# **Overview**

In this document the applicant should outline progress made towards the actions listed in the Fishery Action Plan (FAP) as part of the Fishery Improvement Project (FIP). This should be aligned with the MarinTrust Assessment criteria where possible. The progress actions should be updated in the following tables, and the relevant evidence linked to. It is important that evidence documents are publicly available. This will be checked by MarinTrust and then verified by the peer reviewer during the annual peer review process based on evidence submitted by the applicant.

For the 6-month report, it is not required to provide an update on all actions. The FIP is required to provide updates on actions where demonstrable progress has been made since the last reporting (the last 6 months).

## **Template guidelines**

To help ensure the review process can be carried out effectively and efficiently:

- Include specific citations to the evidence that substantiates it. This should include the exact page numbers and paragraph references where the evidence can be found.
- Where possible, include a hyperlink to any evidence referenced.
- Ensure that the supporting evidence documents are easily accessible and well-organised. They should be available in a format that allows for easy navigation, such as a table of contents, bookmarks, or an index.
- Use clear and concise language when referring to evidence to make it easy for readers to grasp why a particular piece of evidence supports a specific progress claim.
- If evidence documents have been submitted during previous reports, this should be clearly identified.
- Each activity being reported on should be clearly linked to the relevant MarinTrust clause and FAP.

Note: MarinTrust will host all evidence documents on the MarinTrust FIP profiles. If there are any confidential and or draft documents that the applicant does not want made public, this should be made clear in the report.



# **IP 6-month update**

## M – Management framework and surveillance, control and enforcement

MT clause	Action ref.	Action details	Action update / progress made	Evidence	Status of action	Additional comments
M1.1.3, M1.2.3, M1.2.4, M1.4.1, M1.5.3	1.1	Review current legal and policy framework	An initial meeting was held remotely with the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Water Resources (MAFWR) (21/7/25) and we submitted a list of questions, to which they responded. They provided a copy of the key legislation (the Living Aquatic Resources Law) but it is available only in Arabic. After trying online methods (which did not work) the FIP commissioned a commercial translation into English. We are now working on an initial gap analysis but it is not yet complete.	Evidence 1 – translation of Living Aquatic Resources Law  Evidence 2 – List of questions submitted to MAFWR with the responses received to date	Ongoing	The first FIP meeting is planned for 1-3 Dec – it is hoped that further information can be gathered in person
M1.5.1, M1.5.2	2.1	Evaluate system of stakeholder consultations	According to the Ministry there are both formal and informal means by which MAFWR communicates with fishers, including formal meetings, regular liaison with Fishermen's Associations (which have their offices in government buildings in each governorate) and social media.	We do not have direct evidence of consultations, except for the information provided by the Ministry (Evidence 2)	Ongoing	
M1.2.3, M2.2.2, M2.3.1,	3.1	Review the surveillance /	Chapters 7 and 8 of the Living Aquatic Resources Law covers the monitoring and control system and the penalties to be applied in the case of	Evidence 1	Ongoing	



M2.3.2,	enforcement	different types of violation. As noted above, the	42	
M2.3.3	system	initial gap analysis is underway.		

#### A – Category A: Data collection, stock assessment, harvest strategy and stock status

Activities relating directly to Category A in the workplan have not yet started (planned start date in workplan 11/25 – intent is to kick off at FIP meeting in early December.

#### B – Category B Species

No category B species identified so far

#### C – Category C Species

No category C species identified so far

## D – Category D Species

No actions required for the Category D species so far identified

### E – Ecosystem requirements

MT clause	Action ref.	Action details	Action update / progress made	Evidence	Status of action	Additional comments
E1.1.1,	7.1	ETP species	The FIP solicited and received a	Evidence 3 –	Ongoing	Progress has been
E1.1.2,		identification	proposal to undertake this work from	OneOcean proposal		slower than hoped
E1.1.3,		and review	OneOcean, an Omani marine	on ETP species		because key
E2.1.2,		of	environmental consultancy with	interactions		personnel in MAFWR
		interactions	expertise and long experience of			have been away on
E2.2.1,			working on marine conservation in	https://oneocean.blue/		leave, but FIP



E3.1.1,	Oman. The proposal has been accepted	participants consider
E3.1.3	by the FIP participants but we are	it important to involve
	awaiting formal clearance from MAFWR	the Ministry from the
	before starting work.	start

# Defining the UoA

MT clause	Action ref.	Action details	Action update / progress made	Evidence	Status of action	Additional comments
All	0.1 and 0.2	Review factory data and define FIP species list	We have not formally started this action yet – the intent is to establish a list of required data during the meeting in December – it is much easier to discuss this in person, and with representatives from MAFWR present		Delayed	I've added this extra table here to deal with Action 0 in the workplan – better definition of the UoA (species list)

# **Index for evidence documents**

MT clause	Action in plan	Evidence document	Link
See above	Action 1, Action 3	Evidence 1 – translation of Living Aquatic Resources Law	
See above	Action 1, Action 2	Evidence 2 – questions to MAFWR and preliminary responses	
See above	Action 7	Evidence 3 – Proposal from OneOcean	

