Potential Negative Impacts of FAD Use, Proposed Solutions, and RFMO Implementation Status As of March 2026

KEY: Yes | Partial | No

Negative Impacts	Proposed Solution to Negative Impacts	Implementation Status			
		IATTC	ICCAT	IOTC	WCPFC
High catch of juvenile yellowfin and bigeye tunas	Improving stock assessment: FAD data used	✓	✓	✓	✓
Lack of reliable estimates of fishing effort	Improving stock assessment: FAD abundance indices	✓	✓	✓	✗
	Allocation between gears / set types	✗	✗	✗	✗
Higher bycatch rates of non-target species compared to FSC[1]	Discard bans	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Valorization non-target species	✗	✗	✓	✗
	Echosounder position	✓	✗	✓	✗*
	Echosounder biomass to science	✓	✗	✗	✗
	Full observer coverage	✓	✓	…	✓
Ghost fishing	Limit deployments of FADs	✗	✗	…	✗
Habitat perturbation/ ecological trap	Limit active FADs	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Bycatch mitigation and best practices	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Require fully non-entangling FADs	✓	✓	✓	✓
Habitat impacts from lost and abandoned FADs / Marine pollution / Strandings	Biodegradable FADs	…**	…**	…**	✗
	Establish ownership rules	✗	✗	✓	✗
	FAD recovery programs	…	✗	✗	✗
	Spatial management of FADs deployment	✗	✗	✗	✗
Problems of ownership and tracking	Establish ownership rules	✗	✗	✓	✗

* Required by PNA
** Transition timetable adopted

[1] Free-swimming schools

Adapted from: Pons, M., Kaplan, D., Moreno, G., Escalle, L., Abascal, F., Hall, M., Restrepo, V., & Hilborn, R. (2023). Benefits, concerns, and solutions of fishing for tunas with drifting fish aggregation devices. Fish and Fisheries, 00, 1– 24. https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12780

ISSF INTERNATIONAL SEAFOOD SUSTAINABILITY FOUNDATION

iss-foundation.org

Published March 2026