## [FIP name]

## Fishery Improvement Project (FIP) Workplan

## *Introduction*

*Developing a fishery improvement project (FIP) workplan is an important, required step in the FIP process. The purpose of this document is to outline the information that must be included in a FIP workplan. The FIP workplan should be developed in collaboration with FIP stakeholders. This template includes the important components of a workplan and provides the information needed to report progress on FisheryProgress.org. Upon completion, FIP workplans should be translated from the local language into English or from English into the local language to ensure adequate understanding among all stakeholders. Text in italics provides additional guidance about information that should be included in each section and should be removed from the final version of this document. Highlighted text should be replaced to reflect the information for your fishery.*

***Guidance on how to use the workplan template***

*The workplan template aims to help stakeholders develop a clear plan for implementing the fishery improvements that need to be made and ensures that information needed for reporting on FisheryProgress.org is included in the workplan. For Comprehensive FIPs, each performance indicator (PI) that has a scoring category of <60 (i.e., red) or 60-79 (i.e., yellow) must have at least one action directly linked to it, that would, when completed, result in a score of >80 (i.e., meeting the requirements of the >80 guidepost for that PI). For Basic FIPs, there must be at least one action directly linked to a PI that has a scoring category of <60 (i.e., red) or 60-79 (i.e., yellow). The actions, when completed, must lead to at least one increased score change (i.e., meeting the requirements of the next scoring guidepost for that PI).*

*The critical elements that need to be included in the FIP workplan are:*

1. ***Actions:*** *Defined as a major activity in the FIP’s workplan that must be completed to address specific deficiencies identified in the needs assessment (for basic FIPs) or MSC pre-assessment (for comprehensive FIPs). For comprehensive FIPs, actions should clearly link to the PIs of the MSC Fisheries Standard. For FIPs reporting their progress on* [*FisheryProgress.org*](http://www.fisheryprogress.org)*, both basic and comprehensive FIPs need to report progress against the MSC Principles.*
2. ***Completion dates:*** *To ensure accountability, an expected completion date should be included for each action.*
3. ***Priority:*** *High, medium or low priority taking into account scoring in the needs assessment or MSC pre-assessment and sequencing of actions (output of one action needed to begin another action).*
4. ***Estimated Cost:*** *Costs for each action.*
5. ***Responsible parties:*** *Organizations/individuals responsible for completing the actions as agreed upon by FIP stakeholders.*
6. ***MSC PIs:*** *All PIs that will be addressed by the action.*
7. ***Tasks:*** *This section breaks the actions identified above down into specific steps that describe how the action will be accomplished. Tasks provide more clarity on how the FIP intends to complete each action. This allows participants to better track progress over time and communicate about progress being made in the FIP.*

**Table 1: Workplan Overview**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Workplan Version and Date** |  |
| **Start date** (expected) | **End date** (anticipated month/year) |
|  |  |
| **FIP Lead** (organization/individual responsible for Action Plan) | **Improvements recommended by** (meeting/group that supported the development) |
|  |  |
| **FIP Coordinator** (organization/individual responsible for reporting on FisheryProgress) | **Workplan developed by** (consultant or person) |
|  |  |

#### Acronyms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Example:** FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations |
| **Example:** FIP | Fishery Improvement Project |
| **Example:** MSC | Marine Stewardship Council |

####

#### Unit of Assessment(s)

*Fill in the following table, which will be considered the scope against which the fishery is assessed against the MSC Fisheries Standard.*

**Table 2. Unit(s) of Assessment (UoA)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **UoA 1** | **Description** |
| **Target species (common and scientific name)** | Example: Mahi mahi (*Coryphaena hippurus)*  |
| **Stock** | Example: Eastern Pacific |
| **Geographical area** | Example: The exclusive economic zone (EEZ) of Peru |
| **Fishing method or gear type** | Example: Surface longline |
| **Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock** | Example: Artisanal Peruvian fleet |
| **UoA 2 (Add/delete as appropriate)** | **Description** |
| **Target species (common and scientific name)** |  |
| **Stock** |  |
| **Geographical area** |  |
| **Fishing method or gear type** |  |
| **Fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing stock** |  |

## FIP Actions

**Table 3. Performance Indicator Action Plan Table for Action xx [Replace with Action Number or Name]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Action Number and Name** (One sentence description) | 1.1.2 Define the stock unit(s) |
| **Action Goal** (One sentence that describe the result of the action) | Understand the stock distribution and mahi mahi population structure |
| **Action Description** (Brief summary of the steps involved in the action and importance of the action in achieving the FIP objectives) | To define the mahi mahi biological unit and determine the status of the stock, the Working Group for the Assessment of Mahi mahi needs to consider conducting genetic analysis and tagging studies. Genetic markers can be used to identify distinct fish populations. Tagging studies have proven to be very useful to understand the migratory patterns of tuna species and could also be useful to understand migratory patterns of mahi mahi. Implementing research tagging projects would provide an understanding of the stock distribution. |
| **Expected Completion Date** | March 2018 |
| **Priority** (Based on the implementers criteria: e.g., lowest scoring issues are high priority or actions that are necessary to complete before beginning other actions are high priority) |  Medium |
| **Estimated Cost**(An estimate of the budget needed to complete the action) | $50,000 USD |
| **Responsible Parties** (List of participants) | IMARPE, Universities, SRP, IATTC |
| **MSC PI(s) Addressed by the Action** | 1.2.3 Information and Monitoring |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Tasks/ Milestones** | **Responsible (lead)** | **Responsible (supporting role)** | **Starting date** | **Expected completion date** | **Evidence of completion / results** |
| 1.1.2 Define the stock unit(s) | Design and implement tagging research projects | IMARPE, Universities | SRP, IATTC, Relevant NGOs | December 2016 | March 2017 | Tagging study |
| Design and implement genetic research project | IMARPE, Universities | SRP, IATTC, Relevant NGOs | December 2016 | December 2017 |   |

**[Copy and paste table for additional actions needed as appropriate]**

## Additional Impacts

Some FIPs include objectives that go beyond the MSC PIs. Please provide additional detail below on additional impacts that FIP stakeholders are working to address.

### Example: Traceability improvements

*Describe the problems, goals and actions that will be implemented to ensure FIP traceability.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Addition Impact Title**  | **Additional Impact Description** |
| **Status Summary** |  |
| **Improvement Recommendation** |  |

[**Copy and paste table as appropriate]**