will be far more challenging in the light of WCPFC's failure to take compatible measures for



the high seas. Fiji also became a signatory to the non-binding Tokelau Arrangement during the course of the WCPFC11 meeting.

Fiji Ministry of Fisheries and Forests have provided recent catch information by FTBOA and FOFA vessels (Fiji 2015a and 2015b).

FTBOA catches (t)							
		2013			2014*		
Species	Fiji EEZ	High Seas	Total	Fiji EEZ	High Seas	Total	
Albacore	2103.77	18.86	2122.64	1066.84	152.55	1219.39	
Bigeye	127.21	31.85	159.06	99.41	0.07	99.48	
Yellowfin	907.75	18.99	926.74	934.79	59.15	993.94	
Black marlin	0.17	0	0.17	0	0	0	
Blue marlin	40.45	19.60	60.06	62.01	0	62.01	
Short billed spearfish	29.13	0.04	29.17	36.63	0	36.63	
Striped marlin	16.89	0.50	17.40	15.04	0	15.04	
Sailfish (Indo-Pacific)	15.11	0.02	15.13	11.54	0	11.54	
Swordfish	55.28	4.87	60.15	37.07	0.49	37.56	
Other	626.71	5.89	632.61	917.52	1.22	918.74	
Total	3922.48	100.62	4023.10	3180.85	213.48	3394.33	

* 2014 catches are provisional

FOFA MOU vessel catches ¹ (t)							
		2013			2014*		
Species	Fiji EEZ	High seas	Total	Fiji EEZ	High seas	Total	
Albacore	585.95	133.47	719.42	350.54	411.11	761.65	
Bigeye	57.02	5.45	62.47	73.94	7.31	81.25	
Yellowfin	73.27	2.84	76.10	345.0	3.74	348.74	
Black marlin	0.74	0	0.74	0	0	0	
Blue marlin	5.55	0.31	5.86	4.39	0.67	5.06	
Short billed spearfish	2.33	0.15	2.48	21.86	0.19	22.05	

¹ The data was obtained from landings data, only FOFA data included is from vessels with an MOU with FTBOA



FOFA MOU vessel catches ¹ (t)							
		2013		2014*			
Species	Fiji EEZ	High seas	Total	Fiji EEZ	High seas	Total	
Striped marlin	1.84	0.04	1.88	3.33	0	3.33	
Sailfish (Indo-Pacific)	0.15	0.04	0.19	6.20	0.09	6.29	
Swordfish	5.10	1.87	6.97	10.0	1.69	11.70	
Other	59.68	10.79	70.46	160.26	4.14	164.40	
Total	791.61	154.94	946.55	975.52	428.96	1,404.48	

<u>Bigeye tuna</u>

An updated assessment of bigeye tuna was undertaken in 2014 (Harley et al. 2014). The assessment concluded that current catches exceed MSY and that recent levels of fishing mortality exceed the level that will support the MSY. The assessment also concluded that recent levels of spawning potential are most likely at or below the limit reference point of 20%SBF=0 agreed by WCPFC. Longline catches are a major component contributing to the reduction in spawning potential of bigeye tuna. Catches of bigeye tuna by FTBOA vessels within the Fiji EEZ remain low (approximately 3% of the total catch in 2013 and 2014) (Fiji 2015a). Reported catches by FOFA vessels operating under an MOU with FTBOA within the Fiji EEZ were approximately 7% of the total catch of these vessels in 2013 and 2014 (Fiji 2015b) (noting that 2014 catches are provisional).

Any developments or changes within the fishery which impact traceability or the ability to segregate between fish from the Unit of Certification (UoC) and fish from outside the UoC (non-certified fish)

As indicated above, several vessels operating under the original Unit of Certification are no longer operating in the fishery. In addition, there has been a MoU between the FTBOA and FOFA as described above. A Chain of Custody audit has been undertaken to ensure appropriate traceability of fish sold under the UoC.



TAC Data

Table 1. TAC and Catch Data

TAC	Year	NA	Amount	NA
UoA share of TAC	Year	NA	Amount	NA
UoC share of TAC	Year	NA	Amount	NA
Total green weight catch by UoC	Year (most recent)	2014 (provisional)	Amount	1066.8 t (FTBOA) 350.5 t (FOFA MOU)
	Year (second most recent)	2013	Amount	2103.8 t (FTBOA) 586.0 t (FOFA MOU)

Table 2. Summary of Assessment Conditions

Condition number	Performance indicator (PI)	Status	PI original score	PI revised score
1	1.1.2	On target	75	Not revised
2	1.2.1	Behind target	70	Not revised
3	1.2.2 ²	On target	60	Not revised
4	2.1.1	On target	70	Not revised
5	2.1.2	On target	75	Not revised
6	2.1.3	On target	75	Not revised
7	2.3.3	Behind target	60	Not revised
8	3.2.3	On target	70	Not revised

 $^{^2\,}$ PI 1.2.2 has been re-evaluated using CR v2.0 – See Appendix 1, Table 11



Assessment Process.

Audit Process

On 18th December 2014, notification was placed on the MSC website that the 2nd surveillance audit for the Fiji albacore tuna longline fishery would be likely to be undertaken in February 2015 and that the new surveillance process as set out in the MSC Certification Requirements version 2 would be used for this annual audit. Further notification was given on the MSC website that the site visit would be conducted in Suva, Fiji on 9-10 February 2015.

Following the site visit and drafting of the report there followed discussion on whether PI 2.1.1 needed to be re-scored to take account of the change in stock status of bigeye tuna, i.e. a retained species in this fishery. Because of the need for further dialogue between the audit team, IFC and the client a variation request was sought (10th April 2015) and granted by MSC (15th April 2015) to delay the publication of the audit report until the dialogue and an outcome confirmed.

Scope and history of the assessments

IFC confirm that the fishery is in scope. During the audit it was verified that destructive fishing practices or controversial unilateral exemptions have not been introduced.

Details of the Unit/s of Assessment can be found in the General Information section of this report.

The Fiji albacore tuna longline fishery in Fiji's EEZ was certified in December 2012 with eight conditions. The first annual surveillance was carried out in March 2014. All conditions remain open.

Surveillance activities

Several steps were undertaken in preparation for the audit. The surveillance team requires that the client provide evidence that the fishery management system has taken the necessary actions to meet all conditions placed on the fishery during the initial certification assessment or any previous surveillance audits. The client fishery submitted a document outlining progress against the Client Action Plan since the previous audit (see Appendix 4).

The surveillance team met with the client fishery to allow the client to present information gathered to answer questions raised by the surveillance team to ensure that adequate information is available to undertake the surveillance audit. The surveillance team also met with representative of the Ministry of Fisheries and Forests to discuss how well the fishery management system is functioning and if the fishery management system is continuing to meet the MSC standards.

The surveillance team presented its interim findings to the client fishery at the end of the site visit. Where appropriate, the client fishery submits final information to the surveillance team for consideration in the surveillance findings and report. The surveillance team then reviews the final information and submits a final report to the client fishery and the MSC for posting on the MSC website. If there are continued compliance concerns, these are presented as non-conformances that require further action and audits as specified in the surveillance report.



Versions used

MSC Sustainable Fishery Standard	v1.1
MSC Certification Requirements	V2.0
MSC Guidance to the Certification Requirements	V2.0
MSC Surveillance Report Template	v2.0

Results

Table 3: Condition 1

	PI number	Scori	Scoring issue/ scoring guidepost textScoreoference Points: Limit and target reference points are propriate for the stock.75					
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	1.1.2	Reference P appropriate						
	SG6	0	SG80	SG100				
Scoring Guideposts	Generic limit an reference points on justifiable an reasonable prac appropriate for category.	nd target s are based nd ctice the species	Reference points are appropriate for the stock and can be estimated. The limit reference point is set above the level at which there is an appreciable risk of impairing reproductive capacity. The target reference point is such that the stock is maintained at a level consistent with BMSY or some measure or surrogate with similar intent or outcome. For low trophic level species, the target reference point takes into account the ecological role of the stock.	The limit refe set above the there is an ap of impairing r capacity follo consideration precautionary The target re is such that t maintained a consistent wi some measu with similar ir outcome, or a and takes int relevant prec issues such a ecological ro with a high d certainty.	rence point is e level at which opreciable risk reproductive wing n of relevant y issues. ference point he stock is t a level th BMSY or re or surrogate ntent or a higher level, o account autionary as the le of the stock egree of			
Condition	By the third ann reference points objectives and	nual audit the o s have been a scientific stock	client must provide evidence to greed by management, consist cassessment.	demonstrate t tent with the m	arget and limit anagement			
Milestones	 Annual milestones in achieving this end require that the client provide evidence of : Year 1 (First surveillance audit) Promotion of adoption of a Harvest Strategy with appropriate target and limit reference points (or equivalents) within WCPFC should have begun in conjunction with Condition 3. Evidence of engagement with other major countries fishing the southern albacore stock (i.e. New Zealand, Australia, French Polynesia, Japan, Korea, New Caledon 				ence of : nd limit conjunction rn albacore ew Caledonia,			



	adoption of appropriate reference points for the stock in WCPEC
	Year 2 (second surveillance audit)
	• Further promote the adoption of appropriate reference points as part of the Harvest Strategy, in conjunction with Condition 3.
	Year 3 (third surveillance audit)
	• Target and limit reference points have been agreed by management, consistent with the management objectives and scientific stock assessment.
	FTBOA note the urgency of implementing stock-specific reference points and associated harvest control rules given recent increases in overall regional albacore catch levels. To support the development of appropriate reference points for the South Pacific albacore stock, therefore, in the respective years the client will provide evidence of: Year 1
	 Engagement with the Fiji government to promote the completion and adoption of the Fiji Tuna Fishery Management Plan.
	2. Consultation with the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries and Forestry and where necessary FFA and FFA members through the Sub-Committee on South Pacific Tuna and Billfish Fisheries (SC-SPTBF) and Fiji delegates to WCPFC with the objective of establishing an agreed position on limit reference points for the stock that is consistent with the MSC SG 80 standards.
	3. The provision of any requested practical support for SPC, FFA and WCPFC analyses on limit and target reference points for albacore to support discussions at FFA SC- SPTBF meetings.
Oliant action plan	4. Actions to raise awareness of the need for a WCPFC albacore management measure through the Pacific Island Tuna Industry Association (PITIA)
Client action plan	
	1. The provision of any requested support for SPC, FFA and WCPFC analyses on target reference points for albacore to support any further discussions at the FFA SC-SPTBF meetings and the WCPFC Scientific Committee.
	2. Engagement with Fiji government officials, and where necessary FFA and its members, and WCPFC delegates from the other major countries fishing the stock in advance of the Commission meeting to seek their support for the adoption of appropriate target reference points by the WCPFC and appropriately drafted WCPFC Resolutions.
	3. Collaboration with other industry sectors and NGOs in order to continue to raise awareness of the need for WCPFC to adopt appropriate reference points for the South Pacific albacore stock.
	 Actions to raise awareness of the need for a WCPFC albacore management measure through the PITIA
	Year 3
	1. Engagement with high-level Fiji government officials, and where necessary FFA and its members, and WCPFC delegates from the other major countries fishing the stock in advance of the Commission meeting to ensure appropriately drafted WCPFC
	annual meeting, for consideration by the Commission.
	Fiji adopted updated fisheries legislation with the Offshore Fisheries Management
	Decree (OFMD), passed in January 2013. This decree gives the Government of Fiji a
Progress on	comprehensive range of duties, responsibilities, functions and powers to regulate and sustainably manage offshore fisheries. The decree established robust licensing systems
Condition	and conditions for allocating, refusing or suspending licences are described. The decree
[Year 1]	envisages that the most important fisheries will be managed through Fisheries
	Management Plans. There are also detailed monitoring, control and surveillance
	also contain protection for fishers to ensure that the procedures are applied fairly.
	FTBOA provided evidence of their engagement, formal and informal, with the Ministry of

	Fisheries and Forests in the development of the OFMD.
	FTBOA also provided evidence of meetings with the Ministry to consult on the Fiji Tuna Development and Management Plan 2014-2018 (TDMP). FFA has provided input to the development of the TDMP. The draft TDMP has not been officially adopted but is expected to be considered by the Fiji Cabinet in the near future. The current draft of the Plan indicates that Fiji's longline fishery will be managed under clearly defined limits, including a cap on the number of vessels, a total allowable catch (TAC) across all target tuna species, and a TAC for South Pacific albacore. The draft Plan also indicates that suggested limits are based on extensive stakeholder consultations and informed by outcomes of the Fiji's longline fishery bio-economic assessment and the current state of tuna stocks.
	In their submission to the surveillance audit, WWF Western Central Pacific (WWF WCP) have provided comment on the interaction between FTBOA and the Ministry in the development of the TDMP and FTBOA support for improved management measures for South Pacific albacore (WWF 2014). FTBOA has also taken steps to raise awareness of the need to strengthen albacore management measures. WWF WCP (WWF 2014) provides links to radio interviews and press releases given by FTBOA and PITIA representatives indicating the need for improved management. FTBOA has worked through the PITIA to highlight the need for strengthened albacore management arrangements. PITIA provides an opportunity for the tuna industry to promote issues of interest to the industry. The Fiji Government has continued to work with other Pacific nations, predominantly through FFA, to support the adoption of zone-based catch limits.
	The audit team examined progress against the agreed Year 2 milestone requirements for this condition. Three of the milestones relate to provision of support and engagement with agencies and representatives responsible for promoting the adoption of appropriate reference points by the WCPFC. FTBOA have a limited capacity to influence WCPFC outcomes. They have, however, continued to support the adoption of the requirements of this and other conditions on the MSC certification of this fishery through avenues available to them.
Progress on Condition [Year 2]	At the first surveillance audit, FTBOA provided evidence of their engagement, formal and informal, with the Ministry of Fisheries and Forests in the development of the Offshore Fisheries Management Decree (passed in January 2013). FTBOA also provided evidence of meetings with the Ministry to consult on the Fiji Tuna Development and Management Plan 2014-2018 (TDMP). The TDMP was officially approved and adopted by the Fiji Government in 2014. This and the Ministry Of Fisheries and Forests circular letter of the 24th January 2014 confirm the licence cap as 60 vessels and that this will be reviewed after two years. FTBOA have strongly advocated at combined Industry/MFF stakeholder meetings that the cap of 60 vessels should be retained and by preference reduced to 50 vessels.
	FTBOA has indicated its on-going support for the adoption of reference points through canvassing Fiji Government officials attending FFA and WCPFC Management Objectives Workshops (MOW) and the regular annual Commission meeting. FTBOA has a director on the PITIA Executive Committee which issued a strongly worded statement on lack of progress within the WCPFC on 18th December 2014. This is attached as an appendix to the FTBOA client submission at Appendix 4.
	The 9th Regular session of the WCPFC (December 2012) adopted a biomass-based limit reference point for South Pacific albacore13 with the agreement that further work would be carried out by the Scientific Committee on F–based (i.e. fishing mortality-based) reference points. The biomass-based limit reference point adopted for South Pacific albacore is 20% SB _{recent, F=0} . (where SB _{recent, F=0} is the estimated average spawning biomass over a recent period in the absence of fishing) (WCPFC-SC 2012).
	The development of target reference points by WCPFC for the major tuna species is on- going. In the absence of a formally adopted TRP, WCPFC continues to manage tuna



stocks against B _{MSY} , which therefore remains as the de facto target for South Pacific albacore.
As reported at the 1 st surveillance audit for this fishery, WCPFC has held Management Objectives Workshops (MOW) to progress the development of harvest strategies for major tuna species including albacore. MOW1 was held in late 2012, prior to the Commission meeting, developing a "Strawman" candidate list of fisheries management objectives, performance indicators and target indicators. A 2 nd Management Objectives Workshop (MOW2) preceded the WCPFC Commission Meeting in Cairns, Australia, November 28-29, 2013. In that workshop a series of plenary workshop presentations showing examples of the application of target reference points, harvest control rules and trade-offs were provided. A working paper (WCPFC-MOW 2013) examined potential target reference points using South Pacific albacore longlining as an example. This analysis examined potential future effort levels to produce maximum economic yield across the southern longline fishery.
One output of MOW2 provided to WCPFC10 (WCPFC 2013c) was a recommendation for an initial spawning biomass target reference point for skipjack tuna of 0.5SB0. This was not adopted by the Commission and support was given to further workshop, MOW3. The objective for MOW3 was to discuss and report to WCPFC11 on management issues including: the establishment and development of a management framework based on a harvest strategy approach, determining risk levels, a TRP for skipjack and associated multispecies impacts and a process for developing a TRP for South Pacific albacore. MOW3 took place prior to WCPFC11 (November 28, 2014). Representatives of Fiji's Ministry of Fisheries and Forests participated in the workshop.
A working paper presented at MOW3 (WCPFC 2014d) examined whether candidate target reference points for South Pacific albacore are capable of meeting both biological and economic management objectives. The working paper summarises work undertaken on candidate TRPs and aims to:
 Identify the consequences of using the 'minimum' South Pacific albacore biomass target reference point levels compatible with different levels of risk of falling below the agreed LRP;
2. Examine the consequence of achieving the 'default' reference point of MSY;
3. Examine candidate TRPs based upon fishery objectives such as catch rates, fishery profitability and MEY;
4. Motivate discussion on the compatibility and acceptability of these biological, fishery and economic target levels, and the potential implications of those management options for the southern longline fishery.
The workshop also examined directions for further development of a harvest strategy for the southern longline fishery.
MOW3 developed a work plan to progress the consideration of a management framework in 2015. WCPFC11 approved funding to allow for the proposed 2015 activities to progress.
An important development at WCPFC11 has been the adoption of a Conservation and Management Measure (CMM 2014-06) to develop and implement a harvest strategy approach for key fisheries and stocks in the WCPO. A proposal for a framework for the development of harvest strategy approaches was introduced to the Commission by FFA members. The proposal sought that the Commission commit to a formal management framework and outlined the key elements needed for this framework to operate. Following discussion and revision of the proposal CMM 2014-06 was adopted. The major features of the CMM are:
for each of the key fisheries or stocks under the purview of the Commission according to the process set out in the CMM. The CMM identifies the elements that harvest strategies are to contain (including defined operational objectives, target and limit reference points

for each stock, acceptable levels of risk of not breaching limit reference points, a monitoring strategy, decision rules that aim to achieve the target reference point and

	avoid the limit reference point, and management strategy evaluation.
	CMM 2014-06 includes a paragraph that the Commission shall agree a workplan and
	indicative timeframes to adopt or refine harvest strategies for skipjack, bigeye, yellowfin,
	South Pacific albacore, Pacific bluefin and northern albacore tuna by no later than the
	twelfth meeting of the Commission in 2015.
	In addition, as indicated in the background information in this report, a number of South
	Pacific nations have been developing an agreement known as the Tokelau Arrangement,
	a formal expression of an existing cooperative understanding on individual zone
	limitations on catch of South Pacific albacore tuna developed at meetings of the FFA
	Sub-committee on South Pacific Tuna and Billfish. The Tokelau Arrangement provides a
	framework for the development of cooperative zone-based management of South Pacific
	albacore tuna fisheries. The final text of the Tokelau Arrangement was agreed at the 91st
	meeting of the Forum Fisheries Committee on 31st October 2014. Signatories as at 1
	December 2014 were Australia, Cook Islands, Niue, New Zealand, Samoa, Tokelau,
	Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. This move sets self-imposed limits on total allowable
	calches by countries. It nightights now Pacific hattons intend to move forward with of
	WCDEC's failure to take compatible measures for the high seas. Fiji also became a
	signatory to the non-binding Tokelau Arrangement during the course of the WCPEC11
	meeting.
	Overall, there has been satisfactory progress against the milestones of the client action
	plan. The adoption of a limit reference at WCPEC9 was a positive outcome. The adoption
	of CMM 2014-06 which identifies the requirements for development of harvest strategies
	for major tuna species is a major step forward in meeting the MSC requirements for the
	fishery.
	The auditors conclude that satisfactory progress has been made and the fishery is on
	target to meet this condition.
Status of	It should be noted, however, that at this stage CMM 2014-06 requires the development
condition	of a work plan by 2015. Future meeting of the condition will require that this work plan
	sets out an appropriate timetable for implementation of reference points and harvest
	controls by WCPFC.



Table 4: Condition 2

	Pl number	Scorii	ng issue/ scoring guidepo	st text	Score
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	1.2.1	Harvest Stra harvest strat	ategy: There is a robust and pre egy in place.	ecautionary	70
	SG6	0	SG80	SG	\$100
Scoring Guideposts	The harvest strategy is expected to achieve stock management objectives reflected in the target and limit reference points. The harvest strategy is likely to work based on prior experience or plausible argument. Monitoring is in place that is expected to determine whether the harvest strategy is working.		The harvest strategy 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. The harvest strategy may not have been fully tested but monitoring is in place and evidence exists that it is achieving its objectives.	The harvest strategy is responsive to the state of the stock and is designed to achieve stock management objectives reflected in the target and limit reference points. The performance of the harvest strategy has been fully evaluated and evidence exists to show that it is achieving its objectives including being clearly able to maintain stocks at target levels. The harvest strategy is periodically reviewed and improved as necessary.	
Condition	By the third annual audit the client must provide evidence that a harvest strategy for southern albacore which 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 is in place.				
Milestones	 Annual milestones in achieving this condition are: Year 1 (First surveillance audit) The work plan of the relevant management bodies in 2013 to include an examination of the integrated harvest strategies needed to achieve management objectives. Year 2 (Second surveillance audit) An assessment of how the elements of the strategy work together to achieve the management objective. Year 3 (Third surveillance audit) Evidence that a harvest strategy for southern albacore which 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 ref. points is in place. 				
Client action plan	In order to ensure that WCPFC implement a harvest strategy for southern albacore which 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. The client will: Year 1 1. Undertake activities to ensure appropriate focus is given to albacore tuna management at the Ninth Session of the Commission (December 2012). In particular, raise awareness of the need for restraint on future catches of albacore tuna through the PITIA and seek PITIA support for potential management measures resulting from development of harvest control rules and reference points as per Condition 1 and 3. 2. Ensure the work plan of the relevant management bodies in 2013 includes an				

	examination of the integrated harvest strategies needed to achieve management
	objectives.
	Year 2
	1. Provide an assessment of how the elements of the enhanced management strategy
	Voar 3
	rear 3
	2. Engagement with high-level Fill government officials, and where necessary FFA and its members, and WCREC delegates from the other major countries fishing the stock in
	advance of the Commission meeting to ensure an appropriately drafted CMM is
	prepared, for the WCPFC annual meeting, for consideration by the Commission.
Progress on Condition [Year 1]	As for Condition 1, this Condition requires progress to be made through WCPFC processes. Regional management of the albacore stock throughout the South Pacific is the responsibility of the WCPFC. Under this regional convention Fiji is responsible for ensuring that the management measures applied within fisheries waters of Fiji are compatible with those of the Commission. Fiji has made progress with its internal processes to improve implementation of a regional harvest strategy. Fiji adopted updated fisheries legislation with the OFMD, passed in January 2013, giving the Government of Fiji a comprehensive range of duties, responsibilities, functions and powers to regulate and sustainably manage offshore fisheries. The decree envisages that the most important fisheries will be managed through Fisheries Management Plans. FTBOA provided evidence of meetings with the Ministry to consult on the Fiji Tuna Development of the TDMP. The draft TDMP has not been officially adopted but is expected to be considered by the Fiji Cabinet in the near future.
	PITIA provides an opportunity for the tuna industry to promote issues of interest to the industry. It works with the National Tuna Associations of the FFA members and provides up to date information on regional matters and undertakes project work where the results have a "Pan Pacific" interest.
	See FTBOA client summary of progress at Appendix 4 (FTBOA 2015).
	The current harvest strategy for WCPO albacore has several components, with WCPFC, national and archipelagic management actions, supported by a robust stock assessment and extensive monitoring frameworks, but it does not include formal harvest control rules. There are a number of elements to the current harvest strategy and the state of the stock provides some evidence that the harvest strategy has been effective to date. However, there is a need for increased integration of management actions across the region.
Progress on	As with Condition 1, FIBOA's ability to persuade the WCPFC on the implementation of a robust baryest strategy is limited and can only be done through discussion with the Fill
Condition	Government officials attending REMO meetings and through the auspices of PITIA.
[Year 2]	Stakeholder and private meetings have continued throughout the year with Fiji MFF.
	FTBOA has indicated support for the principles of the "Tokelau" arrangement. The
	Tokelau agreement is considered to be a significant positive development in support of
	Conditions 1, 2 and 3.
	The adoption of CMM 2014-06 is also a major step forward in meeting the MSC
	requirements for the lishery. It should be noted, however, that at this stage Civily 2014-
	implementation of the harvest strategy to come from it is yet to be established.
	While good progress has been made with CMM 2014-06 and the Tokelau Arrangement,
Status of	the Year 2 milestone to "provide an assessment of how the elements of the enhanced
condition	management strategy work together to achieve the management objectives for this fishery" has not been undertaken and so progress is behind target . The client must



ensure that this agreed milestone is met by the next annual audit. In the event that this condition is not back 'on target' by the next audit, section 7.23.13.2 of CR v2.0 shall be applied, progress will be considered to be inadequate and the certification will be liable to suspension.



Table 5: Condition 3

	PI number	Scoring is:	sue/ scoring guidepost tex	xt	Score
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	1.2.2	Harvest cont and effective	trol rules and tools: There are v harvest control rules in place.	vell defined	60
	SG6	0	SG80	SG	100
Scoring Guideposts	Generally understood harvest control rules are in place that are consistent with the harvest strategy and which act to reduce the exploitation rate as limit reference points are approached. There is some evidence that tools used to implement harvest control rules are appropriate and effective in controlling exploitation.		Well defined harvest control rules are in place that are consistent with the harvest strategy and ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as limit reference points are approached. The selection of the harvest control rules takes into account the main uncertainties. Available evidence indicates that the tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules	The design of the harvest control rules take into account a wide range of uncertainties. Evidence clearly shows that the tools in use are effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.	
Condition	By the third annual audit the client must provide evidence that well-defined harvest control rules have been proposed, tested and established for the fishery.				
Milestones	 Annual milestones in achieving this condition are: Year 1 (First surveillance audit) The client to encourage Fiji to work with other interested parties to canvas WCPFC members to support strengthening of HCRs and ensure that albacore is treated as a priority species. Promote the adoption of formal HCRs at WCPFC. This should be undertaken in conjunction with any deliberations on appropriate reference points (Condition 1). Additional analyses should be included within the work plan of the WCPFC. Reporting should include the number of WCPFC members supporting revision of HCRs and activity to date. Commitment of other WCPFC members to achieving this goal should be achieved by this date. Year 2 (Second surveillance audit) Further promote the adoption of formal HCRs at WCPFC. This should be undertaken in conjunction with deliberations on reference points (Condition 1). Evidence of contribution to drafting a Resolution for WCPFC to adopt appropriate HCR for the southern albacore stock, to be tabled at the 2013 WCPFC annual meeting for consideration by the Commission, or at the latest, the 2014 meeting. Year 3 (Third surveillance audit) The client must provide evidence that well-defined harvest control rules have been proposed, tested and established for the fishery. 				
Client action plan	FTBOA note the urgency of implementing stock-specific reference points and associated HCRs given recent increases in overall regional albacore catch levels. To support the development of appropriate HCRs for the South Pacific albacore stock, therefore, in the respective years the client will provide evidence of:			nd associated upport the efore, in the	

	Year 1
	 Engagement with the Fiji government to promote the completion and adoption of the Fiji Tuna Fishery Management Plan.
	2. Consultation with the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries and Forestry, and where necessary FFA and FFA members through the Sub-Committee on South Pacific Tuna and Billfish Fisheries (SC-SPTBF) and Fiji delegates to WCPFC with the objective of establishing an agreed position on HCRs for the stock that is consistent with the MSC SG 80 standards.
	Support for and collaboration as requested on activities of the FFA SC-SPTBF in the analysis of HCRs consistent with candidate reference points.
	 Engagement with Ministry of Fisheries and Forestry staff and Fiji delegates to WCPFC to:
	a. promote the tabling of a statement to WCPFC at its Ninth Session (December 2012), urging other members to work diligently to adopt formal HCRs for all tuna stocks, as required by the WCPFC Convention.
	b. engagement with high-level contacts between Fiji government officials, FFA and its members, and WCPFC delegates from the other major countries fishing the stock in advance of the Commission meeting to seek their support for the adoption of appropriate HCRs by the WCPFC.
	c. ensure the work plan of the WCPFC Scientific Committee and FFA SC-SPTBF in 2013 will include analyses of candidate HCRs for albacore.
	5. Actions to raise awareness of the need for a WCPFC albacore management measure through the Pacific Island Tuna Industry Association (PITIA)
	Year 2
	1. Engagement with the Fiji Ministry to consolidate the Fiji position on HCRs for the South Pacific albacore stock at subsequent FFA and WCPFC meetings and workshops and encourage delegates from the other major countries fishing the stock to support the Fiji position. This shall be undertaken in conjunction with any deliberations on appropriate reference points.
	 Provision of any requested support for SPC, FFA and WCPFC analyses on HCRs for albacore to support any further discussions at the FFA SC-SPTBF meetings and the WCPFC Scientific Committee.
	3. Collaboration with other industry sectors and NGOs in order to raise awareness of the need for WCPFC to adopt well-defined HCRs for the southern albacore stock.
	 Support as requested for the activities of the FFA SC-SPTBF in the analysis of HCRs consistent with candidate reference points.
	5. Actions to raise awareness of the need for a WCPFC albacore management measure through the Pacific Island Tuna Industry Association (PITIA) Year 3
	1. Practical support as requested to WCPFC meetings and workshops with the objective of achieving the adoption of HCRs for the South Pacific albacore stock by WCPFC.
	2. Engagement with high-level Fiji government officials, and as required FFA and its members, and WCPFC delegates from the other major countries fishing the stock in advance of the Commission meeting to ensure appropriately drafted WCPFC Resolutions on well-defined harvest control rules for the stock, to be tabled by Fiji and other countries fishing on the stock) at the 2014 (or 2015 if necessary) WCPFC annual meeting for consideration by the Commission.
	 Liaison with the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries and Forestry to ensure relevant supporting research is planned both within the FFA SC-SPTBF and the WCPFC Science Committee.
	4. Actions to raise awareness of the need for a WCPFC albacore management measure through the Pacific Island Tuna Industry Association (PITIA).
ogress on	The progress for this condition is largely reflected in the responses to Condition 1.The Condition on Harvest Control Rules is similar to the Condition for Reference Points.

Pr

Condition	As indicated under Condition 1:
[Year 1]	 Fiji adopted updated fisheries legislation with the Offshore Fisheries Management Decree (OFMD), passed in January 2013.
	 The decree established robust licensing systems and conditions for allocating, refusing or suspending licences are described.
	 The decree envisages that the most important fisheries will be managed through Fisheries Management Plans.
	 FTBOA have consulted with the Ministry on the Fiji Tuna Development and Management Plan 2014-2018 (TDMP). The draft TDMP has not been officially adopted but is expected to be considered by the Fiji Cabinet in the near future.
	 The current draft of the Plan indicates that Fiji's longline fishery will be managed under clearly defined limits, including a cap on the number of vessels, a total allowable catch (TAC) across all target tuna species, and a TAC for South Pacific albacore.
	The Fiji Government has continued to work with other Pacific nations, predominantly through FFA, to support the adoption of zone-based catch limits and to promote the
	introduction of harvest control rules through WCPFC processes.
	The Fiji Government has recently reduced the number of available licences to 60 to reduce effort in the fishery, largely to improve economic returns. FTBOA provided evidence of discussions with the Ministry re restructuring of the fishery.
	See FTBOA client summary of progress at Appendix 4 (FTBOA 2015).
	As indicated in the previous surveillance audit, the status for this condition is largely
	reflected in the responses to Condition 1. FTBOA has indicated its ongoing support for
	the adoption of harvest control rules through canvassing Fiji Government officials
	attending FFA and WCPFC Management Objectives Workshops (MOW) and the regular
	worded statement from PITIA on lack of progress within the WCPFC on 18th December 2014. This is attached as an appendix to the FTBOA client submission at Appendix 4.
Progress on	There are generally understood harvest control rules in place that are consistent with the
Condition	aims of the harvest strategy indicating that the exploitation rate will be reduced as limit
[Year 2]	reference points are approached or as the stock moves below the target level. However,
	the lack of a well-defined harvest control rule prevents assessment of how precautionary
	As for Condition1, a major component of the action plan for the first year was
	communication with the Ministry and other stakeholders to develop and adopt a new
	management plan and promote the adoption of reference points. The TDMP was
	officially approved and adopted by the Fiji Government in 2014.
	The Tokelau Arrangement and the adoption of CMM 2014-06 at WCPFC11 are important steps in this condition being met.
	Note: Following a clarification provided by MSC on the interpretation of this PI under CR
	v1.3 this PI has been re-evaluated using requirements set out in MSC's new fisheries standard version 2.0 (1 October 2014). Further details can be found in Appendix 1 of this report.
01-11-1	The overall score for this PI remains at 60.
Status of	In 2015 there will be an updated assessment of albacore tuna and a timetable is to be
condition	developed for a harvest strategy no later than the WCPFC Commission meeting this
	year. The outcomes of these developments should be assessed at the 3 rd surveillance
	Satisfactory progress has been made against the Year 2 milestones of the CAP and the
	fishery is on target to meet this condition.



Table 6: Condition 4

	PI number	Scoring is	ssue/ scoring guidepost te	ext	Score
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	2.1.1	Status: The irreversible hinder reco	e fishery does not pose a risk of harm to the retained species a very of depleted retained speci	f serious or and does not ies.	70
	SG60)	SG80	SG	5100
Scoring Guideposts	Main retained species are likely to be within biologically based limits or if outside the limits there are measures in place that are expected to ensure that the fishery does not hinder recovery and rebuilding of the depleted species. If the status is poorly known there are measures or practices in place that are expected to result in the fishery not causing the retained species to be outside biologically based limits or hindering recovery.		Main retained species are highly likely to be within biologically based limits, or if outside the limits there is a partial strategy of demonstrably effective management measures in place such that the fishery does not hinder recovery and rebuilding.	There is a high degree of certainty that retained species are within biologically based limits. Target reference points are defined and retained species are at or fluctuating around their target reference points.	
Condition	By the third annual audit the client must provide evidence that a partial strategy of demonstrably effective management measures are in place such that the fishery does not hinder recovery and rebuilding of blue shark, short-finned mako, silky and oceanic sharks.				
Milestones	 Annual milestones in achieving this condition require that the client provide evidence of: Year 1 (First surveillance audit) The development of a partial strategy and implementation plan. Year 2 (Second surveillance audit) Testing and demonstration of the partial strategy and implementation plan. Year 3 (Third surveillance audit) A partial strategy of demonstrably effective management measures are in place such that the fishery does not hinder recovery and rebuilding of blue shark, short-finned mako, silky and oceanic sharks. 				
Client action plan	FTBOA note that stock assessments of shark have recently been completed by SPC on behalf of the WCPFC. These assessments focus initially on oceanic white tip and silky shark, with assessments of blue shark and short finned mako to follow. These will give a clearer picture of the status of these species. It is noted that the long-lived, low fecundity life history of most shark species implies a considerable period of time may be required to quantitatively demonstrate positive impacts of mitigation measures on the wider stock status, and this time period may be beyond the period of certification for some species. Scientific advice will be sought when evaluating the direct effectiveness of FTBOA strategies to mitigate shark bycatch. In the meantime, in collaboration with the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries, the FTBOA have already initiated a shark-mitigation plan to reduce the bycatch of shark during fishing. In the respective years the client will demonstrate the following to the CAB:				

	Year 1
	1. A formal strategy and implementation plan has already been developed in collaboration with the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries. The Fiji longline licence conditions for 2012 note: "No drop line and shark line is to be carried on board (section 1.3); all licensed vessels fishing in the archipelagic waters, the 12 miles territorial seas and the EEZ are to have on board fins that total no more than 5% of the weight of sharks on board" (section 1.4; consistent with WCPFC decisions).
	 The FTBOA will adopt the use of the shark by species logbook prepared by SPC to provide more detailed and accurate record keep of retained shark by species. Year 2
	Testing the effectiveness of the implemented strategy will be with the support of Fiji Ministry of Fisheries and Forestry observer programme, which combined with the monitoring programme initiated to address Condition 5 will allow a preliminary examination of the catch rates of sharks of different species within the FTBOA fishery, and comparison with historical catch rate information. Year 3
	FTBOA will provide any requested practical assistance for the analysis of observer data to assess the effectiveness of measures to provide verifiable information that measures are demonstrably effective such that the fishery does not hinder recovery and rebuilding.
	In years 2 or 3, where deemed scientifically necessary (see above), FTBOA will discuss the implementation of enhanced shark bycatch mitigation measures with the Ministry. These measures may include avoiding particular locations or periods where analyses show fishing leads to a particularly high shark bycatch rate.
	 FTBOA has implemented a partial strategy and implementation plan for sharks in collaboration with the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries. The Fiji longline licence conditions state: "No drop line and shark line is to be carried on board" (section 1.3); "all licensed vessels fishing in the archipelagic waters, the 12 miles territorial seas and the EEZ are to have on board fins that total no more than 5% of the weight of sharks on board" (section 1.4; consistent with WCPFC decisions). Vessels are also required to complete the South Pacific Regional Longline logsheet which allows reporting of catches of the major shark species (blue shark, hammerhead, mako, oceanic whitetip, porbeagle, silky and thresher sharks; the logbook has fields for number retained, kgs retained and number discarded). The Fiji Ministry sent a letter to operators (dated 21 June 2013) reminding them of WCPFC requirements in relation to sharks: WCPFC CMM 2010-07 para 7- 'CCM'S shall have on board fins that total no
Progress on Condition [Year 1]	 WCPFC CMM 2011-04 para 7- CCM's shall prohibit vessel flying their flags and vessels under charter arrangement to the CCM from retaining on board, transhipping, storing on the fishing vessel, or landing any oceanic white tip shark, in whole or in part, in the fisheries covered by the convention.
	The Fiji Fisheries Department and FFA have jointly prepared a National Plan of Action for Sharks (NPOA Sharks) which is awaiting implementation. FTBOA have indicated support for the NPOA in a letter to the Ministry (dated 3 February 2014).
	The Ministry have also indicated that industry will be informed of the CMM relating to silky shark which comes into force on 1 July 2014 (CMM 2013-08).
	In their submission to the audit, WWF WCP indicated that they conducted a project in partnership with FTBOA to support the implementation of field activities to reduce bycatch in Fiji's longline tuna fishing industry (WWF 2014). One aspect of this work has been the deployment of a WWF observer on Solander Pacific fishing vessels to document bycatch mitigation practices being implemented by the company. Another aspect was a 1-day workshop in which several FTBOA companies participated. Emphasis was placed on learning the use of turtle de-hooking devices; understanding critical bycatch issues in Fiji's tuna longline fisheries, including sensitive shark species, and bycatch best practice on board fishing vessels. Further information is given in the

	WWF submission (WWF 2014).
	VVVVF submission (VVVF 2014). See FTBOA client summary of progress at Appendix 4 (FTBOA 2015). As indicated at the 1st surveillance audit, FTBOA has implemented a partial strategy and implementation plan for sharks in collaboration with the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries. The Fiji longline licence conditions state: "No drop line and shark line is to be carried on board" (section 1.3); "all licensed vessels fishing in the archipelagic waters, the 12 miles territorial seas and the EEZ are to have on board fins that total no more than 5% of the weight of sharks on board". Fiji's shark NPOA has been signed off by MFF but is yet to be ratified by Cabinet. However, as the client report indicates, the requirements of the NPOA are in place by MFF and notifications and conditions are applied to fishing permits. The NPOA includes policies promoting within industry the release of live sharks unharmed and unaltered while still in the water. Retained dead sharks are required to be landed whole. Vessels landing their catch in Suva are regularly inspected by Ministry officials to confirm compliance. The "extended" SPC logbook which itemises the principle shark species is required to be completed by all vessels. WCPFC11 approved funding for research on limit reference points for sharks and for a workshop to examine mitigation options for longline shark bycatch. A new CMM on sharks was agreed by WCPFC11 (CMM 2014-05) which requires CCMs to ensure that vessels either a) do not use or carry wire trace as branch lines or leaders; or b) do not use branch lines running directly off the longline floats or drop lines, known as shark lines. Measures currently in place for the FTBOA are compliant with this CMM.
Progress on Condition	FTBOA vessels are also required to adhere to several CMMs previously adopted by WCPFC in relation to sharks. CMM-2011-04 prohibits retention of oceanic whitetip shark is in place and CMM-2013-08 prohibiting retention of silky shark came into force from 1 July 2014. The 1 st surveillance audit provides commentary on information available at the time of that report on the status of the major shark species taken by longlining. Assessments of whitetip shark and silky shark presented at the WCPFC SC have indicated that these species are overfieled and subject to overfishing.
	Information on shark catches by major species is collected in logbooks used by the fishery. The South Pacific Regional Longline logsheet allows reporting of catches of the major shark species (blue shark, hammerhead, mako, oceanic whitetip, porbeagle, silky and thresher sharks; the logbook has fields for number retained, kgs retained and number discarded). However, the logsheet does not have separations of the two pelagic and bigeye thresher sharks and no separation of the 4 hammerhead shark species. Information on shark catches is presented in the Fiji Annual Report to the Commission (Fiji 2013). In relation to CMM-2011-04, the Annual Report states that the Fiji National Observer Program data shows that 5 oceanic whitetip sharks escaped, 5 were released as they were small in size and 285 were released dead. The 2014 Fiji report to the Commission (Fiji 2014) states that 5 oceanic whitetip sharks were landed on-board and release alive, 5 were caught in the branch line and struck off close to the vessel, and another 5 tangled in the branch line were released dead. The Fiji National Observer Program has increased its coverage of longline vessels from around 3% in 2011 to 8.5% in 2012, 10.1% in 2013, 17.4% in 2014 for FTBOA vessels and 10% in 2014 for other vessels. A factor in increased observer coverage in 2014 was the 100% coverage required for mahi mahi fishing (Fiji 2015b). Fiji's Port Sampling coverage was at 15% for 2012 and 10% for 2013. Having a dedicated port sampler, with both the Fiji National and Regional Observers program observer's assistance, was able to cover vessels with an aim of sampling at least three vessels per week. In addition, 100% of port landings are met by Fiji Fisheries officials. No violations have been reported for FTBOA vessels in 2014.



export by sea or air.

Information on shark catches by major species is collected in logbooks used by the fishery. Information on shark catches is presented in the Fiji Annual Reports to Scientific Committee and is compiled below.

	2011 (#)	2012 (#)	2013 (t)
Blue shark	374	74	12.4
Silky shark	250	41	2.4
Oceanic whitetip	92	14	2.0
Short fin mako	172	43	0.9
Long fin mako	8	1	0.03
Pelagic thresher	3	4	0.03
Porbeagle shark	0	0	0.6
Great hammerhead	3	8	0.2
Winghead shark	0	0	0
Scalloped hammerhead	3	1	0.4
Smooth hammerhead	13	243	0.2
Other sharks	27	44	19.3

As yet, the current standardised SPC log-sheet does not have separations of the two pelagic and bigeye thresher sharks and a separation of the 4 hammerhead shark species. As such, in order to provide for the above table, the Fiji National Observer data on sharks observed were raised to the average weights for sharks logged in the Fiji fishing vessels log sheet.

Fiji Fisheries (Fiji 2015b) have indicated that shark catches and landings have been markedly reduced in recent years. Unfortunately, catches in 2013 are reported in tonnes rather than numbers making comparison with previous years difficult. However, the tonnages reported suggest lower overall shark catches in 2013. No explanation of the high catch of smooth hammerhead sharks in 2013 has been provided except that it was from extrapolated data. Since 2012 the Ministry has improved its reporting processes. It is most unlikely that this was the actual number of smooth hammerhead caught and it is more likely to be an error (pers. comm. SPC).

There has been good progress with the development of a partial strategy of management measures for sharks in place such that the fishery does not hinder recovery and rebuilding of blue shark, short-finned mako, silky and oceanic sharks. However, Year 2 of the CAP requires a preliminary examination of the catch rates of sharks of different species within the FTBOA fishery, and comparison with historical catch rate information. There is some information available from MFF annual reports to WCPFC, however an analysis has not yet been undertaken and this will need to be provided at the next annual audit. The condition is **on target**.

Status of condition

Condition 4 was put in place to address shortcomings in relation to shark species management and the establishment of measures to ensure that the recovery of vulnerable or depleted shark fisheries is not hindered.

At the time of the certification of the fishery the assessment of bigeye tuna indicated that although overfishing was occurring, the species was within biologically-based limits (i.e. above Blim = 0.20 B0). On the basis of management measures introduced by WCPFC it was concluded that SG80 scoring issues were satisfied for bigeye tuna although it was acknowledged that it was too early to quantitatively conclude whether fishing mortality for bigeye tuna had been reduced to the levels required by the Conservation and Management Measure (CMM2008-01) for the species.

An updated assessment of bigeye tuna was undertaken in 2014 (Harley et al. 2014). The assessment concluded that current catches exceed MSY and that recent levels of fishing mortality exceed the level that will support the MSY. The assessment also concluded that

recent levels of spawning potential are most likely at or below the limit reference point of 20%SBF=0 agreed by WCPFC. Catches of bigeye tuna by FTBOA vessels within the Fiji EEZ remain low (approximately 3% of total catches in 2013 and 2014) (Fiji 2015a). Reported catches of bigeye tuna by FOFA vessels which have recently begun operating under an MOU with FTBOA within the Fiji EEZ were approximately 7% of the total EEZ catch for those vessels in 2013 and 2014 (Fiji 2015b) (noting that 2014 catches are provisional).

CMM 2014-01 was adopted at WCPFC11 seeking to further limit fishing mortality of bigeye tuna.

The bigeye fishery is assessed by region. Harley *et al's* (2014) report shows that bigeye interactions in Fiji are lower (Fig.32). Most of the impact on bigeye is through FAD (Fish Aggregrating Device) fisheries. The Fiji fishery is clearly not targeting bigeye. The majority of the bigeye is caught north of 7.5 degrees S in the eastern part of the High Seas.

Given the fishery operates in an area where bigeye is less common, it does not use FADs and catches are low in comparison to the total catch of bigeye by other fisheries the audit team concludes that this fishery has a partial strategy in place and the catch does not hinder the recovery of bigeye. However it is recommended that the bigeye situation is reviewed at the next annual audit.



Table 7: Condition 5

	PI number	Scoring is	sue/ scoring guidepost te	xt	Score
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	2.1.2	Managemen managing re the fishery d irreversible h	ment strategy: There is a strategy in place for ng retained species that is designed to ensure ery does not pose a risk of serious or ble harm to retained species.		75
	SG6	0	SG80	:	SG100
Scoring Guideposts	There are meas place, if necess expected to ma main retained s levels which are likely to be with biologically bas to ensure the fis not hinder their and rebuilding. The measures a considered likel based on plaus argument (e.g., experience, the comparison with fisheries/specie	sures in sary, that are intain the pecies at highly in ed limits, or shery does recovery are ly to work, ible general ory or h similar is).	There is a partial strategy in place, if necessary that is expected to maintain the main retained species at levels which are highly likely to be within biologically based limits, or to ensure the fishery does not hinder their recovery and rebuilding. There is some objective basis for confidence that the partial strategy will work, based on some information directly about the fishery and/or species involved. There is some evidence that the partial strategy is being implemented successfully.	There is a for managi species. The strateg based on in directly abd and/or spe and testing confidence will work. There is clu the strateg implemente and intend occurring. There is so that the stra achieving i objective.	strategy in place ng retained gy is mainly nformation but the fishery cies involved, g supports high that the strategy ear evidence that y is being ed successfully, ed changes are ome evidence ategy is ts overall
Condition	 By the third annual audit the client must provide evidence that: A partial management strategy is in place that maintains bycatch at levels which are highly likely to be within biologically based limits or ensures that the fishery does not hinder their recovery; There is some objective basis that the partial strategy will work; There is some evidence that the partial strategy is being implemented effectively. 				
	Milestones in a	chieving the c	ondition:		
Milestones	 Year 1 (First surveillance audit) A partial strategy and implementation plan should be developed in readiness for the first annual surveillance. Year 2 (Second surveillance audit) Testing and demonstration of the partial strategy and implementation plan should be initiated by the second surveillance audit. Year 3 (Third surveillance audit) The client must provide evidence that: A partial management strategy is in place that maintains bycatch at levels which are highly likely to be within biologically based limits or ensures that the fishery does not hinder their recovery; There is some objective basis that the partial strategy will work; There is some evidence that the partial strategy is being implemented effectively. 				
Client action plan	FTBOA note that stock assessments of shark are currently being performed by SPC on behalf of the WCPFC. These assessments focus initially on oceanic white tip and silky				

shark, with assessments of blue shark and mako to follow. These will give a clearer picture of the status of these species.
It is noted that the long-lived, low fecundity life history of most shark species implies a considerable period of time may be required to quantitatively demonstrate positive impacts of mitigation measures on the wider stock status, and this time period may be beyond the period of certification for some species. Scientific advice will be sought when evaluating the direct effectiveness of FTBOA strategies to mitigate shark bycatch. In the meantime, in collaboration with the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries, the FTBOA have already initiated a shark-mitigation plan to reduce the bycatch of shark during fishing. In
the respective years the client will demonstrate the following to the CAB:
Year 1
1. A formal strategy and implementation plan has already been developed in collaboration with the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries. The Fiji longline licence conditions for 2012 note: "No drop line and shark line is to be carried on board (section 1.3); all licenced vessels fishing in the archipelagic waters, the 12 miles territorial seas and the EEZ are to have on board fins that total no more than 5% of the weight of sharks on board" (section 1.4; consistent with WCPFC decisions).
2. The FTBOA will adopt the use of the shark by species logbook prepared by SPC to provide more detailed and accurate record keep of retained shark by species.
Year 2
Testing the effectiveness of the implemented strategy will be with the support of Fiji Ministry of Fisheries and Forestry observer programme, which combined with the monitoring programme initiated to address Condition 6 will allow a preliminary examination of the catch rates of sharks of different species within the FTBOA fishery, and comparison with historical catch rate information.
Year 3
FTBOA will provide any requested practical assistance for the analysis of observer data to assess the effectiveness of measures to provide verifiable information that measures are demonstrably effective such that the fishery does not hinder recovery and rebuilding.
In years 2 or 3, where deemed scientifically necessary (see above), FTBOA will discuss the implementation of enhanced shark bycatch mitigation measures with the Ministry. These measures may include avoiding particular locations or periods where analyses show fishing leads to a particularly high shark bycatch rate.

under Condition 4 applies here. There are licence conditions to prohibit the use of shark gear (including wire traces) and to have on board fins that total no more than 5% of the weight of sharks on board" (consistent with WCPFC decisions). Vessels are also required to complete the South Pacific Regional Longline logsheet which allows reporting of catches of the major shark species.
The Fiji Fisheries Department and FFA have jointly prepared a National Plan of Action for Sharks (NPOA Sharks) which is awaiting implementation. FTBOA have indicated support for the NPOA in a letter to the Ministry (dated 3 February 2014).

The requirements for this Condition are as per Condition 4, above. Progress reported

Conditionfor the NPOA in a letter to the Ministry (dated 3 February 2014).[Year 1]The Ministry have also indicated that industry will be informed of the CMM relating to
silky shark which comes into force on 1 July 2014 (CMM 2013-08).

In their submission to the audit, WWF indicated that they conducted a project in partnership with FTBOA to support the implementation of field activities to reduce bycatch in Fiji's longline tuna fishing industry (WWF 2014). One aspect of this work has been the deployment of a WWF observer on Solander Pacific fishing vessels to document bycatch mitigation practices being implemented by the company. Another aspect was a 1-day workshop in which several FTBOA companies participated.

Progress on

	Emphasis was placed on learning the use of turtle de-hooking devices; understanding critical bycatch issues in Fiji's tuna longline fisheries, including sensitive shark species, and bycatch best practice on board fishing vessels. Further information is given in the WWF submission (WWF 2014).
Progress on Condition [Year 2]	 See FTBOA client summary of progress at Appendix 4 (FTBOA 2015). NB. There is some confusion in the wording of this condition in that it refers to bycatch when it should refer to retained species. This will be amended for next years audit. Information provided above for Condition 4 is relevant here. FTBOA has made significant steps to mitigate and reduce shark bycatch and have given support to the adoption of the Fiji NPOA Sharks. FTBOA has implemented a partial strategy and implementation plan for sharks in collaboration with the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries. There are licence conditions to prohibit the use of shark gear (including wire traces) and to have on board fins that total no more than 5% of the weight of sharks on board" (consistent with WCPFC decisions). Vessels are also required to complete the South Pacific Regional Longline logsheet which allows reporting of catches of the major shark species. FTBOA vessels are required to adhere to several CMMs that have been adopted by WCPFC in relation to sharks. CMM-2011-04 prohibiting retention of oceanic whitetip shark is in place and CMM-2013-08 prohibiting retention of silky shark comes into force from 1 July 2014. CMM 2014-05 requires CCMs to ensure that vessels either a) do not use or carry wire trace as branch lines or leaders; or b) do not use branch lines running directly off the longline floats or drop lines, known as shark lines. Measures currently in place for the FTBOA are compliant with this CMM.
Status of condition	As with Condition 4, this condition requires a preliminary examination of the catch rates of sharks of different species within the FTBOA fishery, and comparison with historical catch rate information. This will need to be presented at the next annual audit. Overall the progress on this condition is on target



Table 8: Condition 6

	PI number(s)	Scoring is	ssue/ scoring guidepost te	ext	Score
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	2.1.3	Information / monitoring: Information on the nature and extent of retained species is adequate to determine the risk posed by the fishery and the effectiveness of the strategy to manage retained species.			75
	SG60		SG80	SG	G100
Scoring Guideposts	Qualitative inform available on the main retained sp taken by the fish Information is ad qualitatively asse outcome status w respect to biolog based limits. Information is ad support measure manage main ret species.	nation is amount of ecies ery. equate to ess vith ically equate to es to tained	Qualitative information and some quantitative information are available on the amount of main retained species taken by the fishery. Information is sufficient to estimate outcome status with respect to biologically based limits. Information is adequate to support a partial strategy to manage main retained species. Sufficient data continue to be collected to detect any increase in risk level (e.g. due to changes in the outcome indicator scores or the operation of the fishery or the effectiveness of the strategy).	Accurate and information is the catch of a species and t consequence status of affe populations. Information is quantitatively outcome stat degree of cer Information is support a cor strategy to m retained spec evaluate with of certainty w strategy is ac objective. Monitoring of species is co sufficient deta ongoing mort	I verifiable s available on all retained the es for the cted s sufficient to r estimate us with a high rtainty. s adequate to mprehensive anage cies, and a high degree thether the chieving its f retained nducted in ail to assess talities to all cies.
Condition	By the third annual audit the client must provide evidence that information is adequate to support a partial strategy to manage main retained species, or detect any increase in risk. The information collected must be sufficient to estimate outcome status with respect to biologically based limits.				
Milestones	 Milestones in achieving the condition require that the client provide evidence to show that: Year 1 (First surveillance audit) A formal monitoring plan has been developed in readiness for the first annual surveillance. Year 2 (Second surveillance audit) The formal monitoring plan is finalised and initiated at least three months before the second surveillance audit, with initial outputs available to the surveillance team. Year 3 (Third surveillance audit) Information is adequate to support a partial strategy to manage main retained species, or detect any increase in risk. The information collected must be sufficient to estimate outcome status with respect to biologically based limits. 				
Client action plan	To address this o	condition the	FTBOA will demonstrate the fo	bllowing to the	CAB.

	Year 1
	In discussion with the Fiji Ministry, FTBOA will implement a formal shark bycatch monitoring plan. This will support the planned expansion of the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries and Forestry observer programme, and ensure observers have access to FTBOA vessels. In liaison with the Fiji Ministry, FFA and SPC, FTBOA will help develop an on- board monitoring plan across all FTBOA vessels that is consistent with the quantitative data collection process of the Ministry observers. This will allow the number and fate of bycatch sharks to be assessed. This will be based on the adoption of a by species logbook to monitor shark landings. Year 2
	The monitoring will then be implemented across the FTBOA fleet where observers are not present. In liaison with the Fiji Ministry, FFA and SPC, the results of the monitoring will be collated for the second surveillance audit.
	In the third year, the data collection programme will continue, with annual review of the results developed in collaboration with the Fiji Ministry.
	I his data collection programme will be continued in subsequent years, as required.
Progress on Condition [Year 1]	Comments shown under Conditions 4 and 5 are applicable here. FTBOA has implemented a partial strategy and implementation plan for sharks in collaboration with the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries. The Fiji longline licence conditions state: "No drop line and shark line is to be carried on board" (section 1.3); "all licensed vessels fishing in the archipelagic waters, the 12 miles territorial seas and the EEZ are to have on board fins that total no more than 5% of the weight of sharks on board" (section 1.4; consistent with WCPFC decisions). Vessels are also required to complete the South Pacific Regional Longline logsheet which allows reporting of catches of the major shark species (blue shark, hammerhead, mako, oceanic whitetip, porbeagle, silky and thresher sharks; the logbook has fields for number retained, kg retained and number discarded). The Fiji Fisheries Department and FFA have jointly prepared a National Plan of Action for Sharks (NPOA Sharks) which is awaiting implementation. FTBOA have indicated support for the NPOA in a letter to the Ministry (dated 3 February 2014). The Ministry have also indicated that industry will be informed of the CMM relating to silky shark which comes into force on 1 July 2014 (CMM 2013-08). FTBOA have cooperated with the Ministry with increased levels of observer coverage (8.5% in 2012) and monitoring of all landings. FTBOA have also cooperated with other initiatives, e.g. WWF filed activities to reduce bycatch in the fishery (WWF 2014).
Progress on Condition [Year 2]	See FTBOA client summary of progress at Appendix 4 (FTBOA 2015). Comments shown under Conditions 4 and 5 are again applicable here. The client states that the percentage of retained species is comparatively low and has remained so over the years. With the EEZ licenced "cap" set at 60 and poor economic returns fishing effort within the Fiji zone has decreased in the last year. In Fiji the retained species are a valuable food fish for the local population in addition to the traditional export varieties. As indicated above, FTBOA has implemented a partial strategy and implementation plan for sharks in collaboration with the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries. FTBOA have cooperated with the Ministry with increased levels of observer coverage and monitoring of landings. FTBOA have also cooperated with other initiatives, e.g. WWF field activities to reduce bycatch in the fishery (WWF 2014). The available information is adequate to support a partial strategy to manage the main shark bycatch species. Increased observer data should allow a more detailed examination though this has not yet been undertaken. The CAP requires a formal shark bycatch monitoring plan to be implemented. Whilst there is no single document that can be described as a formal plan, elements which would constitute a plan have been implemented. The Fiji National Observer Program has been expanded. In 2012, funding was secured to implement a training program and to further its trainee certification process (Fiji 2013). Observer data is entered into Fiji's



	harmonised observer data summary for further analysis with respect to reporting purposes and compliance. All available observer data sets have been forwarded to the SPC for further analysis. Fiji's TDMP indicates a goal of 10% observer coverage by the end of the life of the Plan (2018) with a target of 40 observers who are to be trained each year to meet requirements of the both the FFA & WCPFC Regional Observer Programs. Fiji Fisheries indicated that there are currently 8 national observers and 27 regional observers available. Observer coverage of 10.1% was achieved in 2013, 17.4% for FTBOA vessels in 2014 and 10% for other vessels in 2014. Information on shark catches by major species is collected in logbooks used by the fishery. A summary of shark catches is presented in the Fiji Annual Report to the Commission. In addition, 100% of port landings are met by Fiji Fisheries officials.
Status of condition	FTBOA has made significant steps to mitigate and reduce shark bycatch and have given support to the adoption of the Fiji NPOA Sharks. FTBOA fishers are using the SPC logsheet to record shark catches. The milestone requires the results of the monitoring that has been developed will be collated for the second surveillance audit. There has been some collation of information presented in MFF annual reports to WCPFC. More information will be required to support the progress at the next annual audit. The condition is on target .



Table 9: Condition 7

	PI number	Scoring	issue/ scoring guidepost	text	Score
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	2.3.3	Informatio Relevant i managem including: • ir n • ir th • ir th • o	n / monitoring nformation is collected to supp ent of fishery impacts on ETP s nformation for the development nanagement strategy; nformation to assess the effecti he management strategy; and nformation to determine the out of ETP species.	ort the species, t of the tveness of tcome status	60
	SG60		SG80	SG	G100
Scoring Guideposts	Information is ade broadly understan impact of the fishe ETP species. Information is ade support measures manage the impac ETP species. Information is suff qualitatively estim fishery related mo ETP species.	quate to d the ery on quate to to cts on icient to ate the rtality of	Information is sufficient to determine whether the fishery may be a threat to protection and recovery of the ETP species, and if so, to measure trends and support a full strategy to manage impacts. Sufficient data are available to allow fishery related mortality and the impact of fishing to be quantitatively estimated for ETP species.	Information is quantitatively outcome stat degree of cer Information is support a cor strategy to m impacts, mini and injury of and evaluate degree of cer a strategy is objectives. Accurate and information is the magnitud impacts, mor injuries and the consequence status of ETF	s sufficient to r estimate us with a high tainty. s adequate to mprehensive anage imize mortality ETP species, with a high tainty whether achieving its I verifiable s available on e of all talities and he s for the p species
Condition	By the third annual audit the client must provide evidence that a reporting system to record the occurrence and outcome of all interactions with sea turtles and seabirds has been developed at the fleet level to determine whether the fishery may be a threat to protection and recovery of the ETP species, and if so, to measure trends and support a full strategy to manage impacts. The data that is collected should be sufficient to allow fishery related mortality and the impact of fishing to be quantitatively estimated for ETP species.				
Milestones	 Milestones in achieving this end require that the client provide evidence to show that: Year 1 (First surveillance audit) That a formal monitoring plan has been developed in readiness for the first annual surveillance. Year 2 (Second surveillance audit) The formal monitoring plan is finalised and initiated at least three months before the second surveillance audit, with initial outputs available to the surveillance team. Year 3 (Third surveillance audit) 		show that: he first annual onths before veillance nreat to		

-			
In	te	rt	
	ite		

	protection and recovery of the ETP species, and if so, to measure trends and support a full strategy to manage impacts
	 Sufficient data are available to allow fishery related mortality and the impact of fishing to be quantitatively estimated for ETP species.
	Year 1 In discussion with the Fiji Ministry, FTBOA will implement a formal ETP bycatch
Client action plan	monitoring plan, consistent with the shark bycatch monitoring plan developed to address Condition 6. This will support the planned expansion of the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries and Forestry observer programme, and ensure observers have access to FTBOA vessels. In liaison with the Fiji Ministry, FFA and SPC, FTBOA will help develop an on-board monitoring plan across all FTBOA vessels that is consistent with the quantitative data collection process of the Ministry observers. This will allow the number and fate of ETP species to be assessed. Year 2
	FTBOA will trial the on-board monitoring approach on a sub-set of vessels, and adjust the programme as required based on practical feedback from the crew. The monitoring will then be implemented across the FTBOA fleet where observers are not present. In liaison with the Fiji Ministry, FFA and SPC, the results of the monitoring will be collated for the second surveillance audit. Year 3
	In the third year, the data collection programme will continue, with annual review of the results developed in collaboration with the Fiji Ministry. This data collection programme will be continued in subsequent years, as required.
	Comments shown under Condition 6 are applicable here. The CAP requires a formal
Progress on Condition	ETP bycatch monitoring plan to be implemented. Whilst there is no single document that can be described as a formal plan, elements which would constitute a plan have been implemented. FTBOA have cooperated with the Ministry with increased levels of observer coverage (8.5% in 2012) and monitoring of all landings. In 2012, funding was secured to implement a training program and to further its trainee certification process (Fiji 2013). These observers, having met the criterion of the SPC/FFA certification were immediately deployed to long line vessels fishing in Fiji's EEZ area and the adjacent and surrounding High Seas pockets. Observer data is entered into Fiji's harmonised observer data summary for further analysis with respect to reporting purposes and compliance. All available observer data sets up to and including 2012 have been forwarded to the SPC for further analysis. Fiji's draft TDMP indicates a goal of 10% observer coverage by the end of the life of the Plan (2018) with a target of 40 observers who are to be trained each year to meet requirements of the both the FFA & WCPFC Regional Observer Programs. Fiji Fisheries indicated that there are currently 8 national observers and 29 regional observers available.
[Year 1]	FTBOA have also cooperated with other initiatives, e.g. WWF field activities to reduce
	bycatch in the fishery (WWF 2014). This included deployment of a WWF observer on Solander Pacific longline fishing vessels (48 days at sea on 3 Solander Pacific Limited longliners to observer and document bycatch mitigation practices being implemented by the company. WWF are also working with Solander Pacific to develop bycatch best practice guidelines. Several FTBOA companies participated in a 1-day workshop with emphasis on learning the use of turtle de-hooking devises and understanding critical bycatch issues in Fiji's tuna longline fisheries. WWF also report that Solander Pacific, on behalf of FTBOA, twice requested turtle and shark ID cards to be placed on board all their fishing boats (the cards were sourced from the SPC Noumea and provided to Solander and other participants in the workshop). FTBOA have also cooperated with other initiatives, e.g. WWF filed activities to reduce
	bycatch in the fishery (WWF 2014). A simple analysis of the sub-set of FTBOA trip data that has been entered at SPC as of January 2014 indicates 3 or fewer turtle interactions in each of the past four years (none in 2011). WWF also report (WWF 2014) that FTBOA

	has voluntarily supported research on whale depredation by supporting the investigation of the effectiveness of prototype physical depredation mitigation devices for mitigating depredation by and by-catch of toothed whales in South Pacific pelagic longline fisheries.
	See FTBOA client summary of progress at Appendix 4 (FTBOA 2015).
	Comments made against this condition at the 1 st surveillance audit are again applicable. Although there is no single document that can be described as a formal plan as required by the CAP, elements which would constitute a plan have been implemented. FTBOA have cooperated with the Ministry with increased levels of observer coverage and monitoring of all landings. In 2012, funding was secured to implement a training program and to further the observer trainee certification process. All available observer data sets have been forwarded to the SPC for further analysis. Fiji's draft TDMP indicates a goal of 10% observer coverage by the end of the life of the Plan (2018) with a target of 40 observers who are to be trained each year to meet requirements of the both the FFA & WCPFC Regional Observer Programs. Fiji Fisheries indicated that there are currently 8 national observers and 27 regional observers available. Observer coverage in 2013 was 10.1% and in 2014 was 17.4%.
	FTBOA have also cooperated with other initiatives, e.g. WWF field activities to reduce bycatch in the fishery (WWF 2014). This included deployment of a WWF observer on Solander Pacific longline fishing vessels (48 days at sea on 3 Solander Pacific Limited longliners to observer and document bycatch mitigation practices being implemented by the company. WWF are also working with Solander Pacific to develop bycatch best practice guidelines. In 2014, several FTBOA companies participated in a 1-day workshop with emphasis on learning the use of turtle de-hooking devises and understanding critical bycatch issues in Fiji's tuna longline fisheries. FTBOA have also cooperated with other initiatives, e.g. WWF field activities to reduce
	bycatch in the fishery (WWF 2014).
Progress on Condition	Client action by Year 2 is to provide a monitoring plan of ETP species. The extended SPC log book, as used by FTBOA vessels, has a section devoted to "species of interest" (SOSI)". The ETP species are included in this section. (See FTBOA Appendix 3)
[Year 2]	WWF also report (WWF 2014) that FTBOA has voluntarily supported research on whale depredation by supporting the investigation of the effectiveness of prototype physical depredation mitigation devices for mitigating depredation by and by-catch of toothed whales in South Pacific pelagic longline fisheries.
	The whale depredation research project using PDMDs has been discontinued through lack of funds. Funding has now been confirmed for an FAO Electronic Monitoring (EM) programme to proceed in 2015. Fiji is the pilot nation for application of the FAO ABNJ camera system on longline vessels. It is anticipated that at least five vessels will be fitted with camera systems under the FAO ABNJ project in 2015. In addition the "Trident" electronic system is already fitted on two FTBOA vessels. All vessels are required to carry the FFA VMS and this is strictly monitored. In June 2013, Sea Quest a client member, entered a partnership with WWF to demonstrate full transparency of the company's fishing operations of the MSC- certified Albacore tuna fishery. Eight Automatic Identification System (AIS) transmitters were installed and activated round- the-clock on the tuna fishing vessels to track and monitor fishing activities. The AIS, an automatic tracking system normally used by vessel traffic services to identify and locate ships, is a supplier of satellite data useful for retracing and evaluating fishing and trans- shipping operations on the water. WWF, through its 'Smart Fishing Initiative', uses and promotes the system as a way to monitor global fisheries activities in order to make fisheries more transparent and efficiently managed. The cooperation with WWF shows that this fishery is willing to make their fishing operations traceable and that they assume a leading role in creating transparency on the seas. Fiji Annual Reports to WCPFC provide information on ETP interactions. The 2014 report (Fiji 2014) states that the Fiji Fisheries Offshore Division has ensured that all Fiji licensed long line fishing vessels are using circle hooks and also that industry stake holders were
	made trained on the proper mitigation and turtle handling techniques, such as the
Intertek

	techniques used when using a turtle de-hooker and also cutting the line close to the mouth when a turtle has swallowed a hook instead of de-hooking it. Turtle mitigation devices such as turtle de-hookers have been assigned to licensed vessels from the beginning of the 2012 and posters of the proper means by which to handle sea turtles and turtle identification booklets were made available to fishing companies at the beginning of the 2012 licensing period. Table 4A of the 2014 Annual report shows observation of turtle interaction from 2009 to 2013. There were 6 turtle interactions observed in 2012, with 3 of these reported as dead. Interactions increased in 2013 to 41 with 15 reported dead. Table 4B of the Annual Report shows the observed incidences of vessel interactions and sightings of marine mammals by observers whilst on placement from 2009 to the 2013. These interactions were of marine mammals were swimming in nearby schools or taking bait fish that is thrown back into the sea. In 2012 there was a single monitored instance of a dead whale where a false killer whale was found entangled in the mainline during a set. No mortalities were recorded in 2013, however the number of reported interactions increased from 17 in 2012 to 208 in 2013. The MSC assessment for this fishery identified seabirds interactions as "very rare" and noted that at present all boats in the FTBOA utilize deep setting longline fishing strategies and weighted branch lines in addition to setting primarily during the early morning darkness, consistent with WCPFC CMM-2007-04. The Annual Report indicates that no seabirds were caught in 2011, however a total of 8 seabird interactions were reported for 2013. Of these, 4 were reported as albatrosses, 3 of which were sighted flying above the set, whilst 1 was caught on a hook and was discarded. The other 4 of the seabirds that were paice sighted were perters: 3 were caught hooked in the
	abdomen during hauling and were discarded dead, whilst 1 was entangled in the branch line.It is not clear from the information available whether the increased interactions reported for turtles, marine mammals and seabirds is a direct result of increased observer coverage.
Status of condition	The Year 2 requirement of the CAP is that "FTBOA will trial the on-board monitoring approach on a sub-set of vessels, and adjust the programme as required based on practical feedback from the crew. The monitoring will then be implemented across the FTBOA fleet where observers are not present. In liaison with the Fiji Ministry, FFA and SPC, the results of the monitoring will be collated for the second surveillance audit." FTBOA has made significant steps to report interactions and to mitigate and reduce interactions with ETP species. FTBOA fishers are using the extended SPC logsheet to report ETP interactions cord shark catches and there has been ongoing collaboration on projects to mitigate ETP interactions. However, it is not clear that the requirements identified in the CAP for Year 2 have been addressed. There has been some collation of information presented in MFF annual reports to WCPFC, however this is insufficient to meet the Year 2 requirements and the condition is behind target . It is thought likely that sufficient information is being collected to satisfy the requirements of this condition, however there is a need to collate the available information to present it at the next surveillance audit. The client must ensure that the agreed milestone is met by the next annual audit. In the event that this condition is not back 'on target' by the next audit, section 7.23.13.2 of CR v2.0 shall be applied, progress will be considered to be inadequate and the certification will be liable to suspension.



Table 10: Condition 8

	PI number	Scoring issue/ scoring guidepost text Score			Score
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	3.2.3	Compliance Monitoring, o ensure the fi enforced and	ance and enforcement ring, control and surveillance mechanisms the fishery's management measures are ad and complied with.		
	SG6	0	SG80	;	SG100
Scoring Guideposts	Monitoring, control and surveillance mechanisms exist, are implemented in the fishery under assessment and there is a reasonable expectation that they are effective. Sanctions to deal with non- compliance exist and there is some evidence that they are applied. Fishers are generally thought to comply with the management system for the fishery under assessment, including, when required, providing information of importance to the effective management of the fishery.		A monitoring, control and surveillance system has been implemented in the fishery under assessment and has demonstrated an ability to enforce relevant management measures, strategies and/or rules. Sanctions to deal with non- compliance exist, are consistently applied and thought to provide effective deterrence. Some evidence exists to demonstrate fishers comply with the management system under assessment, including, when required, providing information of importance to the effective management of the fishery. There is no evidence of systematic non-compliance.	A comprehensive monitoring, control and surveillance system has been implemented in the fishery under assessment and has demonstrated a consistent ability to enforce relevant management measures, strategies and/or rules. Sanctions to deal with non- compliance exist, are consistently applied and demonstrably provide effective deterrence. There is a high degree of confidence that fishers comply with the management system under assessment, including, providing information of importance to the effective management of the fishery.	
Condition	By the third annual audit the client must provide evidence that sanctions that deal with noncompliance are consistently applied.				
Milestones	 Milestones in achieving this require that the client provide evidence of: Year 1 (First surveillance audit). By the first surveillance audit the client must, provide evidence of progress towards reporting on regulatory compliance within the FTBOA fishery Year 2 (Second surveillance audit) By the second surveillance audit, the client must provide evidence that the monitoring, control and surveillance mechanisms work together to form part of a system, and demonstrate an ability to enforce relevant management measures, strategies and/or rules. Year 3 (Third surveillance audit) By the third annual audit the client must provide evidence that sanctions that deal with noncompliance are consistently applied. 				
Client action plan	Fisheries and Forest, and the FTBOA will continue to work closely with the relevant Fiji Ministries in this regard. Where necessary, requests will be made of the FFA and/or WCPFC via the Ministry for required information.				



	In the respective years the client will demonstrate the following to the CAB: Year 1
	By the first surveillance audit the client must, provide evidence of progress towards reporting on regulatory compliance within the FTBOA fishery.
	At the second audit, using available information the client will provide an audit report summarising regulatory compliance within the FTBOA fishery. This will detail any incidences of non-compliance within the fishery under certification, how non-compliance was identified (based on data generated from the logbook, observer and inspection programmes in place), and the outcomes (including sanctions applied), in order to examine both consistency and the functionality of existing MCS programmes. This will be performed in collaboration with relevant Fiji Ministries.
	The output will demonstrate whether the MCS system operating has demonstrable ability to enforce relevant management measures, strategies and/or rules, and that any sanctions applied have been consistent.
	At the third annual audit the client will provide a report examining the performance of any vessels within the unit of certification subsequent to the application of any sanctions, providing evidence that regulatory measures have reduced any systematic non-compliance within the fishery under certification. Again, this will be developed in collaboration with relevant Fiji Ministries.
	If any areas of systematic non-compliance are identified, regulatory measures, based on recommendations from Managers, will be instituted in order to reduce the amount of non-compliance, and reports of performance presented at subsequent audits.
	Fiji adopted updated fisheries legislation with the Offshore Fisheries Management Decree (OFMD), passed in January 2013. This decree gives the Government of Fiji a comprehensive range of duties, responsibilities, functions and powers to regulate and sustainably manage offshore fisheries. The decree established robust licensing systems and conditions for allocating, refusing or suspending licences are described. The decree envisages that the most important fisheries will be managed through Fisheries Management Plans. There are also detailed monitoring, control and surveillance provisions that not only describe the powers of fisheries officers and the government, but also contain protection for fishers to ensure that the procedures are applied fairly. FTBOA provided evidence of their engagement, formal and informal, with the Ministry of Fisheries and Forests in the development of the OFMD.
Progress on Condition Year 1]	FTBOA also provided evidence of meetings with the Ministry to consult on the Fiji Tuna Development and Management Plan 2014-2018 (TDMP). FFA has provided input to the development of the TDMP. The draft TDMP has not been officially adopted but is expected to be considered by the Fiji Cabinet in the near future. The current draft of the Plan indicates that Fiji's longline fishery will be managed under clearly defined limits, including a cap on the number of vessels, a total allowable catch (TAC) across all target tuna species, and a TAC for South Pacific albacore. The draft Plan also indicates that suggested limits are based on extensive stakeholder consultations and informed by outcomes of the Fiji's longline fishery bio-economic assessment and the current state of tuna stocks.
	Fiji is currently in the final stages of reviewing the National Plan of Action (NPOA) on Illegal Unreported and Unregulated fishing (NPOA-IUU). This has been jointly prepared by the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries and Forests, the Fiji Offshore Fisheries Division and FFA. The document is intended to support the implementation of a monitoring, control and surveillance system within Fiji. Fiji's NPOA-IUU closely follows the structure of the IPOA-IUU and focuses principally on tuna fisheries. Consequently, considerable importance is attached to the role of RFMOs in fisheries management, particularly with respect to high seas fisheries management. It is expected that the NPOA-IUU will gain final approval in



	coming months. In its submission to the audit, WWF WCP indicated that one of the FTBOA members, Sea Quest (Fiji) Ltd, voluntarily engaged with WWF in a pilot of the Automatic Identification System (AIS) (WWF 2014). AIS is an automatic tracking system used on ships and by vessel traffic services for identifying and locating vessels by electronically exchanging data with other nearby ships with the potential to provide transparency in the operations of vessels at sea.
Progress on	See FTBOA client summary of progress at Appendix 4 (FTBOA 2015). The client reports that anecdotal evidence is that any breach of regulations, however slight, and as reported by observers or MFF officials is judicially followed up and that corrective action notices (CARs) have been issued. The Offshore Fisheries Management Regulations (OFMR) that form part of the Offshore Fisheries Management Decree (OFMD) were introduced into law in June 2014. MFF have held stakeholder consultations and meetings to explain requirements of the OFMR. The client suggests that Fiji maintains a rigid policing control over the movement of fishing vessels within the EEZ. No Fiji flagged fishing vessel is allowed to leave port without a "Marine Checkers" inspection. Weekly position reports are required of all vessels and 24 hours' notice of landings provided to MFF. The OFMR require MFF approvals for bunkering and provisioning.
[Year 2]	The legislation changes mentioned above are seen as having positive outcomes for the management regime of the longline fishery. In 2013 the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries and Forests gained additional funding to employ 25 new staff to help them monitor illegal, unreported and unauthorised fishing in offshore fishing areas. Four of these officers are assigned to a newly created investigations team. The government states that it demonstrates their commitment to international obligations and policy objectives supporting sustainable development. Increased observer coverage and monitoring of all landings indicates an increased commitment by Fiji to strengthen MCS arrangements. Fiji Fisheries staff reported no major instances of non-compliance in the past year. Increased staff levels within the Fiji Ministry and the formation of an investigations team shows a greater commitment to MCS. There appears to be good cooperation between the Ministry and FTBOA members.
Status of condition	As with other conditions, significant steps have been taken to satisfy the requirements of this condition. The Fiji Ministry of Fisheries have made major advances in adding to their MCS team in recent years. Indications are that there have been no major instances of non-compliance in the past year. At the next annual surveillance a written report form the Ministry will be required The condition is on target .

Conclusion

Summary of Findings

IFC confirm that this fishery continues to meet the MSC certification requirements and remains certified. Eight conditions remain open. Two conditions were found to be behind target - Condition 2 (PI 1.2.1) and Condition 7 (PI 2.3.3). The client must ensure that the agreed year 2 milestone for both these conditions is met by the next annual audit. In the event that these conditions are not back 'on target' by the next audit, section 7.23.13.2 of CR v2.0 shall be applied, progress will be considered to be inadequate and the certification is liable to suspension.



References

Fiji (2014). Annual Report to the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission. Part 1: Information on Fisheries, Research and Statistics 2013. WCPFC Scientific Committee, Tenth Regular Session, Majuro, Republic of the Marshall Islands, 6-14 August 2014. WCPFC-SC10-AR/CCM-07.

Fiji (2015a). Submission to Annual Audit for Fiji Tuna Boat Owners Association longline fishery by Fiji Ministry of Fisheries and Forests, Offshore Fisheries Division, 2015.

Fiji (2015b). Additional submission to Annual Audit for Fiji Tuna Boat Owners Association longline fishery by Fiji Ministry of Fisheries and Forests, Offshore Fisheries Division, 2015 (initially submitted 4 March 2015 and amended 19 March 2015).

FTBOA. (2014). Notes on documentation supplied for the first audit of the FTBOA MSC certification. Report prepared on behalf of the Fiji Tuna Boat Owners Association.

FTBOA. (2015). Fiji Tuna Boat Owners Association (FTBOA) Client Action Report to the 2nd year surveillance on MSC certification of Southern Albacore (longline caught) within the Fiji EEZ. Report prepared on behalf of the Fiji Tuna Boat Owners Association.

Harley, S.J., Berger, A.M., Pilling, G.M., Davies, N. and Hampton, J. (2012). Evaluation of stock status of south Pacific albacore, bigeye, skipjack, and yellowfin tunas and southwest Pacific striped marlin against potential limit reference points. WCPFC-SC8-2012/MI-WP-01_rev1.

Harley, S. and P. Williams. (2013). A compendium of fisheries indicators for bigeye, skipjack, yellowfin, and south Pacific albacore tunas. Scientific Committee Ninth Regular Session, Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia, 6-14 August 2013. WCPFC-SC9-2013/SA-WP-06.

Harley, S., Davies, N., Hampton, J., & McKechnie, S. (2014). Stock assessment of bigeye tuna in the Western and Central Pacific. Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Oceanic Fisheries Programme. WCPFC-SC10-2014/SA-WP-01 Rev1 25 July.

Hoyle, S. (2011). Stock assessment of albacore tuna in the South Pacific Ocean. Scientific Committee Seventh Regular Session, Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia, 9-17 August 2011. WCPFC-SC7-2011/SA-WP-06.

Hoyle, S., Hampton, J. and Davies, N. (2012). Stock assessment of albacore tuna in the South Pacific Ocean. Scientific Committee Eighth Regular Session, 7-15 August 2012, Busan, Republic of Korea. WCPFC-SC8-2012/SA-WP-04-Rev1.

Pilling G.M., Harley S.J., Williams, P., Hampton, J. and the WCPFC Secretariat. (2014). Trends in the south Pacific albacore longline and troll fisheries. Scientific Committee Tenth Regular Session, Majuro, Republic of the Marshall Islands, 6-14 August 2014. WCPFC-SC10-2014/SA-WP-07 Rev 1.

WCPFC, 2012. Management Objectives Workshop, Report. WCPFC9 2012-14.

WCPFC, 2013a. Summary Report. Commission for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean. Tenth Regular Session, Cairns, Australia, 2-6 December 2013.

WCPFC, 2013b. Second Management Objectives Workshop, Report of the expert working group. Management objectives, performance indicators and reference points. WCPFC10 2013-15b.

WCPFC, 2014a. Summary Report. Commission for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean. Eleventh Regular Session, Apia, Samoa, 1-5 December 2014.



WCPFC, 2014b. FFA Member's Proposed Replacement for the Conservation and Management Measure for South Pacific Albacore. Eleventh Regular Session, Apia, Samoa, 1-5 December 2014.WCPFC11-2014-DP05.

WCPFC, 2014c. Report on the Third Management Objectives Workshop, Apia, Samoa, 28th November 2014. MOW3-WINF-02.

WCPFC, 2014d. Compatibility and consequences of alternative potential Target Reference Points for the south Pacific albacore stock. Working paper for Third Management Objectives Workshop. MOW3-WP/06 14, Nov 2014

WCPFC-SC, 2013. Summary Report. The Commission for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean. Scientific Committee. Ninth Regular Session, 6-14 August 2013, Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia.

WCPFC-SC, 2014. Summary Report. The Commission for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean. Scientific Committee Tenth Regular Session, Majuro, Republic of the Marshall Islands, 6-14 August 2014.

Williams, P. and Terawasi, P. (2012). Overview of Tuna Fisheries in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean, Including Economic Conditions – 2011. WCPFC-SC8-2012/GN WP-1.

WWF, 2014. WWF Position on the FTBOA 1st Surveillance Audit Progress Assessment. Submitted to Audit team by WWF South Pacific, Suva, 11 February 2014.



Appendix 1. Re-scoring evaluation tables (if necessary)

Scoring for PI 1.2.2 against Certification Requirements v2.0.

The following update was issued by MSC on 24th November 2015:

"Following examination by ASI of a complaint raised by a Stakeholder, MSC is aware that there has been some variability in the interpretation and scoring of PI 1.2.2 (CR v1.3, v1.2, v1.1). A number of certified fisheries have been scored as meeting 1.2.2 scoring issue (c) using an interpretation that harvest control tools are available but not necessarily in use within the fishery, which was not in accordance with the requirements in CR v1.3. This incorrect interpretation has not been used by all CABs or assessment teams.

The issue of HCRs was debated between all stakeholders during the recent Fishery Standard Review (2013-2014), and resulted in MSC's new fisheries standard version 2.0 (1 October 2014) providing clarification as well as additional explicit requirements for scoring PI1.2.2. Version 2.0 maintains the previous general requirement whereby a 60 score can be achieved by the HCR being 'generally understood and in place' but also allows HCRs to be only 'available' in the specific situation that the stock has been above B_{MSY} for a recent period of time and is not expected to decline below B_{MSY} in the medium term (i.e. where $B > B_{MSY}$ and $F < F_{MSY}$; and in some other special cases). However, to be 'available' HCRs must be effectively used in some other fisheries under the control of the management body, or there must be an agreement in place to adopt an HCR before the stock declines to B_{MSY} .

MSC advises that to avoid promulgation of the incorrect interpretation of PI1.2.2 under v1.3 (or earlier versions) and also to avoid conflicting harmonization conclusions between fisheries using v1.3 and v2.0, any CABs that identify certified or in-assessment fisheries scored using v1.3 or earlier that they consider have used the early misinterpretation of PI1.2.2 may rescore them using the clarified requirements set out in PI1.2.2 version 2.0. Scoring justification should be made explicitly addressing paragraphs SA2.5.2-2.5.3 and SA2.5.5-2.5.7.1 and associated guidance from v2.0, as related to the scoring of the SG60 level in scoring issues (a) and (c). CABs should advise MSC for which fisheries they intend to do this.

In order to avoid disruption to fisheries and CAB activities, MSC advises CABs to undertake this activity at an early opportunity, including for instance at their next surveillance audit, but that an expedited audit may not be necessary. Harmonisation discussions should be held where appropriate between CABs in the case of overlapping fisheries.

These changes should only affect the SG60 scoring level. MSC does not expect that any changes to conditions or action plans should result from this action.

In order to avoid complications of harmonisation between different versions of the standard, MSC strongly advises any fishery for which the above solution is adopted to apply Version 2.0 in its entirety at the next reassessment. In particular, CABs should note that the v2.0 guidance recognizes that the timescales for closing out conditions may be relaxed in the case that stock abundance remains high (above B_{MSY} levels, again with the expectation that it will not decline rapidly, i.e. $F < F_{MSY}$) and HCRs are regarded as 'available' but not yet 'well defined' (see guidance in FCR section GSA2.5.2-2.5.5, page 397). CABs should note that extensions to existing PI1.2.2 condition timelines beyond a recertification date on the basis of this guidance shall only be accepted for fisheries undertaking reassessment against v2.0 in its entirety.



Fisheries completing their conditions at reassessment will no longer need to apply the 2.0 interpretation to PI 1.2.2 and may continue to undertake reassessment against v1.3, if applicable (i.e. if reassessment takes place before 1 October 2017).

To assist CABs in considering this request, MSC is able to provide listings of fisheries and the scoring rationales that have been provided by CABs, for PI 1.2.2 or other PIs as requested. Please let us know if you would like MSC to assist in this or any other way."

The above applies to the Fiji albacore longline fishery and so in the course of this surveillance audit, PI 1.2.2 has been evaluated using CR v2.0. The following text is extracted from CR v2.0:

Component	Ы	Scoring issues	SG60	SG80	SG100
Harvest strategy	Harvest control rules and tools 1.2.2 There are well defined and effective harvest control rules (HCRs) in place.	(a) HCRs design and application	Generally understood HCRs are in place or available that are expected to reduce the exploitation rate as the point of recruitment impairment (PRI) is approached.	Well defined HCRs are in place 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, or for key LTL species a level consistent with ecosystem needs.	The HCRs are expected to keep the stock fluctuating at or above a target level consistent with MSY, or another more appropriate level taking into account the ecological role of the stock, most of the time.
		(b) HCRs robustness to uncertainty ■		The HCRs are likely to be robust to the main uncertainties.	The HCRs take account of a wide range of uncertainties including the ecological role of the stock, and there is evidence that the HCRs are robust to the main uncertainties.
		(c) HCRs evaluation ■	There is some evidence that tools used or available to implement HCRs are appropriate and effective in controlling exploitation.	Available evidence indicates that the tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the HCRs	Evidence clearly shows that the tools in use are effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the HCRs.

MSC CR v2.0, PI 1.2.2



MSC CR v2.0 SA2.5.2-2.5.3

Scoring 'available' HCRs at SG60 !!

- SA2.5.2 In scoring issue (a) at the SG60 level, teams shall accept 'available' HCRs (instead of HCRs that are 'in place') in cases where: **!!**
 - a. Stock biomass has not previously been reduced below the MSY level or has been maintained at that level for a recent period of time that is at least longer than 2 generation times of the species, and is not predicted to be reduced below B_{MSY} within the next 5 years; or
 - b. In UoAs where B_{MSY} estimates are not available, the stock has been maintained to date by the measures in use at levels that have not declined significantly over time, nor shown any evidence of recruitment impairment.
- SA2.5.3 Teams shall recognise 'available' HCRs as 'expected to reduce the exploitation rate as the point of recruitment impairment is approached' only in cases where: !!
 - HCRs are effectively used in some other UoAs, that are under the control of the same management body and of a similar size and scale as the UoA; or
 - An agreement or framework is in place that requires the management body to adopt HCRs before the stock declines below B_{MSY}.

MSC CR v2.0 SA2.5.5-2.5.7.1

- SA2.5.5 In scoring issue (c) at the SG60 level, where HCRs are recognised as 'available', teams shall include in their rationale:
 - a. Evidence that HCRs are being 'effectively' used in other named UoAs, also managed by the same management body, including the basis on which they are regarded as 'effective'; or
 - b. A description of the formal agreement or legal framework that the management body has defined, and the indicators and trigger levels that will require the development of HCRs.

Evaluating the effectiveness of HCRs

- SA2.5.6 In scoring issue (c) for "evidence" teams shall include consideration of the current levels of exploitation in the UoA, such as measured by the fishing mortality rate or harvest rate, where available.
- SA2.5.7 Where information is not available on the exploitation rate consistent with achieving a long term MSY, proxy indicators and reference points may be used to evaluate the effectiveness of HCRs in scoring issue (c). ■
 - SA2.5.7.1 Where proxies are used to score scoring issue (c), the team shall justify their use as reasonable proxies of the exploitation rate.



MSC CR v2.0 Guidance

GSA2.5 Harvest Control Rules & Tools PI (PI 1.2.2) ▲

Background

This PI assesses the harvest control rules (HCRs) and actions that management takes in response to changes in the fishery and/or changes in status in relation to reference points.

HCRs are the arrangements by which a fishery expects to achieve the stock status outcomes expressed in PI 1.1.1. They are defined as the pre-agreed rules and management actions that will be taken in response to changes in indicators of stock status with respect to explicit or implicit reference points, and MSC expects these elements to be part of HCRs. The values adopted for such reference points are critical to the performance of the HCR, and CABs should ensure that the interaction between the rules of the HCR and the reference points is part of their assessment.

With the removal of the reference points PI in version 2.0 of the standard, parts of the guidance originally applied to the Reference Points PI 1.1.2 in CR v1.3 have now been moved and adapted to more clearly apply in this PI.

For low trophic level species the target and limit reference points need to take into account the ecological role of the stock for the fishery to score 60 or above under PI 1.1.1. The harvest strategy, control rules, information requirements and assessment also need to be consistent with this distinction for low trophic level species.

There are conceptual differences in the reference points that may be involved in scoring PI 1.1.1 and PI 1.2.2. This is because fisheries may use different reference points for measuring stock status (outcome), and as triggers in the HCRs. Dowling et al (2011a, b) ^a provide examples of such different types of reference points within the conceptual framework of HCRs and harvest strategies used by the MSC. A fishery that uses an explicit B_{MSY} reference point as a target for the fishery biomass may, for example have trigger reference points for adjusting F at values of biomass either at B_{MSY}, or above or below B_{MSY}. Other examples are available in Dowling et al (2011) and in some MSC fisheries (e.g. see Tristan da Cunha and Maine lobster). The focus in this PI is thus on the reference points used in a



fishery to trigger changes in management actions, and how they work in combination to achieve the outcomes required in PI 1.1.1.

Scoring Issue (a) – HCR design and application ▲

This scoring issue focuses on the assessment of the design and plausibility of HCRs and management tools to control exploitation of the whole stock(s) under assessment.

HCRs and/or management tools should be based on plausible hypotheses about resource dynamics and be reasonable and practical, meaning that those measures possess a substantial likelihood of success. The basis for plausibility and practicality of design should be considered in relation to the scale and intensity of the fishery, for instance utilising empirical information; relevant science; or model based approaches such as MP and MSE.

The HCRs should be scored against their ability to deliver the levels expressed in SIa (consistent with the actual outcomes measured in PI 1.1.1).

- At the 60 level, HCRs should be likely to ensure that stocks will be maintained above the PRI.
- At the 80 level, HCRs should also ensure that the stock is likely to fluctuate around a B_{MSY} level. Testing may show that this is achieved by the inclusion of a B_{MSY} consistent reference point as a trigger in the HCRs (such as an inflection in a 'hockey stick' form) at a point that would deliver B_{MSY} in the long term.
- At the 100 level, greater certainty is required. Fisheries with HCRs that target stock levels above B_{MSY} (eg. B_{MEY}) should also be regarded as at least meeting the 80 level and projections in the fishery may show that the HCR would likely achieve the higher 100 score by fluctuating more above than around B_{MSY}.

HCRs will usually include some form of dynamic rule, requiring that a change of some sort will be made in response to a fishery indicator moving above or below one of the trigger reference points. In lightly exploited fisheries, it may be that some reference points are set to trigger changes in data collection or assessment approaches, as certain thresholds are reached (see Dowling et al, 2011a).

HCRs are often applied on a frequent basis, such as with the annual setting of TACs or effort restrictions. Such HCRs respond dynamically to the monitoring data from the fishery with regular adjustments to input/output type management measures. In data-poor fisheries which are managed without such input/output controls, management may comprise only technical measures such as size limits, gear restrictions, closed seasons and closed areas. In these cases, the specific terms of the technical measures are usually set and fixed for a relatively long period of time (several years), based on occasional strategic stock assessments, that are shown to deliver defined target and/or limit reference points. Such an arrangement may be regarded as equivalent to a dynamic HCR operating over a longer time scale in cases where some indicators are monitored to confirm that the HCRs are delivering the intended targets for the stock.

At the 80 level in scoring issue (a), 'well-defined' HCRs in these cases would be expected to explicitly include the conditions under which the technical measures in the fishery would be expected to be revised in the future.



The requirement that an HCR reduces exploitation rates as the limit reference point is approached should not always be interpreted as requiring the control rule to deliver an exploitation rate that is a monotonically decreasing function of stock size:

- Any exploitation rate function may be acceptable so long as it acts to keep the stock above a limit reference point that avoids possible recruitment failure and attempts to maintain the stock at a target reference point that is consistent with B_{MSY} or a similar highly productive level.
- This outcome includes the requirement that the HCR should act to cause stocks to rebuild to the target reference point when they are below it; maintenance of a stock at a level just above the limit reference point would not be acceptable.
- A reduction of exploitation rate may not always mean that the control rule requires a reduction in "total" exploitation rate, but instead could for instance involve reducing exploitation rate on parts of the stock (e.g., by age or sex).
- Reductions in exploitation rate are assumed to primarily refer to reductions in catches and effort, and not to gear modifications unless these have the effect of reducing catches/effort.

As noted in the guidance on PI 1.1.1, HCRs may include both explicit and implicit reference points.

Generally understood' HCRs at \$G60 vs 'well-defined' HCRs at \$G80

HCRs should be regarded as 'well-defined' in the sense required to achieve an 80 score when they exist in some written form that has been agreed by the management agency, ideally with stakeholders, and clearly state what actions will be taken at what specific trigger reference point levels.

HCRs should be regarded as only 'generally understood' as required to achieve a 60 score in cases where they can be shown to have been applied in some way in the past, but have not been explicitly defined or agreed.



GSA2.5.2 – 2.5.5 Scoring 'available' HCRs at SG60 ▲

In scoring issue (a), and the requirements given in SA2.5.2 to SA2.5.5, the expectation is that 'available' HCRs may meet the SG60 level in cases where stock biomass has not previously been reduced below the B_{MSY} level or has been above it for a sufficiently long recent time, and it is 'expected' that the management authority will introduce HCRs for this species in the future if needed.

Under clause 2.5.3.a, teams may provide a rationale that this could reasonably be 'expected' for the target species in cases where HCRs are currently being 'effectively' used by the same management agency on at least one other species of similar importance (i.e., of a similar average catch levels and value).

As an alternative, teams may provide a rationale under clause 2.5.3.b in cases where there is some sort of arrangement in place that clearly requires that management will put HCRs in place as and when the fishery reaches some pre-defined trigger level within the vicinity of B_{MSY} . Such arrangements would normally relate to lightly exploited fisheries that are still in the development stage, but should be explicit in requiring action at some defined point. Although potentially driven by information and triggers, such arrangements are different to the actual HCRs as they relate to the development of the HCRs themselves while the HCRs define how management measures will be adjusted in response to changes in fishery status.

In all cases, there should be a real confidence backed up by 'evidence' (as reported against SI1.2.2c) that the management agency can and will act effectively and in a timely fashion when needed (such evidence being as described in SA2.5.5).

In cases where the stock has not yet been reduced and 'available' HCRs are scored as meeting the 60 level, the condition assigned to this PI may allow longer than the normal five year time period for delivery. While there will be advantages in designing and putting into place a 'well-defined' HCR during the certification period, it may also be acceptable to do this over a longer time period, for example if other conditions are being delivered first. This allowance is made on the basis that the stock remains abundant and the criteria given in SA2.5.2 are still met. As soon as these criteria are no longer met, the fishery will need to have at least 'generally understood' HCRs in place to score 60.

Stocks that change status and thereby fail to meet the SA2.5.2 criteria during the course of a certificate will need to put HCRs in place (in either a 'generally understood' sense or 'well defined'). Given the specific timeframes indicated in SA2.5.2, HCRs (either 'generally understood' or 'well defined') should be in place before a stock declines below B_{MSY}. Similar to the situation with the rebuilding PI (section GSA2.3) fisheries should be allowed one year to put HCRs in place, so that the fishery need not be immediately failed if the SG60 level is not met in this first year. If such fisheries fail to put in place either 'generally understood' or 'well defined' HCRs within one year, they should be suspended by the CAB as not meeting the SG60 level.



Scoring Issue (c) – Evaluating the effectiveness of HCRs (SA2.5.6 – SA2.5.7)

In the third scoring issue, teams must review the ability of the tools associated with the HCRs to achieve the exploitation levels. Such tools would include management measures like total allowable catches (TACs) and fishing limits, and arrangements for sharing TACs between participants in the fishery, including between states in shared stock fisheries. The examination here may consider the overall history of effectiveness of the tools used in the fishery (i.e., their ability to achieve the desired exploitation rates and biomass levels) as well as the current status.

Section SA2.5.6 requires that teams examine the current exploitation levels in the fishery, as part of the evidence that the HCRs are working. Evidence that current F is equal to or less than F_{MSY} should usually be taken as evidence that the HCR is effective. Current F levels greater than F_{MSY} may also sometimes be accepted in cases where stock biomass is currently higher than B_{MSY} or where stock assessment information is comprehensive, and it is appropriate to treat F_{MSY} is a target reference point (see Box GSA3). Teams should be confident in these cases that any such higher levels of F are not likely to lead to overcapacity in the fishery or to create a situation where B is likely to fall below a level at which it is regarded as 'fluctuating around B_{MSY} '. Lower levels of F should be expected when biomass is reduced, consistent with the scoring of the rebuilding PI. In any case, teams should justify how the current levels of fishing mortality are consistent with maintaining the stock fluctuating around a target level consistent with (or above) B_{MSY} .

Teams may also make allowance for the gradual adjustment of fishing mortality rates down to appropriate levels in cases where the pace of change is limited to avoid severe socioeconomic impacts in a fishery. In these cases, projections of stock status should confirm that the expected future adjustments in F will still lead to fluctuations around MSY levels within a reasonable timescale.

Where proxy indicators and reference points are used in the fishery instead of explicit estimates of F and F_{MSY} (as allowed in SA2.5.7), higher scores should be assigned where greater confidence is provided by the proxy information, similar to the scoring of PI 1.1.1. Where higher scores are justified by the use of two or more proxy indicators, they should be independent of each other and also reasonably be expected to be proxies of the quantity of



Table 11. Rescoring PI 1.2.2

PI	1.2.2	There are well defined and effective harvest control rules in place		
Sc	oring Issue	SG 60	SG 80	SG 100
а	Guidepost	Generally understood HCRs are in place or available that are expected to reduce the exploitation rate as the point of recruitment impairment (PRI) is approached.	Well defined harvest control rules are in place that are consistent with the harvest strategy and ensure that the exploitation rate is reduced as limit reference points are approached.	
	Met?	Y	Ν	
	Justification	 The harvest control rules for WCPFC have historically been based on B/B_M F/F_{MSY} benchmarks. The overarching harvest control rule to maintain stock above MSY has been established by the WCPFC in accordance wi Convention provision and the application of the precautionary approach. Ho there has been no formally agreed point at which action will be taken, nor is a clear definition of what action will be taken. A limit reference point has adopted by WCPFC and there is on-going work to examine appropriate reference points and harvest control rules. An important development at WCPFC11 has been the adoption of a Consel and Management Measure (CMM 2014-06) to develop and implement a h strategy approach for key fisheries and stocks in the WCPO. CMM 20 includes a paragraph that the Commission shall agree a workplan and inclusion timeframes to adopt or refine harvest strategies for skipjack, bigeye, yel South Pacific albacore, Pacific bluefin and northern albacore tuna by no late the twelfth meeting of the Commission in 2015. 		een based on B/B _{MSY} and e to maintain stocks at or in accordance with the nary approach. However, will be taken, nor is there eference point has been amine appropriate target doption of a Conservation and implement a harvest WCPO. CMM 2014-06 a workplan and indicative ipjack, bigeye, yellowfin, core tuna by no later than
		To date, the major harves CMM 2010-05. The major number of their fishing ve Convention Area south of (2000-2004) levels. The mortality and catch rates find Although the available as subject to overfishing, cator economic reasons. Questi 2010-05. An alternative harvest con framework of FFA. This cooperative understanding albacore tuna, providing a based management of So December 2014 were Au Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu ar allowable catches by cour forward with or without W	et control rule for South Pacifi requirement of this is that CCI ssels actively fishing for Sout 20°S above current (2005) If objective of CMM 2010-05 or South Pacific albacore as a ssessment indicates the stoc ch rates have declined and an ons have been raised over the ntrol is the Tokelau Arranger Arrangement is a formal ex- on individual zone limitations a framework for the developm uth Pacific albacore tuna fishe ustralia, Cook Islands, Niue, nd Vanuatu. This move sets se intries. It highlights how Pacific VCPEC consensus, noting th	ic Albacore is set out in Ms shall not increase the h Pacific albacore in the evels or recent historical was to stabilise fishing a precautionary measure. ck is not overfished nor re lower than desired for ne effectiveness of CMM ment, established in the cpression of an existing on catch of South Pacific ent of cooperative zone- eries. Signatories as at 1 New Zealand, Samoa, elf-imposed limits on total c nations intend to move at this will be far more



		challenging in the light of WCPFC's failure to take compatible measures for the high seas. Fiji also became a signatory to the non-binding Tokelau Arrangement during the course of the WCPFC11 meeting.			
		In addition, the Fiji Government has recently reduced the number of available licences to 60 to reduce effort in the fishery, largely to improve economic returns.			
		There has been no update of the albacore assessment since 2012. An update is scheduled for 2015. There is on-going concern over the effectiveness of CMM 2010-05 in limiting fishing activity targeting albacore. Nevertheless, the available assessment of albacore tuna status indicates that overfishing is not occurring and the stock is not in an overfished state. An updated assessment is scheduled for 2015. WCPFC has been slow to introduce management measures for other species for which the stock assessment has indicated a need for action, in particular for bigeye tuna. Current arrangements do not ensure that the exploitation rate will be reduced as limit reference points are approached (the SG80 requirement). However, given the			
		current state of the stock, r development with the requirements are met.	nanagement arrangements tha Tokelau Arrangement and	at are in place and recent CMM 2014-06, SG60	
b	Guidepost		The selection of the harvest control rules takes into account the main uncertainties.	The design of the harvest control rules takes into account a wide range of uncertainties.	
	Met?		Ν	Ν	
	Justification	Although the stock asses current CMM (2010-05) is vessels actively targeting a of controlling fishing mor effectiveness of the CMM. are not constrained, nor are SG80 requirements are not	ssment considers a wide ran expressed in terms of cappir albacore and does not directly tality. There is a large degre In addition, the fleets of Small e any fleets north of 20°S. t met.	ge of uncertainties, the ng the number of fishing addresses the objective ee of uncertainty in the Island Developing States	
С	Guidepost	There is some evidence that tools used or available to implement HCRs are appropriate and effective in controlling exploitation	Available evidence indicates that the tools in use are appropriate and effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.	Evidence clearly shows that the tools in use are effective in achieving the exploitation levels required under the harvest control rules.	
	Met?	Y	Ν	Ν	
	Justification	The latest assessment indicates that current levels of biomass and fishing mortality are at acceptable levels. CMM 2010-05 was introduced to limit the number of fishing vessels operating south of 20°S. There are shortcomings with this CMM in only applying to waters south of 20°S as well as the exemption to SIDS which allows licensing of foreign vessels to fish in their EEZs as well as by developing their own fleets. The Tokelau Arrangement sets out provisions for catch limits across the EEZs of South Pacific nations. If taken up by all FFA members, the Arrangement will cover ~80% of EEZ catches and 100% if adopted by overseas territories. This has the potential to be effective in constraining catches at around the MSY level according to the stock assessment (noting that the estimates of MSY are quite uncertain). The Tokelau Arrangement is seen as the start of a process towards developing a			



		the current state of the stock lend support to there being used are appropriate and effective in controlling exp requirements. It should be noted, however, that the	some evidence that tools loitation, meeting SG60 South Pacific albacore
		assessment is dated and due to be revised in 2015. In ad further development of the harvest strategy for the fisher 2015 under CMM 2014-06. It is important that these implication for the fishery be closely monitored in the com	dition, a timetable for the ry is to be established in developments and their ing year.
Re	References Hoyle et al. 2013, CMM-2010-05, CMM-2014-06, WCPFC-SC 2014		
OVERALL PERFORMANCE INDICATOR SCORE:			60
СС	NDITION NUM		

Scoring for PI 2.1.1 from 2012 MSC assessment. Updated information for bigeye tuna is shown in blue.

	PI	SG60	SG80	SG100
2.1.1	<i>Status:</i> The fishery does not pose a risk of serious or irreversible harm to the retained species and does not hinder recovery of depleted retained species.	Main retained species are <u>likely</u> to be within biologically based limits or if outside the limits there are <u>measures</u> in place that are <u>expected</u> to ensure that the fishery does not hinder recovery and rebuilding of the depleted species.	Main retained species are <u>highly likely</u> to be within biologically based limits, or if outside the limits there is a <u>partial strategy</u> of <u>demonstrably effective</u> management measures in place such that the fishery does not hinder recovery and rebuilding.	There is a <u>high</u> <u>degree of</u> <u>certainty</u> that retained species are within biologically based limits.
		If the status is poorly known there are measures or practices in place that are expected to result in the fishery not causing the retained species to be outside biologically based limits or hindering recovery.		arget reference points are defined and retained species are at or fluctuating around their target reference points.

Scoring Comments

Both yellowfin (20% of species composition by weight) and bigeye tuna (6.7%) are retained bycatch in this fishery. Three other teleost species considered as main retained species are the opah (spotted moonfish), swordfish and blue marlin. Although each consisting of less than 5% of the catch by weight (4.5, 4.2% and 2.0% and 1.4% respectively), they are all potentially vulnerable species. In addition, four shark species are also considered as main retained species. One – blue shark – represents over



5% of the overall catch by weight. The others - short-finned mako, silky shark and oceanic white tip – are all under 5% of the catch by weight (3.0%, 2.7% and 2.5% respectively) are also considered as main species as (i) they are all of 'medium' vulnerability and (ii) their fins are considered of high economic importance.

<u>Yellowfin tuna</u>: Not overfished, within biological based limits (FAM 7.1.11/7.1.12). $B_{current} / B_{MSY} = 1.25-1.60$. Depletion has increased steadily over time, reaching a level of about 50-55% of unexploited biomass (a fishery impact of 45-50%) in 2006-2009 ($B_{current} / B_{current,F=0} = 0.50-0.55$). This represents a moderate level of stock-wide depletion. The stock remains considerably higher than the equivalent equilibrium-based reference point (B_{MSY}/B_0 of approximately 0.35-0.40). The assessment indicates that it is highly likely that $B/B_{MSY} > 1.0$. Biomass is therefore estimated to be currently above $B_{LIM} = 0.2B_0$, with a high degree of certainty.

<u>Bigeye tuna</u>: Not overfished, within biologically based limits (FAM 7.11/7.11.12). $B_{current} / B_{MSY} = 1.25$; $B_{current} / B_0 = 0.44$. Biomass is therefore likely, with a high degree of certainty, to be currently above $B_{lim} = 0.20 B_0$.

<u>Bigeye tuna</u>: An updated assessment of bigeye tuna was undertaken in 2014 (Harley et al. 2014). The assessment concluded that current catches exceed MSY and that recent levels of fishing mortality exceed the level that will support the MSY. The assessment also concluded that recent levels of spawning potential are most likely at or below the limit reference point of 20%SBF=0 agreed by WCPFC. Catches of bigeye tuna by FTBOA vessels within the Fiji EEZ remain low (approximately 3% of total catches in 2013 and 2014) (Fiji 2015a). Reported catches of bigeye tuna by FOFA vessels which have recently begun operating under an MOU with FTBOA within the Fiji EEZ were approximately 7% of the total EEZ catch for those vessels in 2013 and 2014 (Fiji 2015b) (noting that 2014 catches are provisional). As the catch is small, the area that this fishery operates in is not in the area where bigeye are caught in any quantity and the only method being used is longline (no FADs) it can be concluded that there is a partial strategy in place and the fishery does not hinder recovery and rebuilding of the stock.

<u>Blue shark</u>: Stock assessments to date, including those using Pacific data through 2002, have not indicated overfishing or an overfished state. Catch data within the southern hemisphere (2006 - 2010) do not show any significant decline.

<u>Short-finned mako</u>: Recent abundance indices and median size analyses for shortfin mako in the WCPO have shown no clear trends; therefore there is no apparent evidence of the impact of fishing on this species in the WCPO

<u>Silky shark</u>: The silky shark represents a minor shark bycatch from this fishery. The majority is discarded, and observer reports indicate that there is a high level of post-discard survival (c. 80%). Longline CPUE figures for Region 6 indicate there is no significant decline in the availability of this species in this area. This said, according to a recent assessment, the stock is subject to over-fishing and is over being over-fished.

<u>Oceanic white tip shark</u>: Oceanic white tip sharks are also a minor bycatch in this fishery. There have been declines in the median length of this species in the WCPO, although these are not statistically significant trends for Region 6. This said, according to a recent assessment, the stock is subject to over-fishing and is over being over-fished. As such there is an evident need to reduce fishing pressure on these potentially vulnerable species, and a number of measures have been adopted at regional level to do so.

<u>Opah</u>: Overall, the median size of opah captured by WCPO longline fisheries has shown a steady increase since the late 1980s, albeit with (apparently) seasonal fluctuations. This is also reflected in observation data from the client fleet, where there doesn't appear to be any concern for these species based on the time-series trends in CPUE and size at capture based on observer data

<u>Swordfish:</u> The most recent stock assessment for the broadbill in the Southern region of the WCPFC convention area (0-50°S; 140°E -130°W) for the period 1952-2007 showed that although the data

were not sufficient to estimate a stock recruitment relationship reliably, all estimates from the model ensemble suggested that biomass (total and spawning) is above levels that would sustain MSY, and fishing mortality is below F_{MSY} .

<u>Blue marlin</u>: Although the stock is likely to be fully exploited, it is likely to be within biological limits and this fishery contributes a very small part of overall fishing mortality. An ISC stock assessment for blue marlin is scheduled 2012 (ISC, 2009).

Score: 70

<u>Yellowfin tuna</u>: There is a high degree of certainty that yellowfin tuna stocks in the WCPO are within biologically-based limits (i.e. above $B_{LIM} = 0.20$ B0). The 2011 assessment indicates that current biomass levels are well above this value and it is therefore concluded that there is high degree of certainty that yellowfin tuna stocks in the WCPO are within biologically-based limits. Default target reference points (i.e. $B_{MSY} \& F_{MSY}$) are defined (but not adopted) and yellowfin tuna has never dropped below these TRPs. Thereby meeting all the scoring issues under the 80SG

<u>Bigeye tuna</u>: There is a high degree of certainty that bigeye tuna stocks in the WCPO are within biologically-based limits (i.e. above $B_{lim} = 0.20 B_0$). The structural uncertainty analysis in the 2011 assessment shows there is a 13% probability of spawning biomass being below the target value of 1.0 (SB_{curren}t < SB_{MSY}) across the grid examined and a zero probability for the reference case (where steepness is assumed to be 0.8). Two of the alternate models in the 2011 assessment found that SB_{curren}t / SB_{MSY} < 1.0 with a range across the six models considered of 0.86 – 1.49. Overfishing is occurring with very high probability that F_{current}/F_{MSY} is much greater than 1.0. The SC recommends a minimum of 32% reduction in fishing mortality from the average levels for 2006–2009 and concluded that it is too early to quantitatively conclude whether CMM2008-01 has reduced fishing mortality for bigeye tuna to the levels specified in the CMM. Thereby meeting all the scoring issues under the 80SG.

<u>Bigeye tuna</u>: bigeye tuna stocks in the WCPO are assessed as being at or below biologically-based limits (i.e. below $B_{lim} = 0.20 B_0$). SC10 advised that the stock was overfished and rebuilding would require a reduction in fishing mortality (WCPFC-SC 2014). SC10 indicated that a 36% reduction in fishing mortality from the average levels for 2008–2011 would be expected to return the fishing mortality rate to FMSY and also allow the stock to rebuild above the limit reference point over a period of time. Catches of bigeye tuna by FTBOA vessels within the Fiji EEZ remain low (approximately 3% of the total in 2013 and 2014)(Fiji 2015a). Reported catches of bigeye tuna by FOFA vessels which have recently begun operating under an MOU with FTBOA within the Fiji EEZ were approximately 7% of the total EEZ catch for those vessels in 2013 and 2014 (Fiji 2015b) (noting that 2014 catches are provisional).

CMM 2014-01 was adopted at WCPFC11 seeking to further limit fishing mortality of bigeye tuna. Given the small level of bigeye catch within the Fiji EEZ by FTBOA and FOFA vessels and the area that the fishery operates it can be concluded that the fishery does not hinder recovery and rebuilding of bigeye tuna, i.e. SG80 requirements are met. However it is recommended the bigeye catch needs to be further investigated at the next annual surveillance.

<u>Blue shark</u>: The standardised catch rate increased over 2004 – 2008 with a sharp decline in 2009, but there was no statistically significant change in the southern blue shark stock, and in fact standardised longline catches show an increasing trend since 2003. Stock assessments to date have not indicated overfishing or an overfished state and as such the stock is likely to be within biologically-based limits (60). Management measures taken by the fishery, such as the use of small circular hooks, deep sets, a prohibition on the use of wire traces and a requirement to release live sharks suggests that there are measures in place that *are expected* to ensure that the fishery does not hinder recovery and rebuilding of this depleted species (60) - Thereby meeting all the scoring issues under the 60 SG.

<u>Short-finned</u> mako: Recent abundance indices and median size analyses for shortfin mako in the WCPO have shown no clear trends; therefore there is no apparent evidence of the impact of fishing on this species in the WCPO and as such the stock is likely to be within biologically based limits (60).



Management measures taken by the fishery, such as the use of small circular hooks, deep sets, a prohibition on the use of wire traces and a requirement to release live sharks suggests that the fishery has a partial strategy of demonstrably effective management measures in place such that the fishery does not cause the retained species to be outside biologically based limits (80). Thereby meeting all the scoring issues under the 60 SG and the SG 80 with an overall score of 80

<u>Silky shark</u>: Although there is no significant change in the LL CPUE for this species in Region 6, a recent 2012 stock assessment for silky sharks shows that they are subject to over-fishing and the stock is over-fished. Management measures taken by the fishery, such as the use of small circular hooks, deep sets, a prohibition on the use of wire traces and a requirement to release live sharks suggests that there are measures in place that *are expected* to ensure that the fishery does not hinder recovery and rebuilding of this depleted species. Thereby meeting all the scoring issues under the 60 SG.

<u>Oceanic white tip shark</u>: A recent 2012 stock assessment for oceanic whitetip sharks shows that they are subject to over-fishing and the stock is over-fished. Management measures taken by the fishery, such as the use of small circular hooks, deep sets, a prohibition on the use of wire traces and a requirement to release live sharks suggests that there are measures in place that *are expected* to ensure that the fishery does not hinder recovery and rebuilding of this depleted species. Thereby meeting all the scoring issues under the 60 SG.

<u>Opah</u>: Based on improving or constant catch at age and CPUE tends respectively, it is highly likely that this species is being fished within biologically-based limits. Thereby meeting all the scoring issues under the 80 SG.

<u>Swordfish</u>: Current biomass (total and spawning) is above levels that would sustain MSY, and fishing mortality is below F_{MSY} . Thereby meeting all the scoring issues under the 80 SG.

<u>Blue marlin</u>: assessments indicate stock highly likely to be within biological limits, although these need to be updated. Thereby meeting all the scoring issues under the 80 SG.

Condition 4 has been set to address short-comings. These focus on the mitigation measures to ensure that the recovery of vulnerable or depleted shark fisheries is not hindered.



Appendix 2. Stakeholder submissions (if any)

None received



Appendix 3. Surveillance audit information (if necessary)



Appendix 4. Additional detail on conditions/ actions/ results (if necessary)



Fiji Tuna Boat Owner's Association Office of the Executive Secretary PO Box 178 Suva, Fiji Phone: +679 331 4819 Fax: +679 999 3281 Email: FTBOA@connect.com.fj

27 January 2015

Fiji Tuna Boat Owners Association (FTBOA) Client Action Report to the 2nd year surveillance on MSC certification of Southern Albacore (longline caught) within the Fiji EEZ.

Preamble:-

There are eight conditions attached to the FTBOA certification and these will be referred to in detail. However an understanding of the economic and political conditions in Fiji and in the wider Fishery needs to be understood in assessing progress on recommendations applying to this accreditation.

The Southern Albacore fishery is assessed as being "biological sound" but increased vessel numbers in the WCPO in contravention of WCPFC CMM 2010-05 have reduced CPUE's of the FTBOA fleet to a level where their commercial operation is barely and sometimes not viable. This is demonstrated to the extent that a major member company of the Association has withdrawn from the MSC process. These are commercial considerations, which too often get put aside, in assessments such are being considered in this report. The FTBOA has responded in a robust and vigorous way in trying to convince regulators of the need to introduce controls on vessel numbers (capacity) in the WCPO.

Credence should be given to the Government of Fiji in setting a "cap" of 60 longline vessels within the Fiji EEZ. This is the UOC of the FTBOA accreditation. This cap was confirmed early 2014 and remains in place for three years. In previous years the "cap" has been as high as 120. Fiji takes a responsible approach to fisheries management often not acknowledged or appreciated by others.

A general election in September 2014 has taken precedence in Fiji but even so the Regulations that attach to the Offshore Fisheries Management Decree have been put in place. The Tuna Management Plan 2014-2018 has been adopted.

To secure the integrity of the MSC process a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) has been agreed between vessel owners forming part of the FTBOA accreditation going forward into 2015 and until reassessment in 2017. This forms part of FTBOA compliance an adoption of the recommendations that apply to this accreditation. The modus operandi of this MOU is attached as appendix one and forms part of this report.

With regard to the specific conditions that apply to this accreditation we are pleased to advise on progress and work undertaken to comply with the timetable as set down.

Condition One:-

By the third annual audit the client must provide evidence to demonstrate target and limit reference points have been agreed by management, consistent with management objectives and scientific stock assessment.

The "Fiji Tuna Management Plan 2014-2018" was officially approved and adopted by the Fiji Government in 2014. This, and the Ministry Of Fisheries and Forests (MFF) circular letter of the 24th January 2014 confirm the licence cap within the UOC " as 60 and that this will be reviewed after two years ". FTBOA have strongly advocated at combined Industry/MFF stakeholder meetings that the cap of 60 vessels should be retained and by preference reduced to 50 vessels.

On a regional level the FTBOA has limited opportunity to make its voice heard other than through canvassing Fiji Government officials attending FFA and WCPFC Management Objectives Workshop (MOW) and the regular annual Commission meeting. This, and through the auspices of the Pacific Island Tuna Industry Association (PITIA) are the only avenues available to FTBOA. These avenues have been pursued vigorously during the 2014 year. FTBOA has a director on the PITIA Executive Committee (EC) which issued a strongly worded statement on lack of progress within the WCPFC on 18th December 2014. This is attached as appendix two to this client report to emphasise the increasing frustration that responsible industry bodies such as FTBOA are facing.

WCPFC MOW discussions attended by Fiji Government officials covered issues on risk levels relative to the agreed limit reference point and candidate target reference points for south Pacific albacore, but no decisions were taken.

Condition Two:-

By the Third annual audit the client must provide evidence that a harvest strategy for southern albacore which 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 is in place.

As with Condition One FTBOA's ability to persuade the WCPFC on the implementation of TRP's and HCRs is limited and can only be done through discussion with the Fiji Government officials attending relative RFMO meetings and through the auspices of PITIA. Stakeholder and private meetings have continued throughout the year with MFF. FTBOA supports the principle of the "Tokelau" agreement (noting that there is additional drafting work to be completed) and Fiji's accession to it. The Tokelau agreement is considered to be a significant positive development in support of conditions 1,2 and 3.

Condition Three:-

By the third annual audit the client must provide evidence that a well-defined harvest control rules have been proposed, tested and established for the fishery.

The status for this condition remains as much as in Conditions One and Two. FTBOA fully supports the regional adoption of TRP's as well as HCRs. Fiji,by adoption of the TMP, has these in place but cannot achieve the required regional initiative alone. FTBOA has been vocal in local Fiji media on this issue and supports PITIA in its recent public statement.

We support the adoption by WCPFC of CMM 2014-06 to develop and implement a harvest strategy approach for key fisheries and stocks in the WCPO, including south Pacific albacore.

Condition Four:-

By the third annual audit the client must provide evidence that a partial strategy of demonstrably effective management measures are in place such that the fishery does not hinder receiver and rebuilding of blue shark, short-finned mako, silky and oceanic sharks.

Commercial events have overtaken the management of sharks in that there are, now, virtually no landings of sharks from domestic vessels in Fiji. Whilst FTBOA does not have exact tonnages landed there is no commercial carrier – whether by sea or air prepared to carry shark fins or bodies for export. This applies even to product which is caught and landed in accordance with Fiji MFF edits and RFMO CMM's. This has seriously impacted upon crew earnings. Although the Fiji NPOA Sharks has yet to be ratified by Cabinet the requirements of the NPOA are in place by MFF notifications and conditions applied to fishing permits. The Fiji NPOA goes beyond the requirements of similar international documents requiring all live sharks to be released to the sea. Fins have to be landed "naturally attached". The carriage of "shark gear" on board is prohibited and the fact that the vessels land their catch in Suva allows for regular inspection by Ministry officials to confirm compliance. The "extended" SPC logbook which itemises the principle shark species is required to be completed by all vessels. Catch log books are uplifted by MFF usually on day of landing or soon thereafter.

We note that a CMM on sharks was agreed by WCPFC (CMM 2014-06) which requires CCMs to ensure that vessels either a) do not use or carry wire trace as branch lines or leaders; or b) do not use branch lines running directly off the longline floats or drop lines (aka 'shark lines'). FTBOA consider themselves already compliant with this CMM.

Condition Five:-

By the third annual audit the client must provide evidence that:-

- (1) A partial management strategy is in place that maintains bycatch at levels which are highly likely to be within biologically based limits or ensures that the fishery does not hinder their recovery.
- (2) There is some objective basis that the partial strategy will work
- (3) There is some evidence that the partial strategy is being implemented effectively

This condition relates to "by catch" as opposed to "retained species". Effectively the by catch species are sharks only and management of these is covered in condition four . Virtually all "by-catch" is retained as a valuable food source for the local population.

Condition Six:-

By the third annual audit the client must provide evidence that information is adequate to support a partial strategy to manage retained species, or detect any increase in risk. The information collected must be sufficient to estimate outcome status with respect to biologically based limits.

The retained species are not those that can be targeted as such and are a consequence of surface line fishing. The actual percentage of retained species is comparatively low and has remained so over the years. With the EEZ licenced "cap" set at 60 and poor economic returns fishing effort within the Fiji zone has decreased in the last year. In Fiji the retained species are a valuable food fish for the local population in addition to the traditional export varieties. There has been increased observer coverage in 2014 with the employment of additional observers within the Ministry. The percentage of observer coverage on the FTBOA fleet is ______ which is well above the WCPFC average. In addition two FTBOA vessels carry Electronic Monitoring equipment (see condition 7).

Condition Seven:-

By the third annual audit the client must provide evidence that a reporting system to record the occurrence an outcome of all interactions with sea turtles and seabirds has been developed at fleet level to determine whether the fishery may be a threat to protection and recovery of the ETP species, and if so, to measure trends and support a full strategy to manage impacts. The data that is collected should be sufficient to allow fishery related mortality and the impact of fishing to be quantitatively estimated for ETP species.

Interactions with turtles are required to be reported and all vessels carry turtle release gear. During the year WWF ran an Industry wide workshop on the use of turtle release

equipment which was attended by fishers and vessel managers. Interaction with turtles are a rare occurrence and mortalities even less so.

The whale depredation research project using PDMDs has been discontinued through lack of funds which is unfortunate as it was in a state of "work in progress". Funding has now been confirmed for the FAO Electronic Monitoring (EM) programme to proceed in 2015. Fiji is the pilot nation for application of the FAO ABNJ camera system on longline vessels. It is anticipated that at least five vessels will be fitted with camera systems under the FAO ABNJ project in 2015. In addition the "Trident" electronic system is already fitted on two FTBOA vessels. All vessels are required to carry the FFA VMS and this is strictly monitored. In June 2013, Sea Quest a client member, entered a partnership with WWF to demonstrate full transparency of the company's fishing operations of the MSC- certified Albacore tuna fishery. Eight Automatic Identification

System (AIS) transmitters were installed and activated round-the-clock on the tuna fishing vessels to track and monitor fishing activities. The AIS, an automatic tracking system normally used by vessel traffic services to identify and locate ships, is a reliable supplier of satellite data useful for retracing and evaluating fishing and trans-shipping operations on the water. With many tuna fish stocks being overexploited, WWF, through its 'Smart Fishing Initiative' uses and promotes the system as a way to monitor global fisheries activities in order to make fisheries more transparent and efficiently managed. The cooperation with WWF shows that this fishery is willing to make their fishing operations traceable and that they assume a leading role in creating transparency on the seas.

<u>Client action by Year 2 is to provide a monitoring plan of ETP species.</u> The extended SPC log book, as used by FTBOA vessels, has a section <u>devoted to "species of interest" (SOSI)"</u>. The ETP species are included in this section. (See Appendix three)

Condition eight:-

By the third annual audit the client must provide evidence that sanctions that deal with noncompliance are consistently applied.

This is a compliance issue administered by MFF. FTBOA obviously does not have access to individual cases - if there are any. Anecdotal evidence is that any breach of regulations, however slight, and as reported by observers or MFF officials is judicially followed up. Corrective action notices (CARs) have been issued. The Offshore Fisheries Management Regulations (OFMR) that form part of the Offshore Fisheries Management Decree (OFMD) were introduced into law in June 2014. The MFF have held stakeholder consultations and meetings to explain requirements of the OFMR. Fiji maintains arguably the most rigid policing control of any nation in the movement of fishing vessels within the EEZ which is the UOC of this accreditation. No Fiji flag fishing vessel is allowed to leave port without a "Marine Checkers" inspection. Weekly position reports are required of all vessels and 24 hours notice of landings provided to MFF. The OFMR require MFF approvals for bunkering and provisioning.

Appendix One – MOU modus operandi Appendix Two – PITIA public statement Appendix Three – SPC extended logbook Appendix Four – List of vessels covered by FTBOA FOFA MOU In summary we consider that FTBOA is well on track in achieving the milestones recommended in the certification. This has been achieved under difficult economic conditions and lack of regional support at the RFMO level. Fiji is at the forefront of fisheries management and control with mechanisms in place that exceed, or are equal to, the most compliant of jurisdictions. Improvements can always be made and FTBOA have recommended some of these to government regulators. The UOC of this accreditation is robustly managed and there is a good working relationship between the Ministry of Fisheries and Industry. The integrity of the MSC certification, through adequate traceability is also very important to FTBOA.

FTBOA Appendix One – MOU modus operandi

Appendix One

BETWEEN

FIJI TUNA BOAT OWNERS ASSOCIATION

AND

FIJI OFFSHORE FISHERIES ASSOCIATION

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Mitchell Keil Lawyers & Notary Public Credit House Gorrie Street Suva, Fiji www.mitchelikeil.com.fj

1

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ("MOU") dated the 29th December 2014.

BETWEEN:	FIJI TUNA BOAT OWNERS ASSOCIATION of C/- Solander Pacific Limited, Rona Street, Mua-1-Walu Complex, Walu Bay, Suva, Fiji (hereinafter referred to as "FTBOA")
AND:	FIJI OFFSHORE FISHERIES ASSOCIATION of Lot 9-10 Rokobili Ind- Sub, Walu Bay, Suva, Fiji
	(hereinafter referred to as "FOFA")

RECITALS

- A. The Marine Stewardship Council is an international non-profit organisation committed with its Head Office situated at Marine House, 1 Snow Hill, London EC1A 2DH, United Kingdom (hereinafter referred to as "MSC") which provides credible standards for sustainable fishing and seafood traceability to increase the availability of certified sustainable seafood by issuing certification to members.
- B. The FTBOA received MSC accreditation under certificate MML: 138 on the 13 December 2012 in respect of Albacore Tuna caught by the longline method within the EEZ of Fiji. The accreditation is due for reassessment by December 2017.
- C. This MOU provides for additional vessels of FOFA or others to join the MSC accreditation by forming a "FTBOA MSC sub group". The membership of FOFA (or other) is retained.
- D. It is acknowledged that annual surveillance audits are required and that the current accreditation is subject to conditions mentioned in Schedule A annexed hereto.
- E. It is now agreed that the following vessels will be listed on the FTBOA "Fisheries Management Certification of Registration" to be known as the "MSC Group" subject to their owners agreeing to the conditions mentioned in this MOU.

9 1St

F. The obligations created by this MOU are legally enforceable and binding on the Parties.

IT IS AGREED BETWEEN THE PARTIES THAT:

1.0 General Terms

The parties will adhere to the following:

- Compliance with the requirements under accreditation MSC MML:138;
- 1.2 Compliance with the Fiji Offshore Fisheries Management Decree 2012 and regulations as amended from time to time;
- 1.3 Compliance with the Fiji NPOA IUU and NPOA Sharks;
- 1.4 The vessels are Fiji flagged;
- Only Albacore caught within the Fiji EEZ is recorded for MSC accreditation;
- MSC Albacore to be landed in Fiji ports only and subject to MFF inspection;
- Owners to nominate a chosen MSC "Chain of Custody" however not limited to selling only under this scheme;
- 1.8 Submit to Fiji Ministry of Fisheries and Forests (hereinafter referred to as "MFF") a monthly return of all MSC certified Albacore exported. MFF will undertake a random audit of returns to confirm authenticity; and
- FTBOA submits a generic annual return to MSC Sydney of the total volume of Albacore shipped under MSC.

2.0 Audit and assessment

2.1 Annual on site surveillance audits are due in December in the following years,

all

 Q^3

2014, 2015, and 2016. Application has been made to defer these to February in the following years respectively.

- 2.2 Reassessment is due December 2017.
- 2.3 The charges of the Conformity Assessment Body (hereinafter referred to as "CAB") for each of the surveillance audits are estimated at approximately USD25,000 and reassessment USD100,000.
- 2.4 Additional technical support will be necessary to complete the audits from FFA and SPC.
- 3.0 Extension of the Unit of Certification
- 3.1 During the term of the current assessment the MSC Group will canvas the prospect of extending the Unit of Certification (hereinafter referred to as "UoC") to include an expedited Principle 1 audit of Yellow Fin and fishing the adjacent High seas areas.
- 3.2 Prior to reassessment in 2017 discussions will be held on the title nomenclature and applied UoC.
- 4.0 Finance and membership fees
- 4.1 The estimated financial commitment for the MSC Group in CAB audit fees is USD160,000.
- 4.2 Whilst avenues for grant assistance will be sort the membership fees will be set with a view to meeting the full cost of the CAB's.
- 4.3 Fees will be set annually to provide for estimated audit fees in that year and a reserve toward reassessment costs. The schedule of fees for year 2015 is contained in Schedule B annexed hereto. These are to be paid immediately. Failure to pay fees will automatically cancel MSC accreditation.

Sh

Ì

- 4.4 FTBOA secretariat will maintain a separate record of account for the MSC Group.
- 5.0 Term of Membership
- 5.1 The full term of membership is upto and including the reassessment in 2017.
- 5.2 Members may add or delete vessels from the register but this has to be done prior to the annual surveillance audits and in 2017 prior to final assessment. This to enable a current list of vessels to be entered on the MSC certificate in the relevant year.
- 5.3 Members wishing to redraw must give six months of doing so. There will be no refund of fees paid in the year of withdrawal.

6.0 Schedule of vessels

- 6.1 The schedule of vessels is to include owners name, Fiji call-sign, Fiji Offshore licence number (current), IMO number (if applicable).
- 6.2 The schedule for 2015 year is contained in Schedule C annexed hereto.

7.0 Breach of Conditions

- 7.1 It is acknowledged by the parties that any breach of conditions by any one vessel or company or owner could result in loss of accreditation for the entire group.
- 7.2 FTBOA reserves the right to delist vessels or companies or owners in cases of non-compliance.
- 7.3 Any party who is aggrieved by the decision of the FTBOA may lodge a dispute against the decision within seven (7) days of receipt of the decision to delist it/him failing which it will deemed that the decision is accepted without any further rights and/or remedies.

by 25

8.0 Dispute Procedure

- 8.1 In the first instance, the parties to the dispute will discuss the dispute to attempt, in good faith, to reach agreement or otherwise resolve the dispute.
- 8.2 Upon failure to resolve the dispute amicably such dispute difference or question shall be referred to two (2) arbitrators, one (1) to be appointed by each party or their umpire pursuant to the Arbitration Act, Cap 38 or any statutory modification or re-enactment thereof for the time being in force and the decision of the Arbitrators' shall be final without any right to appeal or adjudication by the Courts.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, each of the Parties have caused this Memorandum of Understanding to be duly executed and delivered in its name and on its behalf as of the date first set forth above.

SIGNED BY the said FIJI TUNA BOAT OWNERS :10 REAL ASSOCIATION by its duly authorised officers in the 3 NOWWOO 3HL presence of:-١ NMO Winara Presider o Secretary Bola Bala Witness's name: Asena Bolla Witness's name: ACCA Bok Occupation: Export Clerk Occupation: Expost CIENC Address: Navere Address: Nanore Suna Sula SIGNED BY the said FIJI OFFSHORE FISHERIES - 1 ASSOCIATION by its duly authorised officers in the presence of: President Secretar With less's name: Ano Delaslonalino Witness's name: Occupation: A Gillehry Mang Occupation: Address: Address: 6
SCHEDULE A

Conditions of Accreditation

Compliance with all MSC certification standards both for Fisheries and Chain of Custody. These are described in a series of documents assessable under;

www.msc.org/documents/scheme-documents.

And such other documents listed from time to time that apply to this accreditation

7

FTBOA Appendix Two - PITIA public statement

Another WCPFC failure

At a recent meeting in Brisbane of the Pacific Island Tuna Industry Association (PITIA) executive the meeting noted with grave concern and disappointment the failure, yet again, of the 11th annual session of Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission to make any substantive progress in considering pressing issues relating to Pacific tuna fisheries management.

Despite the efforts of FFA and PNA secretariats and members, discussions of key issues for tropical tuna and albacore were stalled by the DWFN countries resulting in no progress being made.

PITIA believes that the faith in WCPFC as a functional RFM O is now eroded to the extent that there is no longer confidence in Commission processes to effectively manage the Pacific tuna fisheries. It is also clear that the interests of Small Island Developing States as reflected in the convention simply receive lip service and are not sufficiently taken into account.

WCPFC now has proven to be unable to settle key issues and has settled into a process of agreeing to disagree, failing to reach the necessary compromises required for action on issues that should be the primary business of the Commission .

It is becoming increasingly clear that FFA and PNA members need to move forward with meaningful and effective management arrangements through continuing to enhance internal management avenues such as the 3rd Implementing Arrangement of the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA) and the recently adopted Arrangement of certain countries who participate in the Southern Longline Albacore Fishery.

PITIA continues to call for stronger and smarter management that is linked to the responsible and sustainable development of the WCPFC tuna fisheries for all members.

FTBOA Appendix Three – SPC extended logbook



Owner	Ship	Regn No	Call Sign 2014 .	
IMO No. Chain of Custody				
			Licence	
Win Full Fishing Co., Ltd 1207	WIN FULL 1 Golden Ocean	000206	3DVU	
Win Full Fishing Co., Ltd 1208	WIN FULL 2 Golden Ocean	000207	3DVW	
Ocean Harvest Fiji Ltd 1203	WIN STAR 1 Golden Ocean	000421	3DXG	
Ocean Harvest Fiji Ltd 1204	WIN STAR 2 Golden Ocean	000422	3DXH	
Wistar Fiji Ltd 1205	WIN FULL 6 Golden Ocean	000300	3DWO	
Wistar Fiji Ltd 1206	WIN FULL 10 Golden Ocean	2 000876	3DWQ	
Fexlixstow Limited 1212 N/A	Julamari Solander	000904	3DN6652	
Solander Pacific Limited 1220 8114481	Kariqa Solander	0000428	3DYK	
Solander Pacific Limited 1214 897550	Solander II Solander	000424	3DYJ	
Solander Pacific Limited 1227 8653152	Solander III Solander	373770	3DQH	
Solander Pacific Limited 1215 8653164	Solander IV Solander	000015	3DVD	
Solander Pacific Limited 1216 8875554	Solander V Solander	000117	3DVL	
Solander Pacific Limited 1217 8653176	Solander VI Solander	000193	3DVS	
Solander Pacific Limited 1218 8972118	Solander IX Solander	000339	3DWW	
Solander Pacific Limited 1231 9269154	Solander X Solander	000299	3DWN	
Solander Pacific Limited 1219 8653188	Solander X1 Solander	000271	3DWK	
Solander Pacific Limited Carrier 8931449	Solander XV Solander	001067	3DVY	
Solander Viti Limited 1210 8879407	Solander XII Solander	000796	Vessel 3DSP	
Solander Viti Limited 1211 8950926	Solander XIV Solander	000914	3DNA	

FTBOA Appendix Four – List of vessels covered by FTBOA FOFA MOU.

Cleveland Limited 1209 N/A	Lady Ama Solander	000361	3DN6572
Sea Quest (Fiji) Limited 1221 N/A	Rabi 1 Sea Quest	000020	3DN6264
Sea Quest (Fiji) Limited FJ/LIC- N/A	Sea Jiko Sea Quest	000024	3DVF
Sea Quest (Fiji) Limited	Sea Malibu	001176	FFW-001 3DOW
Sea Quest (Fiji) Limited 1243 N/A	Sea Beluga Sea Quest	001175	3DOU
Sea Quest (Fiji) Limited 1247 N/A	Seaquence Sea Quest	000831	3DTH
Sea Quest (Fiji) Limited FJ/LIC-N/A	Seaka Sea Quest	001179	3DWR
Sea Quest (Fiji) Limited TBA N/A	Seaqual Sea Quest	000235	FFW-007 3DWC
Sea Quest (Fiji) Limited TBA N/A	Sea Green Sea Quest	000776	3DX0
Hangton Pacific Co Ltd 1202 8648925	Hangton 9 Hangton	000848	3DUW
Hangton Pacific Co Ltd 1201 8648913	Hangton 8 Hangton	000847	3DUV
Hangton Pacific Co Ltd 1200 8648901	Hangton 7 Hangton	000846	3DUU
Hangton Pacific Co Ltd 1198 864884	Hangton 3 Hangton	000382	3DXU
Sam Weon Fishery Ltd FFW-015 N/A	Sam Weon 11 Sea Quest	000694	3DZN



Appendix 5. Revised Surveillance Program (if necessary)

Table 5.1 : Surveillance level rationale

Year	Surveillance activity	Number of auditors	Rationale
3	e.g. On-site audit	2 auditors on-site	e.g. From the client action plan it can be deduced that information needed to verify progress towards all 8 conditions must be provided in year 3. The CAB proposes to have an on-site audit with 2 auditors - this is to ensure that all information is collected and because the information cannot be easily provided remotely.

Table 5.2: Timing of surveillance audit

Year	Anniversary date of certificate	Proposed date of surveillance audit	Rationale
3	13 December 2012.	February 2016	This fits with the client and key stakeholder availability

Table 5.3: Fishery Surveillance Program

Surveillance Level	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Level 6	e.g. On-site surveillance audit	e.g. On-site surveillance audit	e.g. On-site surveillance audit	e.g. On-site surveillance audit & re-certification site visit.