

South Africa Hake Longline

Fishery Improvement Action Plan

02 February 2023



**Table
1a:**

Action Plan Overview

Fishery name:	South Africa Hake Longline	Fishery location:	South African EEZ
Fishing method/gear:	Demersal longline	Fishery in ITM program? (Applicant/Yes/No):	Applicant (Yes, by 06 December)
Start date (expected):	End date (anticipated month/year of entering Full Assessment):		
01 April 2022	30 June 2025 (30 September 2025)		
Project leaders (organisation/individual responsible for Action Plan):	Improvements recommended by (meeting/group that supported the development):		
South African Hake Longline Association (SAHLLA) – Clyde Bodenham, Redah DeMaine, Gastao Fernandez, Kerrigan Marx	On the basis of the Pre-Assessment and consultation with the SAHLLA Executive, BirdLife South Africa and WILDOCEANS.		
FIP Coordinator/ ITM Project Manager (name, affiliation and position if applicable):	Action Plan developed by (consultant or person):		
Alistair Burls / Stewart Norman, CapMarine	Stewart Norman, CapMarine		
Overview of the Action Plan :			

Principle 1 – The fishery targets two species of cape hake that are considered IPI stocks due to the nature of the fishing operations that would make separating the species uneconomical. The deepwater hake stock (*M. paradoxus*) is shared with the neighbouring Namibian EEZ and fished by the certified trawl and longline fisheries therein as well as the overlapping SA hake Trawl fishery in South Africa. The shallow water hake (*M. capensis*) stock is not shared with Namibia but is also fished by the certified SA Hake Trawl fishery. Any Improvements required under P1 are linked to the certified South African Hake Trawl and the Namibian Hake Trawl and Longline Fishery. There is only a single PI 1.2.4 related to the deepwater hake stock that requires improvement. The stock assessment, carried out in South Africa and vice versa in Namibia, as yet does not take account of the extent of removals in Namibia and vice versa. The CAP for both certified fisheries has been harmonised in order to address this improvement. The Action Plan described here therefore is likewise harmonised with the CAP of those overlapping previously certified fisheries.

Principle 2 – The fishery has very little non-target catch and there is no need to make improvements related to primary or secondary species, outcome, management or information PIs (although more information on the source and volume of the bait species used should be provided by the fishery). More information related to ETP species needs to be gathered to ensure that the fishery can measure direct impacts on those species (in particular seabirds) and contribute information to measure trends in those populations. This data should continue to be collected through the scientific fishery at-sea observer program. The fishery operates in a geographical area that hosts known VMEs and potential VMEs and there is a need to quantify the impact of the fishery on VMEs and develop move-on rules (if necessary).

Principle 3 – Fishery specific management PIs require some improvement, in particular with respect to PI3.2.3 and acquiring statistics of offload monitoring and inspections. The Client is a representative at the South African National Demersal Scientific and Management Working Groups and should therefore be able to request up to date compliance records from the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), the regulating authority. There have been difficulties with compliance monitoring in the past (particularly regarding the enforcement presence at sea). Evidence of inspections and transgressions as well as consistent application of the sanctions in the hake longline fishery is required. Clarity on the total landed weight estimate procedure and surety of its ability to accurately estimate landed volumes of hake (and bycatch) species is needed.

Chain of Custody/Traceability – To be expanded on during the FIP

References (document/s on which the Action Plan was based):

Norman S.J. Pre-assessment of the South African Hake Longline Fishery. Capricorn Marine Environmental (PTY) LTD. 2021, 130pp.

PCR South African Hake Trawl fishery (<https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/south-africa-hake-trawl/>)

PCR Namibia Hake Trawl and Longline (<https://fisheries.msc.org/en/fisheries/namibia-hake-trawl-and-longline-fishery/>)

Table 1b: Action Plan Overview Performance Indicator detail

Performance Indicator (PI)	Action ID and Name	Timescale
1.2.4 Assessment of Stock Status	A1.2.4 – Paradoxus stock status	Year 1 – consider the appropriateness of the stock assessment applied to M. paradoxus in Namibia and South Africa Year 2 – Engage South Africa demersal scientific working group Year 3 – support DFFE to review stock assessment (if required)
2.3.2 ETP Species Management	A2.3.2 – ETP management	Year 1 – risk assessment survey Year 2 - bycatch mitigation measures implemented Year 3 – reporting and conclusion of actions
2.3.3 ETP Species Information & monitoring	A2.3.3 - ETP species information	Year 1 – Continue data collection Year 2 - Ongoing data collection and strategy in place Year 3 – reporting and conclusion of actions
2.4.1 Habitats outcome	A2.4.1 – VME impacts	Year 1 – Mapping longline footprint to ecosystems types Year 2 – Determine degree of likelihood (% overlap) for serious or irreversible harm to VMEs Year 3 – VME impact and management report

Performance Indicator (PI)	Action ID and Name	Timescale
2.4.2 Habitat management strategy	A2.4.2 – VME Move-on Rules	Year 1 – Assess need for MORs (observer data/effort-ecosystem mapping /Benthic Impacts Tool) Year 2 – Implement MORs if required or alternative management Year 3 – reporting and conclusion of actions
2.4.3 Habitat information	A2.4.3 – VME catch rates	Year 1 – adopt data collection protocols Year 2 – assess frequency of occurrence of VMEs Year 3 – reporting and conclusion of actions
3.1.1 Legal and/or customary framework	A3.1.1 – Shared stock management	Year 1 – engage existing MSC certified fisheries Year 2 – incorporate SAHLLA management personnel to established platforms Year 3 – reporting and conclusion of actions
3.2.2 Decision making processes	A3.2.2 - FRAP	Year 1 – finalize FRAP Year 2 – defined Client group members Year 3 – reporting and conclusion of actions
3.2.3 Compliance & enforcement	A3.2.3 – Evidence	Year 1 – develop data request to DFFE

Performance Indicator (PI)	Action ID and Name	Timescale
		Year 2 – collate and report inspections and transgressions data Year 3 – reporting and conclusion of actions

Actions at Performance Indicator and/or Scoring Issue level

Table 2a. Performance Indicator Action Plan table for Action 1.2.4

Action ID no	A1.2.4				
Action name	M. paradoxus stock assessment				
Action summary	Extend the assessment of M. paradoxus to account for the scenario of a demographically panmictic stock off both South Africa and Namibia				
Performance Indicator(s) and/or Scoring Issue(s)	PI 1.2.4 – Assessment of stock status Scoring Issue a - There is an adequate assessment of the stock status The assessment is appropriate for the stock and for the harvest control rule				
Date of completion	30 June 2024				
Task/s No.	Responsible – Action lead	Responsible – Action partners	Resources - Time	Date of completion	Evidence of completion
A1.2.4 – 1 Support the re-assessment if the M. paradoxus stock in South Africa (if required) taking into account the consideration of demographic panmixia with Namibia	SAHLLA Executive	DFFE Demersal Scientific Working group	10 people days	30 June 2024	Updated stock assessment report endorsed by the Demersal Scientific Working Group

Table 2b. Performance Indicator Action Plan table for Action 2.3.2

Action ID no	A2.3.2				
Action name	ETP management				
Action summary	Evidence should be collected to ensure that ETP species bycatch management measures are being implemented successfully (in particular for seabirds). There should also be a review of alternative measures to reduce post-capture mortality of chondrichthyans.				
Performance Indicator(s) and/or Scoring Issue(s)	<p>PI 2.3.2 – ETP species management strategy Scoring Issue d - Management strategy implementation There is some evidence that the measures/strategy is being implemented successfully.</p> <p>Scoring Issue e - Review of alternative measures to minimize mortality of ETP species There is a regular review of the potential effectiveness and practicality of alternative measures to minimise UoA-related mortality of ETP species and they are implemented as appropriate</p>				
Date of completion	30 June 2025				
Task/s No.	Responsible – Action lead	Responsible – Action partners	Resources - Time	Date of completion	Evidence of completion
A2.3.2 – 1 Collate available existing information from historical and current observer programs (OROP, FCP, CapMarine) on the use of bird bycatch mitigation measures (tori line, discard chute, offal discarding, night setting, deck lighting) for each vessel in the hake longline fleet.	Alistair Burls – CapMarine	BLSA CapFish	10 people days	30 June 2024	Technical report detailing the proportion of vessels using / not using each of the existing bird bycatch mitigation measures
A2.3.2 – 2 Propose vessel bird bycatch mitigation plans for vessel categories and vessels that have been	Reason Ngyera – BLSA	CapMarine	15 people days	30 June 2025	Checklist confirming viability of mitigation measures in place for each vessel

<p>visited by BLSA and CapMarine Observers. <i>State/presence absence of BSL, height of attachment point, need for additional infrastructure for BSL attachment, presence of offal management mechanisms, informal interview process with crew to have baseline information of crew awareness of bird bycatch mitigation</i> Propose recommendations to maintain or update permit conditions with respect to gear material and configuration to reduce seabird interactions.</p>					<p>listed as a SAHLLA Member. Evidence of vessel visit, assessment of vessel</p>
<p>A2.3.2 – 3 Propose safe handling and release procedures for vessel crew for chondrichthyans (and seabirds)</p> <p>Develop self-Training materials for crew in safe-handling techniques.</p> <p>Train observers in safe handling and release of sharks. Observers to monitor uptake of self-training by crew and provide support training where needed.</p>	<p>Philip Augustyn – CapMarine</p>	<p>Responsible Fisheries Alliance (RFA)</p> <p>Jennifer Olbers – Wild Oceans</p>	<p>10 people days</p>	<p>30 June 2025</p>	<p>Technical report detailing safe handling techniques</p> <p>eTraining module on species ID and safe handling.</p> <p>Observer training workshop registers.</p>

Table 2c. Performance Indicator Action Plan table for Action 2.3.3

Action ID no	A2.3.3				
Action name	ETP Species Information				
Action summary	Collect information on the number and frequency of ETP species interactions through at-sea observer coverage to a point where enough data are available to develop catch rates for each ETP species encountered in non-negligible numbers and to measure trends and support a strategy to manage impacts on ETP species – in particular for seabirds.				
Performance Indicator(s) and/or Scoring Issue(s)	PI2.3.3 ETP Species Information Scoring Issue b - Information adequacy for management strategy Information is adequate to measure trends and support a strategy to manage impacts on ETP species.				
Date of completion	30 June 2025				
Task/s No.	Responsible – Action lead	Responsible – Action partners	Resources - Time	Date of completion	Evidence of completion
A.2.3.3 – 1 Continue collecting at sea observer data to monitor interaction rates with ETP species	Alistair Burls – CapMarine	BLSA – Reason Ngyera	400 observer sea days over 2 years (~4.5%) Program management	30 June 2025	Trip reports Deployment log Annual Observer Program report 2022 Annual Observer Program Report 2023
A2.3.3 – 2 Statistically estimate catch rates of ETP species based on observer data (historical and current)	CapMarine – Jodie Reed	UCT Biological Sciences	10 statistician days	30 June 2025	Technical statistical report quantifying the impact of the hake longline sector on ETP species

Table 2d. Performance Indicator Action Plan table for Action 2.4.1

Action ID no	A2.4.1				
Action name	VME Impacts				
Action summary	Mapping the demersal longline effort footprint and existing MPAs to the ecosystem types identified in the updated 2018 National Biodiversity Assessment. This will initiate the evaluation the degree to which different ecosystem types that host potential VMEs are threatened and that may not be adequately conserved.				
Performance Indicator(s) and/or Scoring Issue(s)	PI 2.4.1 – Habitats outcome Scoring Issue b – VME Habitat status The UoA is highly unlikely to reduce structure and function of the VME habitats to a point where there would be serious or irreversible harm.				
Date of completion	30 June 2024				
Task/s No.	Responsible – Action lead	Responsible – Action partners	Resources - Time	Date of completion	Evidence of completion
A2.4.1-1 Engage relevant stakeholders to facilitate mapping the longline footprint and existing MPAs to the ecosystem types identified in the updated 2018 National Biodiversity Assessment	Dr Jodie Reed – CapMarine	SANBI – Mari-Lise Franken	8 people days	30 June 2024	Technical report from mapping exercise indicating the degree to which ecosystem types overlap with logline footprint
A2.4.1-2 Analysis of protection levels for each ecosystem type recommendations for additional management, where required, based on the results of the mapping exercise.	Dr Jodie Reed – CapMarine	SANBI – Mari-Lise Franken	4 people days	30 June 2024	Technical report on level of threat/protection posed by the longline sector to ecosystem types that may host VMEs and level of protection afforded by offshore MPA network.



Table 2e. Performance Indicator Action Plan table for Action 2.4.2

Action ID no	A2.4.2				
Action name	VME Move-On Rules				
Action summary	VME move-on rules are a minimum requirement for fisheries that operate in areas where there are known or potential VME indicator species. Move-on rules are available for the SEAFO region and neighbouring Namibian longline fishery. Adoption and incorporation/implementation of move-on rules into the SA hake longline fishery is the primary objective of this action.				
Performance Indicator(s) and/or Scoring Issue(s)	PI 2.4.2 – Habitats management strategy Scoring Issue a - Management strategy in place There are measures in place, if necessary, that are expected to achieve the Habitat Outcome 80 level of performance.				
Date of completion	30 June 2025				
Task/s No.	Responsible – Action lead	Responsible – Action partners	Resources - Time	Date of completion	Evidence of completion
A2.4.2-1 Review of available literature on VME move-on rules and Indicator species thresholds. Trial MSC Benthic Impacts Tool (https://rstudio.bangor.ac.uk/shiny/benthic/).	Alistair Burls – CapMarine	SANBI – Mari-Lise Franken	3 people days	30 June 2024	Technical report of available relevant MORs and recommendations for the Move-on rule and indicator species the fishery may adopt. Provisional scoring using the MSC Benthic Impacts Tools.
A2.4.2-2 Formal adoption of MORs by vessels and Right Holders (if required)	SAHLLA – Kerrigan Marx	SAHLLA Executive	10 people days	30 June 2024	Signed Memorandum of Understanding confirming adoption of MORs for each vessel and Right Holder in the fleet (if necessary).

<p>A2.4.2-3</p> <p>Development of VME sub-sampling strategy and monitoring of adoption of and compliance with MORs and evaluation of MOR appropriateness</p>	<p>Alistair Burls - CapMarine</p>		<p>400 observer sea days (2 years)</p> <p>Program management</p>	<p>30 June 2025</p>	<p>Invertebrate data collection and reporting. Monitoring of adoption of and compliance with MORs (if adopted) reported on a trip-by trip basis (trip reports)</p>
<p>A2.4.2-4</p> <p>Investigation of alternative precautionary approaches to avoidance and potential VMEs and VME habitats</p>	<p>Alistair Burls - CapMarine</p>		<p>3 people days</p>	<p>30 June 2025</p>	<p>Technical report highlighting alternatives to MORs to satisfy scoring at SG80 on 2.4.2a</p>

Table 2f. Performance Indicator Action Plan table for Action 2.4.3

Action ID no	A2.4.3				
Action name	VME catch rates				
Action summary	For UoAs encountering VMEs, the MSC Fisheries Standard (SA3.15.6) states that at SG80, information should at least include catch and catch rates of VME-indicator organisms and information to support the scientific definition of precautionary trigger levels, where these are used. The at-sea observer program will collect information on the frequency of occurrence of invertebrates in the longline catch, and types (genus, species) of invertebrates the fishing gear interacts with. Statistical analysis of information will be undertaken to determine VME indicator species catch rates and inform the UoA-specific definition of precautionary thresholds, if required.				
Performance Indicator(s) and/or Scoring Issue(s)	PI2.4.3 – Habitats Information Scoring Issue b – Information adequacy for assessment of impacts Information is adequate to allow for identification of the main impacts of the UoA on the main habitats, and there is reliable information on the spatial extent of interaction and on the timing and location of use of the fishing gear.				
Date of completion	30 June 2025				
Task/s No.	Responsible – Action lead	Responsible – Action partners	Resources – Time	Date of completion	Evidence of completion
A2.4.3-1 Implementation of invertebrate sub-sampling strategy through at-sea observer program	Alistair Burls - CapMarine	SANBI	400 observer sea days (2 years) Program management	30 June 2025	Invertebrate data collection and trip-by-trip reporting.
A2.4.3 – 2 Determination of VME indicator species catch rates	CapMarine – Jodie Reed	SANBI	10 statistician days	30 June 2025	Technical statistical report for determination of VME indicator species catch rates (if data are sufficient to do so) and recommendations on precautionary trigger levels if they are to be used.

<p>A2.4.3 – 3</p> <p>Spatial mapping of the hake longline footprint to the South African National Biodiversity Ecosystem types updated in 2019</p>	<p>CapMarine – Jodie Reed</p>	<p>SANBI</p>	<p>10 Geographical Information System days</p>	<p>30 June 2025</p>	<p>Technical report update of Massiel at 2015</p>
---	-------------------------------	--------------	--	---------------------	---

Table 2g. Performance Indicator Action Plan table for Action 3.1.1

Action ID no	A3.1.1				
Action name	Shared stock management				
Action summary	A system for organised and effective cooperation shall be established between the respective clients(SA Hake Longline, SA Hake Trawl, Namibia hake trawl and longline) which delivers management outcomes consistent with MSC Principles 1 and 2 in accordance with those normative requirements set out in MSC FCR v2.01 SA4.3.3.2 which are necessary to achieve that.				
Performance Indicator(s) and/or Scoring Issue(s)	PI 3.1.1 – Legal and/or customary framework Scoring Issue a - Compatibility of laws or standards with effective management There is an effective national legal system and organised and effective cooperation with other parties, where necessary, to deliver management outcomes consistent with MSC Principles 1 and 2.				
Date of completion	30 December 2024				
Task/s No.	Responsible – Action lead	Responsible – Action partners	Resources - Time	Date of completion	Evidence of completion
A3.1.1-1 Interactions with Namibian client and South African hake trawl executive towards the development of the requisite protocol	SAHLLA Executive	SADSTIA Executive Namibia Client Executive	10 people days	31 December 2024 (Harmonised with SADSTIA CAP timeline)	Annual summary record of progress in interactions with Namibian and SA trawl clients, together with Aide Memoire Copy of agreed protocol at conclusion of meetings

Table 2h. Performance Indicator Action Plan table for Action 3.2.2

Action ID no	A3.2.2				
Action name	FRAP				
Action summary	Until the conclusion of the Fishing Rights Allocation Process (FRAP) and any subsequent disputes amongst Right Holders or between SA fishing sectors are completed one cannot be certain of the ability of the Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries (DFFE) having in place decision-making processes, and dispute resolution mechanisms, which respond to serious and other important issues. The process will naturally be tested within the timeframe of the FIP. Furthermore it will be incumbent on SAHLLA to ensure that the FIP and associated Actions are completed within set timeframes and ensure determination/clarification of the SAHLLA client body				
Performance Indicator(s) and/or Scoring Issue(s)	<p>PI 3.2.2 – Decision-making processes Scoring Issue b - Responsiveness of decision-making processes Decision-making processes respond to serious and other important issues identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation and consultation, in a transparent, timely and adaptive manner and take account of the wider implications of decisions.</p> <p>Scoring Issue d – Approach to Disputes The management system or fishery is attempting to comply in a timely fashion with judicial decisions arising from any legal challenges.</p>				
Date of completion	31 December 2022				
Task/s No.	Responsible – Action lead	Responsible – Action partners	Resources - Time	Date of completion	Evidence of completion
A3.2.2-1 Conclusion of FRAP	DFFE	SAHLLA Executive	8 people days	31 December 2022	List of new RHs in the sector and adoption / clarification of the SAHLLA client body

Table 2i. Performance Indicator Action Plan table for Action 3.2.3

Action ID no	A3.2.3				
Action name	PI 3.2.3 – Evidence				
Action summary	The hake sector is one of the 4 compliance priorities in South Africa. Confirmation that annual enforcement inspection targets that are set for the hake longline fisheries, including 100% monitoring of offloads, are being achieved is required. Evidence of inspections and transgressions as well as consistent application of the sanctions in the hake longline fishery is required. Clarity on the total landed weight estimate procedure and surety of its ability to accurately estimate landed volumes of hake (and bycatch) species is needed.				
Performance Indicator(s) and/or Scoring Issue(s)	<p>PI 3.2.3 – Compliance and enforcement</p> <p>Scoring Issue a - MCS implementation</p> <p>A monitoring, control and surveillance system has been implemented in the fishery and has demonstrated an ability to enforce relevant management measures, strategies and/or rules.</p> <p>Scoring Issue b – Sanctions</p> <p>Sanctions to deal with non-compliance exist, are consistently applied and thought to provide effective deterrence.</p> <p>Scoring Issue d - Systematic non-compliance</p> <p>There is no evidence of systematic non-compliance</p>				
Date of completion	30 June 2025				
Task/s No.	Responsible – Action lead	Responsible – Action partners	Resources - Time	Date of completion	Evidence of completion
A3.2.3-1	DFFE: CD MCS, Buyukezwa Polo, Fatima Savel, VMS Ops.	DFFE: CD MRM SAHLLA Executive	8 person days – DFFE 8 people days – SAHLLA Executive	30 June 2025	Technical Report detailing the MCS system in place for the demersal longline sector as well as providing metrics to measure/verify the level of implementation and compliance
A3.2.3-2	Alistair Burls – CapMarine	Fish Processing Establishments (FPEs)	14 people days at R3200/day 20 Executive days at R4000/day	30 June 2025	Comparative landed mass estimate based on the normal

<p>Assessment of the methodology and sampling procedures used to estimate hake catches of the South African Hake Longline Fishery.</p> <p>Comparison of factory offload weights with Skipper logbooks.</p> <p>Recommendations to Skippers with respect to accurate completion of logbooks</p>	<p>SAHLLA Executive and Operators</p>	<p>DFFE MCS Offload Monitors</p>	<p>Calibrated Scales x 2 (provided by FPE)</p>		<p>estimation procedures that should be followed by the inspectors and/or monitors and those derived from factory weights</p>
---	---------------------------------------	----------------------------------	--	--	---

Table 3a. Action plan score change table for Principle 1 Performance Indicators

UoA 1 *M. paradoxus*

Performance Indicator	Draft Scoring Range [Pre-Assessment] Year 0	Action(s) IDs [If improvement is needed]	Expected PI draft scoring range change		
			Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
1.1.1 Stock Status	≥80	N/A			
1.1.2 Stock rebuilding	≥80	N/A			
1.2.1 Harvest Strategy	≥80	N/A			
1.2.2 Harvest control rules and tools	≥80	N/A			
1.2.3 Information and monitoring	≥80	N/A			
1.2.4 Assessment of stock status	60-79	A1.2.4			

UoA 2 *M. capensis*

Performance Indicator	Draft Scoring Range [Pre-Assessment] Year 0	Action(s) IDs [If improvement is needed]	Expected PI draft scoring range change		
			Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
1.1.1 Stock Status	≥80	N/A			

1.1.2 Stock rebuilding	≥80	N/A			
1.2.1 Harvest Strategy	≥80	N/A			
1.2.2 Harvest control rules and tools	≥80	N/A			
1.2.3 Information and monitoring	≥80	N/A			
1.2.4 Assessment of stock status	≥80	N/A			

Table 3b. Action plan score change table for Principle 2 Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Draft Scoring Range Year 0	Action(s) IDs	Expected PI draft scoring range change		
			Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
2.1.1 Primary species outcome	≥80	N/A			
2.1.2 Primary species management	≥80	N/A			
2.1.3 Primary species Information & monitoring	≥80	N/A			
2.2.1 Secondary species outcome	≥80	N/A			
2.2.2 Secondary species management	≥80	N/A			
2.2.3. Secondary species Information & monitoring	≥80	N/A			
2.3.1 ETP species Outcome	≥80	N/A			
2.3.2 ETP species management	60 - 79	A2.3.2			

2.3.3 ETP Species Information & monitoring	60 - 79	A2.3.3			
2.4.1 Habitats Outcome	60 - 79	A2.4.1			
2.4.2 Habitat management strategy	<60	A2.4.2			
2.4.3 Habitat information	60 - 79	A2.4.3			
2.5.1 Ecosystem outcome	≥80	N/A			
2.5.2 Ecosystem management strategy	≥80	N/A			
2.5.3 Ecosystem information	≥80	N/A			

Table 3c. Action plan score change table for Principle 3 Performance Indicators

Performance Indicator	Draft Scoring Range Year 0	Action(s) IDs	Expected PI draft scoring range change		
			Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
3.1.1 Legal and/or customary framework	60 - 79	A3.1.1			
3.1.2 Consultation, roles & responsibilities	≥80	N/A			
3.1.3 Long-term objectives	≥80	N/A			
3.2.1 Fishery-specific objectives	≥80	N/A			
3.2.2 Decision-making processes	60 - 79	A3.2.2			
3.2.3 Compliance & enforcement	60 - 79	A3.2.3			

3.2.4 Monitoring and management performance evaluation	≥80	N/A			
--	-----	-----	--	--	--

Stakeholder Action Plans

The use of Stakeholder Action Plans is Optional. The Action Plan Report could include an individual action plan for each stakeholder that is responsible for delivery actions within the action plan. The report may also include signed agreements from the stakeholders that have been assigned a responsibility for a particular action.

Table 4. Stakeholder responsibilities

[Complete a separate stakeholder responsibilities table for each stakeholder group]

Stakeholder	[Insert stakeholder name and contact information here]
Actions for which responsible	[Insert the Action IDs for which the stakeholder is responsible]
Tasks	[Insert tasks for which the stakeholder is responsible]
Date of completion	[Insert date that the tasks should be completed by]

Appendix. Stakeholder agreement to undertake actions