

## 6-month review of Mauritania small pelagic FIP under the MarinTrust IP

Jo Gascoigne, October 2020

Note:

There are two versions of the FIP workplan, one in the form of a excel spreadsheet / pdf which is available on FisheryProgress, and one in the form of a word document which is used to provide the FIP 6-monthly updates. These have the same activities (verified) but for some reason in a different order. In neither case does the order relate very logically to the MarinTrust standard, while the excel spreadsheet is very difficult to read and the word document numbering system has gone wrong.

To sort out these various problems, I have re-ordered and renumbered the FIP activities in an order which approximates a stock-ecosystem-management structure, so the numbering of tasks and activities here does not relate back to either workplan (but should be used from now on). I have also taken this as a cue to review and revise the workplan and our template for updates, which will be done before the next update.

In addition in the workplan, the milestones are stated as activities (evaluate stock status) rather than milestones (stock status evaluated) – they have therefore been slightly reworded as well.

In red are comments on the workplan in relation to activities that may not be required, or may need revision, based on information we have gathered in the course of the FIP.

Task		Activities		Year 1 milestone	Subsequent milestones
1	Define the sardinella stock	1.1	Support additional data collection to define suitable stock or management unit boundaries	Current stock definitions and data evaluated, gaps identified	Y2 and Y3: Additional data collection implemented as necessary; Y4: Data evaluated
		1.2	Evaluate stock definitions		
	<i>Progress against Y1 milestone</i>	There are two species of sardinella taken in this fishery: <i>Sardinella aurita</i> (round sardinella) and <i>S. maderensis</i> (flat sardinella). The CECAF/COPACE working group highlights uncertainty around stock definition as a problem for sardinella stocks, but an evaluation by Ahmede Vall (2019) suggests that it is fairly well-established that there is a single stock of <i>S. aurita</i> in the region (S. Morocco to Guinea Bissau). The main problem relates to <i>S. maderensis</i> which is more coastal and less migratory, and where there is more likely to be unrecognised stock structure.			

	<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>	<p>A project is planned to start under the FAO EAF-Nansen programme (<a href="http://www.fao.org/in-action/eaf-nansen/en/">http://www.fao.org/in-action/eaf-nansen/en/</a>) to research sardinella stock structure (COPACE 2019), but the start appears to have been delayed by covid.</p> <p>For information about data collection in Mauritania, see Task 2 below.</p>			
2	Improve fishery-dependent sampling	2.1	Adapt sampling protocol if required based on Task 1 <b>(not likely to be required)</b>	Resources available for sampling evaluated in relation to sampling required by IMROP and FAO/COPACE for improved stock assessment; funding proposals to improve sampling coverage if necessary	In consultation with FAO/COPACE if necessary, protocol for size-frequency and other sampling of catches evaluated; e.g. coverage of various fleet segments, assessment of sampling frequency vs sample size
2.2		Evaluate resources available for sampling and develop funding proposals to improve sampling if required			
2.3		Evaluate protocol for size-frequency and other sampling and adapt if required <b>(protocol is set by COPACE – no need to change)</b>			
	<i>Progress against Y1 milestone</i>	<p>COPACE (2018, 2019) is clear that sampling from Mauritania is not adequate. IMROP's resources have not kept pace with the enormous growth of the coastal fishery (FIP fishery) since ~2015. A key aim for the FIP is to support IMROP and improve data from the fishery, and we have tried to address this in various ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new Mauritania Fisheries Policy (2020-24) highlights this problem and sets out clear targets from IMROP to improve data collection. However, the implementation of the policy requires strong and ongoing national commitment. The FIP participants collectively sent a letter to the Minister of Fisheries, expressing their support for the policy and underlying our strong belief that support for science, data collection and IMROP is the only route to sustainability for this fishery (see letter Attachment 1). Subsequently, the Minister has changed, but Olvea has been able to meet the new Minister (October 2020) and he has appointed a FIP liaison within his office (Mme. Azza). The Mauritania FIP coordinator (Cheikh-baye Braham) has met her and we hope to be able to work with her and the Ministry more closely than has been possible in the past.</li> <li>• The FIP participants have developed and support (financially) a 'mini-project' (funding €35,000 so far from the FIP; see Attachment 2) which aims to fill the most critical gaps in IMROP's sampling for the coastal fishery by the end of 2020. This includes establishing some facilities in the new port of Tanit, purchase of a vehicle for enumerators as well as tablets for collecting data (IMROP uses the software ODK to support electronic data collection). A key secondary aim of this project is as a demonstration that the FIP and IMROP have the governance in place to be able to receive and spend funds in a robust and transparent way.</li> <li>• It is clear, however, that additional, more sustainable funding is required to support IMROP. The FIP has been working with a project funded by the MAVA Foundation through MSC. The aim of this project is to find new sources of funding for supporting and improving fisheries, and to this end they are working with experts in projecting</li> </ul>			

		<p>financing (ClarMondiale). To be part of this project, the FIP must align itself with the MSC standard, alongside MarinTrust (which is still the key objective of the participants). To this end, work is ongoing on a MSC pre-assessment of the fishery (MRAG, in prep.). The FIP has also worked to engage with other bilateral donors in Mauritania (including the EU – meetings with ambassador and fisheries attaché, October 2020) and GIZ (meetings with Dr Mohammed Vall, director of Mauritania programme, October 2020 as well as on several previous occasions). The FIP organised a workshop in Nouadhibou in March 2020 to build knowledge and capacity among the factory owners and other stakeholders about the global fishmeal industry and the importance of sustainability in the marketplace, to which both these organisations were invited, but sadly it had to be cancelled due to covid.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some practical issues remain: for example IMROP recently reported problems with access to some factories – the FIP is looking into facilitating this. The importance of working closely with IMROP and providing data has been emphasised at every FIP meeting – unfortunately the March 2020 meeting had to be cancelled and there is currently no decision about when the next FIP meeting can be held.</li> </ul>			
	<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>	As noted above, COPACE sets sampling protocols and they appear to be appropriate; the difficulty is achieving them. IMROP recently held a workshop which evaluated their entire data system (Système de Suivi de la Pêche Artisanal et Côtière / System for monitoring the artisanal and coastal fishery; SSPAC), supported by GIZ.			
3	Improve the acoustic survey frequency / methodology	3.1	Assess options for analysis of survey data and support funding proposals for data analysis and preparation if necessary (survey methodologies and data preparation and analysis are harmonised across the region and this element is already supported by the EAF-Nansen project)	Options for analysis of survey data assessed; funding proposals for support of data analysis and preparation if necessary	Y2: Funding proposals to cover costs of improved survey coverage; requirements and costs for filling key gaps in survey coverage and frequency assessed, Y3: Suitability of existing surveys and key gaps evaluated with regional scientists
	3.2*	Assess requirements, costs and facilities available for acoustic surveys			
	3.3*	Develop funding proposals to support improved survey coverage			
	3.4*	Work with regional scientists to ensure that surveys are addressing the needs of stock assessment			
	<i>Progress against Y1 milestone</i>	Encouragingly, there were two acoustic surveys in Mauritanian waters in 2019 (attachment 3a and b); one with the Mauritanian RV Al Awam and a regional survey with the RV Fridtjof Nansen. Another Nansen survey was planned in 2020			

		(see <a href="http://www.fao.org/in-action/eaf-nansen/en/">http://www.fao.org/in-action/eaf-nansen/en/</a> ) but had to be cut short due to covid (the scientists were stuck in Norway for some time). The new policy (2020-24) acknowledges that the AI Awam needs maintenance and update, but this is extremely expensive.			
	<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>	Work on locating funding to improve science and data is described under Task 2.			
4	Management plan for the sardinella fishery	4.1*	Develop national-level objectives for the stocks to support the delivery of regional objectives	Current management plan and data gaps evaluated; catches made by the fishery and others evaluated	Y2: Management plan for the Mauritania sardinella fishery, including appropriate measures for each fleet segment to deliver regional and associated national stock objectives; Y3: Stock assessment in relation to current objectives, In consultation with FAO/COPACE
		4.2*	Define a harvest strategy with appropriate reference points		
		4.3*	Within the management plan, define a harvest strategy and reference points for each species		
		4.4*	Implement the management plan, including legislative implements, administrative framework and resources		
		4.5*	Assess stock status in relation to objectives		
		4.6*	Evaluate catch and fishing capacity and evaluate whether a reduction is needed		
	<i>Progress against Y1 milestone</i>	A management plan for the small pelagic fishery exists (finalised in June 2013 Attachment 4) but has never been implemented; the fishery has changed so much since then that it needs complete revision. The new Fisheries Policy emphasises the role of management plans, so hopefully this will now come to the fore. There is an established process for development / revision of management plans which involves extensive stakeholder participation, so the FIP should be able to be involved.  In terms of data, the FIP's work to support data collection is outlined in Task 2. Data are available for catch of small pelagics by species and fleet (provided by IMROP on request), although they are uncertain to some extent, as outlined above.			
	<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>	Stock-level objectives and stock assessments already exist, both at regional level (COPACE) and at national level (IMROP conducts an annual national stock assessment based on the COPACE objectives, in order to provide management advice to the government, notably on the level of the TAC).			
5	Management plan for the obo fishery <i>(not required – see</i>	5.1	Work with stakeholders to develop objectives for the obo stock at Mauritanian level	If capacity / catch reduction is required, stakeholders from all fishery segments agree a	<i>(not considered – see below)</i>
		5.2	Develop a management plan for the obo fishery		
		5.3	Define a harvest strategy with reference points		
		5.4	Implement the management plan, including legislative implements, administrative framework and resources		

	explanation below)	5.5	Assess the stock status of obo in relation to management objectives	management approach consistent with agreed objectives	
		5.6	Evaluate catch / capacity in relation to the obo resources available		
		5.7	If capacity / catch reduction is required agree a management approach to achieve agreed objectives		
	Progress against Y1 milestone	<p>NB: obo = bonga shad = éthmalose = <i>Ethmalose fimbriata</i></p> <p>Having obtained catch data which is broken down by fleet sector from IMROP, it is apparent that the proportion of obo in the catch has declined, and in 2018 was only 0.4% of the total catch of small pelagics (artisanal and coastal fleets – high seas freezer trawler excluded as not supplying factories in FIP) (data from IMROP). This means that this part of the workplan is most likely not required, but will be kept under review as more data are obtained.</p>			
Progress against subsequent milestones	See above				
6	Increase sampling of mackerel	6.1	Improve data for mackerel	Data for mackerel improved	Y2: Identification techniques in use as required
		6.2	Investigate more advanced identification techniques		
		6.3	Evaluate results		
	Progress against Y1 milestone	For the FIP's work towards improving data, see Task 2			
Progress against subsequent milestones	It is unclear that this is actually a problem; further north there are two species of mackerel – <i>Scomber colias (japonicus)</i> and <i>S. scombrus</i> . As far as we know, however, in this area it is only <i>S. colias</i> (see for example the statistics in COPACE 2018, 2019), <b>but we will double check with IMROP!</b>				
7	Reduce catch and effort for Atlantic horse mackerel	7.1	Assess the total overlap of the stock	Stock/species definitions clear; work underway to improve management	Y2-Y4: FIP supporting improved management and enforcement
		7.2	Advocate for stronger management		
		7.3	Support stronger management and enforcement		
	Progress against Y1 milestone	<p>NB: Atlantic horse mackerel = <i>Trachurus trachurus</i></p> <p>Having obtained catch data which is broken down by fleet sector from IMROP, it is apparent that ~95% of the horse mackerel catch (both species combined) in Mauritanian waters in 2019 was taken by the high seas pelagic freezer trawler fleet, which is not part of the FIP (this is a fleet made up of Russian and EU freezer trawlers, fishing in Mauritania under</p>			

		<p>Fishing Agreements – the catch does not supply the factories or enter the fishmeal supply chain in Mauritania). According to COPACE (2019; data from 2018) only 28% of this catch is <i>T. trachurus</i> – the rest is <i>T. trecae</i> (see below).</p> <p>This means that this part of the workplan is most likely not required, but will be kept under review as more data are obtained.</p>			
	<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>	See above			
8	Improve understanding of Cunene horse mackerel stock	8.1	Improve data collection	Additional data collection	Y4: Stock definition and data collection suitable for stock assessment
		8.2	Evaluate stock definitions		
		8.3	Evaluate data collection to make sure it is sufficient		
	<i>Progress against Y1 milestone</i>	<p>NB: Cunene horse mackerel = <i>Trachurus trecae</i>  See under Task 7 above. For information on data collection, see Task 2.</p>			
<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>	See under Task 7 above				
9	Improve management of false scad	9.1	Improve data	Current stock assessed and overlap with fishery mapped	Y3 and Y4: Stronger management measures in place if required
		9.2	Evaluate current management measures		
		9.3	Support stronger management measures as required		
	<i>Progress against Y1 milestone</i>	<p>NB: False scad = <i>Caranx rhonchus</i>  According to COPACE, false scad is a negligible proportion of catch in Mauritania (&lt;0.2% in 2018). This means that this part of the workplan is most likely not required, but will be kept under review as more data are obtained. COPACE (2019) attempted to assess the stock of false scad but since Senegal did not provide any data, it was not possible. However, CSRP is supporting Senegal in a project to improve data collection from the artisanal fishery, and it is reported that the situation in 2019 and 2020 has improved. Unfortunately, the COPACE small pelagic working group has not been able to meet in 2020 as yet (planned for April but postponed due to covid; Cheikh-baye Braham, chair, pers. comm.).  For information on FIP work on data collection, see Task 2.</p>			

	<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>	<b>See under Task 7 above</b>			
10	Data collection on discards and ETP species interactions	10.1*	Evaluate the best way of collection data from the vessels supplying the factories	Improve quality and quantity of observer data	Y2: Data analysed; Y3 Management measures in place if required; Y4: Outcome evaluated
		10.2*	Support IMROP in the analysis of existing observer data, if not already done		
		10.3*	Implement observer / observation scheme		
		10.4*	Support IMROP for data analysis as required		
		10.5*	Support the implementation of additional management measures for protection of bycatch and endangered species if required		
	<i>Progress against Y1 milestone</i>	<p>It does not seem that data from the high seas EU and Russian trawlers can provide much information about the vessels in the FIP since they are operating in a different zone (further offshore) (Inejih 2020) and with different gear. Three cruise reports from the RV Al Awam (Camphuysen et al. 2012, 2015, 2017) evaluated possible interactions of vessels with birds and marine mammals, but again further offshore from this fishery so probably not relevant.</p> <p>It has therefore been concluded that it is necessary to put observers directly on the vessels concerned (the coastal fleet). To this end, IMROP has recently held a workshop to train observers (observer protocol, species identification, rights and responsibilities, safety etc.) (being a fisheries observer is not an easy job) (IMROP 2020; report available on request).</p>			
	<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>	No data yet available – no progress.			
11	Evaluation of impact on the ecosystem	11.1*	Support work on evaluating the ecosystem impacts of the fishery in Mauritania	Ecosystem impacts analysed	Y2: The changes needed to the fishery, if any, are evaluated; Y3: Work underway to implement changes; Y4: Results evaluated
		11.2*	Incorporate the results of the study into the development of objectives and action plans		
	<i>Progress against Y1 milestone</i>	An ecosystem model has been developed (Ahmede Vall 2019) which draws on previous work conducted in Morocco (Macha-Allah and Guenette 2018) (thesis co-supervised with IMROP and INRH in Morocco). This analysis suggests that the fishery is not likely to have catastrophic impact on the ecosystem at current levels of exploitation. However (similar to problems which arose with this work in Morocco), the ecosystem of northern Mauritania is extremely complex and			

			biodiverse, and therefore not very amenable to modelling; particularly not if the model is to be used for management purposes (they are not likely to be sufficiently robust). A different approach is therefore needed.		
	<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>		The key source of ecosystem impacts identified in this study is over-exploitation and reduction in biomass of target species, which are the main source of prey for a wide variety of predators (demersal and pelagic fish, seabirds and mammals in particular). The highest biomass in the zone (and therefore the key prey) is either sardinellas or sardines, depending on the state of the ecosystem (position of the Cap Blanc front) at the time. The sardine stock is healthy (hence why it does not feature in this workplan despite being the main source of fishmeal from this area at present), but the sardinella stocks are not – hence the elements of the workplan which address the management of these stocks (Tasks 2 and 4 in particular) are likely to be the best means of addressing ecosystem impacts.		
12	Support improved compliance	12.1	Identify gaps in compliance	Gaps in compliance identify	Y2: Projects developed; Y3: Projects underway; Y4: Compliance improved
		12.2	Identify means to fill gaps		
		12.3	Support projects to improve compliance		
	<i>Progress against Y1 milestone</i>	Inejih (2020) identifies the main gaps in compliance for the small pelagic fishery, which is: non-respect of zoning, failure of some vessels to use VMS/AIS, under/mis-declaration of catch and non-respect of bycatch limits. That's not to say that all vessels are doing this, but these issues arise in the fleet as a whole. In terms of catch identification, it is hoped that Task 2 will improve the situation. In relation to VMS and bycatch failures, Inejih (2020) raises concerns about corruption, which is hard for the FIP to tackle. The zoning system is currently under review, the current system having had a series of unintended consequences for the fishery.			
<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>	Inejih report is very recent (October 2020) and since we have had no FIP meetings in 2020 we have not had an opportunity to discuss this issue as yet – no progress.				
13	Support improved compliance	12.1	Identify gaps in compliance	Gaps in compliance identify	Y2: Projects developed; Y3: Projects underway; Y4: Compliance improved
		12.2	Identify means to fill gaps		
		12.3	Support projects to improve compliance		
	<i>Progress against Y1 milestone</i>	As part of the development of the 2020-24 fisheries policy, the Ministry commissioned a report on the situation in relation to control and surveillance for all its fisheries (Attachment 5), including small pelagics (the most important in terms of size and value). Inejih (2020) also identifies the main gaps in compliance for the small pelagic fishery, which is: non-respect of zoning, failure of some vessels to use VMS/AIS, under/mis-declaration of catch and non-respect of bycatch limits. That's not to say that all vessels are doing this, but these issues arise in the fleet as a whole. In terms of catch identification, it is hoped that Task 2 will improve the situation. In relation to VMS and bycatch failures, Inejih (2020) raises concerns about			



		corruption, which is hard for the FIP to tackle. The zoning system is currently under review, the current system having had a series of unintended consequences for the fishery.			
	<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>	Inejih report is very recent (October 2020) and since we have had no FIP meetings in 2020 we have not had an opportunity to discuss this issue as yet – no progress.			
14	Development of legislative instruments to bring policies into force	14.1	Identify gaps in implementation of legislation and policy	Identify gaps in legislation / implementation	Y3: FIP participates as a stakeholder in the development of legislation
		14.2	Support Ministry as required to draft suitable legislative instruments (not required – the Ministry has a legal team and agreed procedures for drafting and agreeing legislation)		
		14.3	Support implementation of legislation on the ground as required		
	<i>Progress against Y1 milestone</i>	<p>Since the FIP started, the Ministry has put out a large number of arrêtés, décrets, lettres circulaires and other legislative instruments including management measures for the fishery – the problem highlighted by FIP participants relates more to i) coherence of these measures and ii) implementation. Recent management measures are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• arrêté 28 du 13 janv. 2016 – licensing</li> <li>• circulaire 13 du 1er mars 2016 – TAC</li> <li>• décret 2015-159, arrêté 992 de 2019 and message 41 du 24 avril 2020 – zoning</li> <li>• lettre du Ministère et des Garde Côtes, 4 fév.2020 – no landing of <i>S. aurita</i> to fishmeal, 20% of landings should go for human consumption</li> <li>• arrêté 264 du 9 av.2018 – VMS and logbook</li> <li>• there are also: restrictions on gear mesh size and requirement to land in a designated port and (reportedly – very recent) a requirement for vessels to land catch in plastic boxes rather than in bulk</li> </ul> <p>As clearly identified by Inejih (2020) and FIP participants, the coherence of these measures, unintended consequences and implement-ability in practice are all problems. To give some examples, the recent requirement to land a proportion of the catch to human consumption (including all <i>S. aurita</i>) is restricted by the lack of facilities which are of suitable sanitary standard (although the factories are investing in this aspect); while gear of the required mesh size put strain on the hauling equipment on the vessels. The work to revise and implement the management plan for sardinella (Task 4) should be the best method of addressing these issues – by providing a coherent overview of what is required and how it is possible to achieve it, and by allowing stakeholders, including FIP participants to provide input.</p>			

		<p>Another element which gives rise for optimism is the new fisheries policy 2020-24 (Attachment 6), which shows a clear analysis and understanding of the problems in the fishery and how they need to be addressed. As part of the development of this policy, the Ministry commissioned a review of the effectiveness of governance in the fisheries sector (MPEM 2020; Attachment 7). As already noted, the FIP has provided input and support for this policy. Although it is ambitious, a review of implementation of the previous policy (2015-19 – Poseidon and Maurifish 2019) shows that the Ministry has a reasonable track record of implementation.</p>			
	<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>	See above – this is already the case to some extent but as noted above needs improvement			
15	Promote bilateral or multilateral agreements of management	15.1	Evaluate the appropriate geographical level required for management of each stock	Appropriate level for management is clear, national level biomass indicators available	Issues relating to the fishery highlighted at regional level, management cooperation in place in some form*
		15.2	Where the appropriate level is national, develop management plans		
		15.3	Support work to bring forward issues at regional level where appropriate		
		15.4	Evaluation options for national-level biomass indicators for regional stocks, to support informal / bilateral cooperation		
	<i>Progress against Y1 milestone</i>	<p>Regional fisheries organisations are CECAF/COPACE, CSRП and COMHAFAT, but none of them have any mandate for regulation or any decision-making powers. The main activity of CECAF is scientific (supporting regional cooperation for stock assessments) – and in this it is very successful. The main activity of CSRП is to implement projects at regional level in support of fisheries management – for example they are currently supporting Senegal to improve data collection from the artisanal fishery (a very big challenge) and ensuring that data collection protocols are harmonised across the region. (NB CSRП does not include Morocco.) COMHAFAT is a Ministerial-level coordination body which is not open to outside participants except by invitation. However discussion have been held to see if on the pertinence of delegating fisheries management to COMHAFAT (Attachment 8).</p> <p>The geographical level of management required for the main stocks in the fishery is fairly clear. For sardine, Morocco takes the majority of the catch, with the proportion of the catch coming from Mauritania varying from low to ~third depending on the oceanographic regime at the time. For the two sardinella species, Mauritania and Senegal take ~50% of the catch each, with the other COPACE participants (Morocco, Gambia) taking a small proportion (Guinea-Bissau will also take some but no data are available). Management of all three of the main stocks is therefore possible through bilateral means, and this might be a more realistic approach than creating a RFMO from scratch, although it is still not easy.</p>			

		As well as the regional COPACE stock assessment, IMROP conduct an annual national-level stock assessment – see for example IMROP 2019. There are also national acoustic surveys – most recent in 2019. There are, therefore, national as well as regional biomass indicators.			
	<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>	<p>In relation to Morocco, Moroccan scientists and a representative of the DPM (Ministry) had planned to attend the FIP-organised small pelagic workshop in March 2020 – which would have represented major progress. However, the workshop sadly had to be postponed due to covid, and at time of writing we still do not know when it can be held.</p> <p>Senegal has major problems with fisheries management (e.g. they were unable to provide any catch statistics to COPACE in 2019). It is very difficult for the FIP to see how to deal with this issue.</p>			
16	Support a regional body in developing regional-level management	16.1	Identify most appropriate regional body	Engagement with regional organisations	National authorities supported to develop regional structures
		16.2	Support work to develop appropriate structures within the organisation		
		16.3	Apply to attend meetings as an observer – providing input as permitted		
		16.4	Put forward proposals to move the management forward, where necessary		
	<i>Progress against Y1 milestone</i>	See Task 15 – it seems more realistic to try and work at bilateral level (Task 15) than create a regional management organisation (Task 16)			
	<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>	See above – this task is unrealistic.			
17	Identify and coordinate with other relevant projects	17.1	Identify similar FIPs / other similar projects	Engage with relevant organisations	Engage with relevant organisations
		17.2	Engage with these projects		
	<i>Progress against Y1 milestone</i>	The work of the FIP to engage with the MAVA/MSC/ClarMondiale project is described under Task 2. In addition to that (and MarinTrust of course), we have had some moral and practical support from SFP, and will be participants in their forthcoming Global Reduction Fisheries Supply Chain Roundtable – which has identified NW Africa as a key area requiring support. We have identified the fact that the fishery is mainly a reduction fishery as a key barrier to obtaining external support and cooperation. To this end we have been trying to highlight and support government policy which is to move from reduction fishing to human consumption; several of the factories are already investing in improvements to this end, and Olvea aims to source from byproducts rather than whole fish where possible (as per Olvea CSR policy). The FIP has			
	<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>				

			been promoting GMP+ certification of the factories as an initial step towards improvement of traceability and sanitary standards.		
18	Identify social issues within the fishery	18.1	Assess social components in the fishery	(none)	Y2: Assess social issues; Y3, Y4: Support change as required
		18.2	Support change		
		18.3	Promote social management measures		
	<i>Progress against Y1 milestone</i>	n/a			
	<i>Progress against subsequent milestones</i>	Some work has been done on social issues in Mauritanian fisheries but the FIP has not yet addressed this issue. As of 2021 we will be required to have a social component to our activities as a condition of being on FisheryProgress.org, but their social policy is not yet finalised.			

\* these activities reworded and reordered a bit to improve coherence – it seems that in some cases activities have been listed from end to beginning

## References

- Ahmede Vall M. 2019. Construction d'un modèle d'équilibre de masse « Ecopath » sur le réseau trophique de l'écosystème d'upwelling nord mauritanien (19,15°N - 21°N). Travail de fin d'études.
- Camphuysen C.J., T.M. van Spanje and H. Verdaat 2012. Ship-based seabird and marine mammal surveys off Mauritania, Nov-Dec 2012. Cruise report. NIOZ and IMROP.
- Camphuysen C.J. 2015. Ship-based seabird and marine mammal surveys off Mauritania, 4-14 Sept. 2015. Cruise report. NIOZ and IMROP.
- Camphuysen C.J., R. van Bemmelen, T. van Spanje 2017. Ship-based seabird and marine mammal surveys off Mauritania, 1-12 Nov. 2016. Cruise report. NIOZ and IMROP
- COPACE 2019. Rapport de groupe de travail sur l'évaluation des petits pêlagiques au large de l'Afrique Nord-Occidentale Casablanca, Maroc, 8-13 juillet 2019. Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (CECAF)/Comité des pêches pour l'Atlantique Centre-Est (COPACE). FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Report No. 1309/FAO, Rapport sur les pêches et l'aquaculture no 1309. Rome.

COPACE 2018. Rapport du Groupe de travail de la FAO sur l'évaluation des petits pélagiques au large de l'Afrique nord-occidentale. Banjul, Gambie, 26 juin–1 juillet 2018. FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Report/FAO Rapport sur les pêches et l'aquaculture No. R1247. Rome.

IMROP 2019. 9ieme édition du groupe de travail scientifique de l'IMROP sous le thème : Aménagement des ressources halieutiques et gestion de la biodiversité au service du développement durable. Nouadhibou, 11-14 février 2019.

IMROP 2020. Atelier interne de formation des observateurs scientifiques pour le suivi des activités de pêche des senneurs ciblant les petits pélagiques ; IMROP, Nouadhibou, 06 juillet au 10 juillet 2020 : Rapport de l'atelier.

Inejih C.A. 2020. Audit du zonage des pêcheries maritimes-Mauritanie : Rapport final.

Macha-allah R. and Guénette S. 2018. Rapport de fin de projet de modélisation écosystémique, Réalisé dans le cadre d'un contrat d'étude pour la Fédération Nationale des Industries de Transformation et de Valorisation des Produits de la Pêche du Maroc (FENIP). Aout 2018.

MPEM 2020. Elaboration de la stratégie nationale pour un développement durable et inclusif du secteur de la pêche maritime pour la période 2020-2024. Rapport thématique: Amélioration de la Gouvernance, de l'Efficacité et de l'Efficience de la Fiscalité du Secteur des Pêches

Poseidon et Maurifish 2019. Évaluation à mi-parcours de la mise en œuvre de la stratégie nationale de gestion responsable pour un développement durable du secteur des pêches et de l'économie maritime 2015-2019 – rapport final provisoire. 13 pages.