



TECHNICAL AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE
Twentieth Regular Session
25 September – 1 October 2024
Pohnpei, FSM

Summary Report

Issued: 24 November 2024

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACAP	Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels
ANCORS	Australian National Centre for Ocean Resources and Security
APIL	Advocates for Public Interest Law
AW	Archipelagic waters
BET	Bigeye tuna
CCFS	(Vessel-level) Compliance Case File System
CCM	Members, Cooperating Non-members and participating Territories
CKMR	Close-kin mark-recapture
CMM	Conservation and Management Measure
CMR, pCMR, fCMR	Compliance Monitoring Report (p-provisional; f-final)
CMS	Compliance Monitoring Scheme
CNM	Cooperating Non-Member
DP	Delegation paper
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EPO	Eastern Pacific Ocean
ER and EM	electronic reporting and electronic monitoring
EU	European Union
FAC	Finance and Administration Committee
FAD	Fish aggregating (or aggregation) device
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FFA	Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
FSM	Federated States of Micronesia
GFW	Global Fishing Watch
HCR	Harvest Control Rule
HMTC	Harmonized Minimum Terms and Conditions
HS	Harvest Strategy
HSBI	High Seas Boarding and Inspection
IATTC	Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission
IPNLF	International Pole and Line Foundation
ISC	International Scientific Committee for Tuna and Tuna-like Species in the North Pacific Ocean
ISSF	International Seafood Sustainability Foundation
IWG	Intersessional Working Group
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
JPF	Japan Promotion Fund
JTF	Japan Trust Fund
JWG	Joint Working Group
MFCL	MultiFAN-CL
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MP	Management Procedure
MSC	Marine Stewardship Council
MSE	Management Strategy Evaluation

NC	WCPFC Northern Committee
NGO	Non-Governmental Organizations
NPFC	North Pacific Fisheries Commission
NTADS	Non-target and Associated or Dependent Species
OM	Operating model
OSPESCA	Organisation of the Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector of the Central American Isthmus
PIFS	Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
PNAO	Office of the Parties to the Nauru Agreement
PNG	Papua New Guinea
PSM	Port State Measures
RBAF	Risk-based assessment framework
RMI	Republic of the Marshall Islands
ROP	Regional Observer Programme
SBT	Southern bluefin tuna
SC	Scientific Committee
SciData	Scientific data
SDR	Special Drawing Rights
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SKJ	Skipjack tuna
SMD	Science Management Dialogue
SP-ALB	South Pacific albacore
SPARM	South Pacific albacore Roadmap
SPC	Pacific Community
SPG	South Pacific Group
SPR	Spawning potential ratio
SPRFMO	South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation
SSB/SB	Spawning Stock Biomass
SSP	Scientific Services Provider
SWG	Small working group
TCC	Technical and Compliance Committee
TRP	Target Reference Point
USA	United States of America
VDS	Vessel Day Scheme
VMS	Vessel Monitoring System
WCPFC	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission
WCPO	Western and Central Pacific Ocean
WPEA-ITM	West Pacific East Asia – Improved Tuna Monitoring Project
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
YFT	Yellowfin tuna

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	ii
AGENDA ITEM 1 – OPENING OF THE MEETING	6
1.1 Welcome.....	6
1.2 Adoption of Agenda.....	7
1.3 Meeting Arrangements	7
AGENDA ITEM 2 – EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S ANNUAL REPORT ON TECHNICAL AND COMPLIANCE MATTERS	7
AGENDA ITEM 3 – TCC WORKPLAN	8
Introduction of Delegation Papers	9
AGENDA ITEM 4 – IUU VESSEL LIST	12
AGENDA ITEM 5 – CNM REQUESTS	14
AGENDA ITEM 6 – COMPLIANCE MONITORING SCHEME (CMS)	17
6.1 Provisional CMR covering RY 2023	17
6.2 Addressing imbalance in CCFS.....	19
6.3 Addressing outstanding CCFS cases (older than 24 months).....	24
6.4 Provisional list of obligations for assessment in 2025 CMS	26
6.5 Future work to enhance the CMS	30
AGENDA ITEM 7 – STATUS OF FISHERIES AND CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS	31
AGENDA ITEM 8 – SUPPORTING SCIENCE-BASED MANAGEMENT	36
8.1 CMMS with interpretation issues identified in the CMS (updates)	36
8.2 Review of CMM 2015-02 SP albacore	39
8.3 Tropical Tuna CMM and FAD Management Options IWG.....	41
8.4 Development of Monitoring Strategy for Skipjack tuna.....	44
8.5 Review of CMM 2018-03 Seabirds	48
8.6 Review alternative measures to shark finning prohibition (CMM 2022-04).....	49
8.7 Review of CMM 2011-03 Cetaceans.....	57
AGENDA ITEM 9 – WCPFC’S MONITORING PROGRAMMES	58
9.1 CMM 2018-05 Regional Observer Programme	58
9.2 Development of E-Monitoring Standards	60
9.3 CMM 2009-06 Regulation of Transshipment	62
9.4 CMM 2014-02 Commission VMS	63
9.5 CMM 2017-02 Port State Minimum Standards	65
9.6 Review data access and data exchange arrangements.....	67
9.7 Scientific Data Gaps and relevant SC20 outcomes	69
9.8 CMM 2006-08 High Seas Boarding and Inspection Scheme.....	71
9.9 CMM 2021-04 Charter Notification Scheme	73
AGENDA ITEM 10 – AVAILABLE DATA FOR VERIFYING COMPLIANCE	74
AGENDA ITEM 11 – LABOUR STANDARDS	75
AGENDA ITEM 12 – SUPPORTING CCMS WITH MONITORING AND EVALUATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF COOPERATIVE MCS TOOLS	76
AGENDA ITEM 13 – SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS OF DEVELOPING STATES	77
13.1 Capacity Assistance Needs	77
13.2 Implementation of CMM 2013-06.....	78
AGENDA ITEM 14 – ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS	83
14.1 WCPFC Information and Network Security Framework.....	83
14.2 Required resources	84
14.3 Election of Officers	84
14.4 Next meeting.....	85

AGENDA ITEM 15 – OTHER MATTERS FOR TCC INCLUDING ADVICE FROM THE TCC20 ODF 85
AGENDA ITEM 16 – CLEARANCE OF TCC20 RECOMMENDATIONS 85
AGENDA ITEM 17 – CLOSE OF MEETING..... 85
ATTACHMENT A – List of Confirmed Participants..... 87
ATTACHMENT B – Draft Provisional List of TCC Work for 2025 103
ATTACHMENT C – Provisional List of Obligations to be assessed in the 2025 CMS..... 105
ATTACHMENT D – Proposed forward workplan for ER&EM IWG..... 109

AGENDA ITEM 1 – OPENING OF THE MEETING

1.1 Welcome

1. TCC Chair, Mat Kertesz formally opened the meeting and warmly invited the Fiji delegation to bless the meeting with a prayer.
 2. Nixon Anson from Pohnpei State Government provided some opening remarks on behalf of the host country. He paid respects to traditional leaders and acknowledged the Executive Director, WCPFC and TCC Chairs and CCM delegations and extended a warm welcome to all. It was an honour for Pohnpei to host this gathering, and he noted that TCC is a regular meeting that convened every year in Pohnpei State. This meeting helped safeguard the tuna resources for future generations, and was an opportunity to share information about the challenges facing the tuna fisheries of the region. He asked delegations not to spend all their time working but to take some time to explore the island and talk to its people.
 3. The WCPFC Chair Josie Tamate greeted all present and acknowledged with appreciation the support from the WCPFC host country of FSM and in particular Pohnpei State. As Chair she was using the opportunity to observe the discussions and how this important work would feed into the deliberations of the Commission Annual session at the end of the year. She noted that some external voices have called for transparency and accused the commission of working in secret. She was encouraged by the collaborative side-event with WWF the previous day and said that this was the kind of collaboration that should continue to be promoted. She thanked the TCC Chair for the hard work in preparing for this meeting. The agenda for WCPFC21 would be intense, with much to be done, but hoped discussion would be efficient and effective without needing delegations to work late into the night like the Annual Session last year. The subsidiary bodies and IWGs were being tabled early in the agenda because their recommendations were important. She was working with the ED on how SC, NC, TCC and IWG work could more effectively be channelled into the WCPFC Annual Session. She requested that the IWGs presenting proposals for consideration at TCC20 should make best efforts to accomplish their work during the time available to produce new and more efficient CMMs, but if further work was needed then it was important for TCC participants to please say so. It should not be left to the Commission Annual Session to make such evaluations at the last minute. She hoped TCC could take up this challenge and wished participants all the best in their deliberations.
 4. WCPFC Secretariat Executive Director Rhea Moss-Christian warmly welcomed everyone to the WCPFC headquarters in Pohnpei. For two decades TCC had provided the cornerstone for sustainable management of WCPO tuna fisheries. The role of TCC had never been more critical, with a growing need for MCS amid the pending impacts of climate change. There were also increasing pressures from other ocean activities which complicated the region's efforts to maintain healthy tuna stocks and ecosystems, and complicated the task of implementing management measures. There had been significant strides, but much remained to be done. She encouraged all to continue collaboration within TCC, and felt that these problems could be tackled with determination and unity.
 5. TCC Chair Mat Kertesz welcomed participants to the meeting and encouraged participants to take time to enjoy being in Pohnpei and support the local communities. The Chair welcomed the work of the Secretariat, the SSP and CCMs in driving the successes of the Commission. The Chair noted the important role of subregional groups in this Commission, as well as the constructive relationships with non-government organisations. The Chair welcomed the significant, collaborative effort that CCMs and the Secretariat had put into the Compliance Monitoring Scheme over the years and that these efforts would help meet a key goal of
-

providing more time to progress work on a range of critical technical issues this year. The Chair noted an increased focus on ensuring that subsidiary bodies are working together effectively to support the Commission in implementing science-based management, and drew attention to the need for a new TCC workplan to support these efforts.

1.2 Adoption of Agenda

Relevant paper: [TCC20-2024-02_rev3](#)

6. The Chair noted that the 3rd revision of the Provisional Agenda rev 3 was being put forward for adoption after having been considered by the Heads of Delegation meeting the previous day.

7. TCC20 adopted the agenda (WCPFC-TCC20-2024-02_rev3)
--

1.3 Meeting Arrangements

Relevant papers: [Circular 2024-36](#), [TCC20-2024-01](#)

8. The Chair outlined the meeting arrangements and indicative schedule. The Executive Director briefly introduced the new features of the WCPFC meeting page, including presentation of the documents by agenda item, and the activity feed for updates on new and revised papers. It was noted that the rapporteur was working remotely so submissions via email of interventions would be particularly appreciated this year.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S ANNUAL REPORT ON TECHNICAL AND COMPLIANCE MATTERS

Relevant paper: [TCC20-2024-04](#)

9. Rhea Moss-Christian (WCPFC Executive Director) presented Working Paper 4. This report was in two parts – a consolidated update on work undertaken since TCC19 in relation to the Commission’s data collection and monitoring programmes to support TCC20’s discussion of future priorities for consideration in the updated TCC workplan; and an overview of the Commission’s activities in 2024 through intersessional working groups and their linkages to TCC.
10. The Secretariat restructure of the Compliance team to address the expectations of the Commission was continuing. The scope and duties of the Assistant Compliance Manager position were expanded, and Eidre Sharp was recruited in July and commenced as the new Deputy Compliance Manager. Karl Staisch, the former ROP Manager was now in a consultancy role managing the ROP audit process. There was a new Fisheries Management and Compliance Adviser, and support staff duty statements had been revised. The Secretariat was not just striving to improve data quality but also analytical capability.

Discussion

11. Fiji appreciated the presentation and asked if the WCPFC Port State Measures (PSM) CMM review to take account of progress across the region would be addressed at some point? The Chair noted that agenda item 9.5 would be an opportunity to discuss this question, and encouraged everyone to think about the review required under the PSM CMM. The Deputy

Compliance Manager noted that there was a required report on HSBI and that the measure was overdue for review. This might also be progressed under the TCC workplan.

12. The Cook Islands spoke for FFA CCMs to thank the Executive Director for the Secretariat's Annual Report to TCC on technical and compliance matters. This had provided a useful update and snapshot of the Commission's monitoring tools. They also thanked the Secretariat for its approach to leveraging open-source software tools to support the generation and reproduction of CCM annual reports to the Commission. They recognised that the workload of the TCC, including the Secretariat's preparation, was quite significant. Preparation for TCC was also difficult for CCMs, who needed to work through a large number of papers and they appreciated these being provided as early as possible (at least 30 days in advance of TCC) to assist in preparations.
13. Korea thanked the Executive Director for outlining all the tasks and progress to date. The website improvements were particularly appreciated, and the restructure of staffing was noted. Korea understood that the WCPFC Secretariat had been working with other RFMOs and asked for the next Executive Director's Report to describe the collaborative work undertaken.
14. The USA found the Executive Director's report on TCC matters to be extremely informative. They congratulated those involved in improving the online compliance platform, which had greatly improved the efficiency of CCM engagement with the process.

15. TCC20 welcomed the Annual Report of the Executive Director on the technical and compliance activities undertaken since TCC19 and recognised the substantial body of TCC-related work that takes place intersessionally as well as year-round (TCC20-2024-04).

16. TCC20 **tasked** the Secretariat to include in future Annual Reports an overview of the engagement on compliance and monitoring undertaken with other RFMOs.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – TCC WORKPLAN

Relevant paper: [TCC20-2024-05](#)

17. The Chair explained that in line with the WCPFC20 tasking an updated workplan had been posted at the end of June as TCC20-2024-05, however a new workplan for 2025 and beyond needs to be prepared for consideration by WCPFC21. This workplan will be developed based on the outputs of TCC20 and the guidance of TCC and the Commission on prioritisation of key bodies of work.
18. He noted that this agenda item would be kept open and reopened, probably on Day 5, to discuss any issues flagged during the course of the meeting.
19. Korea thought these were sensible suggestions. We should also consider how to streamline the work of the CMS IWG. Also there had not been much progress on the VMS SWG and we needed to discuss how to approach this, since one co-chair Viv was no longer with the Australian Government.

-
20. The Chair noted there were some workplan key tasks that would transition into “business as usual” and some that were time-bound, and would need to think about the structure of the plan.
21. Tonga spoke for FFA Members to thank the TCC Chair for the updated and consolidated Work Plan 2022- 2024. In terms of the review and update process of the TCC work plan, FFA supported the proposed review process for the TCC Chair, Vice Chair and Secretariat to undertake during and post TCC20 in the lead up to the Commission meeting in December to put together the TCC Workplan for post-2024. It was noted that the work would be done intersessionally and it is important that there is sufficient opportunity for Member feedback and input. Some decisions coming out of WCPFC21 will need to be captured in the new work plan and that the work plan may need to be updated to reflect where work is concluded. Noting that the current work plan is very extensive and contains 22 priorities, this raises a genuine question around the ability of TCC to prioritize its work. To that end, FFA Members propose identifying the priorities and separating them from the “business as usual” tasks in the revised updated work plan. We also see the work on management procedures on skipjack and albacore as a priority and that TCC should articulate its role on these priorities.
22. Discussion on this agenda item resumed following Agenda Item 14.2 Required Resources. The TCC Chair and TCC Vice-Chair provided an update on the noted list of TCC workplan items from the TCC20 plenary discussions (**ATTACHMENT E**). TCC was asked to discuss priorities for 2025, and to potentially spread out the topics across three years. This could be used as guidance for developing a draft updated TCC workplan for consideration at WCPFC21, noting that this would need to also need to take into account Commission priorities arising from WCPFC21 discussions in Fiji.
23. TCC20 **tasked the TCC Chair, TCC Vice-Chair and the Secretariat** to develop an updated TCC Workplan (2025-2027) for consideration at WCPFC21.

Introduction of Delegation Papers

24. The Chair explained that this was not a separate agenda item, but was an early opportunity for proponents to introduce their Delegation Papers for consideration later in the meeting. Many of these proposals would benefit from preliminary informal discussion, either in the margins or in Small Working Groups, before coming back to plenary for decision under the appropriate agenda item, and it would be helpful to identify these early in the meeting so separate times could be set aside to accommodate these discussions.

DP01 and DP05_rev1 on improving the Seabirds CMM – under Agenda 8.5

25. New Zealand briefly described DP01 and DP05_rev1 on improving the Seabirds CMM, and invited delegates to take part in an Informal Small Group discussion before the plenary discussion.

DP03 & DP06 Alternative measures to prohibiting shark finning – under Agenda 8.6

26. Canada and Japan both had papers on alternative measures to prohibiting shark finning, under Agenda 8.6. Canada described DP03 which highlighted the difficulty of assessing compliance with these alternatives, and ways in which the CMM might be amended to make compliance assessment more feasible. Japan then introduced DP06, and noted that this kind of information was normally provided in the Annual Report, but Japan also wanted to bring these specific issues

to the attention of CCMs but also to observers. Japan had found no difficulty in assessing compliance after landing and wanted the measure to continue.

27. Nauru on behalf of FFA CCMs thanked both Canada and Japan for the reports of their experiences with monitoring enforcement of paragraph 9 of CMM2022-04. They noted with concern the findings from Canada's report from High Seas Boarding Inspections and hoped the responsible Flag States were addressing these issues appropriately. They looked forward to engaging with other CCMs on this issue to clearly define and clarify this paragraph for its primary intended purpose.
28. The Chair noted there was CCMs Annual Report Part 2 reported information related to CMM 2022-04 07-10 available on the WCPFC CCM secure site, and asked if some progress towards agreement could be made in the margins of the meeting before formal discussion under Agenda item 8.6.

DP04 Cetaceans – under Agenda 8.7.

29. DP04 from Korea and the USA sought to extend the management of interactions with cetaceans to longline vessels. Currently the measure only applies to purse-seiners. Korea had submitted a similar proposal in 2019, and was happy to renew this. Other CCMs were invited to support it. No ISG was envisaged.

DP07 & DP08 on transshipment – under Agenda 9.3

30. The Marshall Islands explained that DP08 was an executive summary of the full report in DP07, which looked at analysing the application of the "impracticability clause" in the prohibition of at-sea transshipment measure, noting that the review found many instances where high seas transshipment (HSTS) had been authorised when it did not appear to be impracticable to tranship in port.

DP02 High seas Boarding & Inspection (HSBI) – under Agenda 9.8.

31. China introduced DP02 which highlighted an HSBI issue, and noted that this was actually China's first ever Delegation Paper. China noted that the paper asked questions about when is inspection necessary, and are all measures used by inspection teams appropriate? They noted that the measure was first agreed in 2007 and needed to be updated. China had proposed language for amendment, but was suggesting that the CMM be discussed over the course of the coming year and considered for updating at TCC in 2025. China was seeking the convening of an ISG here, but a tasking in the TCC workplan to review the measure and consider it for decision in 2025.

OP03 & 4 Observers & EM coverage – under Agenda 9.1, 9.2

32. WWF provided a summary of their position on Observer coverage and EM standards contained in their Observer Paper OP03. WWF noted that the WCPO region was fortunate that target tuna stocks were in the green and it is hoped, in spite of climate change, IUU, and other threats, that projections would continue to tick up for target stocks and bycatch - that the data was correct and that the region would get lucky with the consequences. But "hope is not a strategy and luck should not be a factor" when considering the dire economic and ecological consequences of a mistake. Scientists continually cite uncertainty as a challenge to predict and protect our fisheries' future, and some members have continually declined to answer that challenge by continuing to defer and delay improved observer coverage on the longline fleet.

-
33. WCPFC was currently managing the silky shark population on the basis of a statistical coin flip. Similarly, given the odds, WCPFC would be better off managing Southwest Pacific striped marlin with a roulette wheel. Additionally, nobody had any real understanding of cetacean bycatch or depredation, despite recent and growing claims of an increase. The list could go on with respect to target stocks and non-target species alike. The common thread through all these issues was the lack of independent and robust observer coverage and the critical data verification and validation they provide.
 34. It was also important to acknowledge that none of these issues existed in isolation. The same practice that we know facilitated IUU fishing and human rights abuses by allowing vessels to stay out at sea for years at a time - transshipment - was also used as an excuse for not improving observer coverage on those vessels that might detect and ultimately prevent those issues, because, it is claimed, that it was too difficult to place observers or even electronic monitoring on those vessels that tranship. Nobody should get to have it both ways and benefit from a practice while declining to accept costs of addressing the issues the practice causes.
 35. Most importantly, improved observer coverage was a matter of accountability, equity, and fairness. While some countries and fleets bore the costs and conservation burden by exceeding observer coverage levels of 20%, proving that it can be done, many others barely or didn't meet the minimum 5% standard. As WWF had said many times about the 5% coverage level, it is statistically insignificant and was not enough, it was never enough, and it would never be enough. Those members and their fleets that continued to fail to meet appropriate levels of observer coverage or rested on meeting 5% were cheating the rest of the members out of their share of the resource and costing everyone more in the long run due to their irresponsibility.
 36. It has been 20 years since this Commission was established and nearly as long that it have not secured appropriate levels of observer coverage. It was time to end the free ride for those fleets evading their conservation responsibilities and level the playing field for all fleets so that the region might achieve reality-based fisheries management underpinned by strong observer coverage rather than gambling with everyone's future. In light of the threats all knew were on the horizon improvements in observer coverage must be urgently prioritised across all longliners through both human observers and EM.

OP05 Seabirds – under Agenda 8.5

37. Birdlife International described their Observer Papers, noting that “the 20th Meeting of the Scientific Committee in Manila, New Zealand presented a detailed analysis of the complete body of scientific evidence available on seabird bycatch mitigation measures and their effectiveness. The evidence presented in EB-WP-06 included more than 130 relevant research papers. Along with a suite of supporting analyses that were submitted as information papers to the SC. They felt that this body of information unequivocally constituted the best available science and was perhaps the most exhaustive, robust, and transparently compiled collection of evidence that had ever been brought before the WCPFC Scientific Committee. BirdLife International drew attention to Article 10 (Functions of the Commission), paragraph (c) which required the Commission to “adopt, where necessary, conservation and management measures and recommendations for non-target species and species dependent on or associated with the target stocks, with a view to maintaining or restoring populations of such species above levels at which their reproduction may become seriously threatened”. Noting paragraph's 143 and 146 of the SC20 outcomes document that at least 8 albatross species that breed in New Zealand are experiencing consistent declines, and that the Antipodean albatross is at risk of becoming
-

extinct by 2070. BirdLife directed Members to papers OP01 and OP02 providing information on BirdLife’s activities to support implementation of measures at the vessel level, and advice for wording on straddling sets, respectively.” TCC20 had a responsibility to adopt scientifically evidenced conservation and management measures and ensure compliance monitoring to address these impacts and Birdlife looked forward to seeing that reflected in the outcomes of this meeting. They reiterated the need expressed by WWF for drastically increasing observer coverage.

OP06 Ocean Foundation and Pew Charitable Trusts positions

38. The presenter thanked the Chair for inviting remarks from observers who had submitted papers, and the WCPFC for providing the option of virtual attendance.
39. OP06 was submitted on behalf of The Ocean Foundation and The Pew Charitable Trusts and emphasized the opportunity that CCMs had at TCC20 to make substantive progress on key items including electronic monitoring, transshipment, port State measures, and compliance. These were interrelated issues, needing urgent progress.
40. They said that among the tuna RFMOs, the WCPFC had been the first to move on electronic monitoring and transshipment reform, but was now the last to fully implement it. WCPFC had also agreed to improve its compliance monitoring scheme, but several pieces of important work remained outstanding. And WCPFC was well overdue to review its measure on Port State Minimum Standards, although other measures had been reviewed in recent years.
41. The need to complete this work was clear. As papers prepared for TCC demonstrated, the Commission needed more independent data to verify reported fishing activities, particularly for longline and transshipment activities, and the Ocean Foundation and Pew Charitable Trusts continued to have concerns about the effectiveness of the compliance monitoring scheme.
42. They urged CCMs, as they went about their work during the week, not to conclude this meeting without:
 - agreeing on amendments to strengthen the transshipment measure
 - agreeing on interim EM technical standards and a plan for developing EM data standards;
 - reviewing the measure on port State minimum standards;
 - and, relative to compliance, agreeing to deadlines to develop corrective and supportive actions to resolve persistent non-compliance, and to develop guidelines that allow observers to attend the review of the draft compliance monitoring reports, as the Convention and Rules of Procedure provide.
43. These actions would enhance the functioning of the Commission, increase public confidence in the WCPFC, and generate better outcomes on the water.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – IUU VESSEL LIST

Relevant Paper: [TCC20-2024-06_rev1](#)

44. The Deputy Compliance Manager Eidre Sharp explained that the purpose of this agenda item was to review the *draft* IUU vessel list, including information on the vessels presumed to have undertaken IUU fishing for possible inclusion on a *provisional* IUU vessel list, and to review the

current IUU vessel list (the vessels on the existing WCPFC IUU vessel list for 2024). TCC20 would then agree recommendations to WCPFC21 concerning these lists.

45. This year, Australia had nominated a vessel flagged to China for inclusion on the draft IUU vessel list, but after bilateral discussion, and reviewing the information provided by China, Australia had advised that the case had now been settled to their satisfaction.
46. Australia confirmed they had been satisfied with the action taken by China and the case had been settled in accordance with the CMM. They outlined the history of the case.
47. China thanked Australia for bringing this case to their attention. China had a no-tolerance policy for this kind of offence. The company had accepted a financial penalty and all of its 12 vessels had their licences suspended for 4 months. China hoped that TCC could accept that this case had been settled and that the vessel did not need to be IUU-listed.
48. The Solomon Islands, on behalf of FFA CCMs, commended the efforts and process undertaken by Australia and China in resolving the listing of Lu Rong Yuan Yu 139 on to the Draft IUU Vessel List for 2025. Based on the procedures outlined in CMM 2019-07, particularly paragraph 15, and the information presented by China and Australia, FFA CCMs supported Australia's recommendation to remove the listing of Lu Rong Yuan Yu 139 from the Draft IUU Vessel List for 2025. This was based on the acknowledgment that China, as the Flag State, has imposed adequate penalties and sanctions to meet the satisfaction of Australia.
49. Korea asked China for an update when the Company actually paid the fine, and China explained that the fine had already been received by the authorities in China.
50. The Deputy Compliance Manager then moved the attention of the meeting to the current IUU vessel list.

WCPFC IUU VESSEL LIST FOR 2024

(Effective from 6 February 2024: WCPFC20 agreed to maintain the WCPFC IUU list for 2023 and added one new vessel)
 Note: Information provided in this list is in accordance with CMM 2019-07 para 19 and WCPFC13 decisions

Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Date first included on WCPFC IUU Vessel List ²	Flag State Registration Number/ IMO Number	Call Sign (previous call signs)	Vessel Master (nationality)	Owner/beneficial owners (previous owners)	Notifying CCM	IUU activities
Neptune	unknown (Georgia)	10 Dec. 2010	M-00545	unknown (4LOG)		Space Energy Enterprises Co. Ltd.	France	Fishing on the high seas of the WCPF Convention Area without being on the WCPFC Record of Fishing Vessels (CMM 2007-03-para 3a)
Fu Lien No 1	unknown (Georgia)	10 Dec. 2010	M-01432 IMO No 7355662	unknown (4LIN2)		Fu Lien Fishery Co., Georgia	United States	Is without nationality and harvested species covered by the WCPF Convention in the Convention Area (CMM 2007-03, para 3h)
Yu Fong 168	unknown (Chinese Taipei)	11 Dec. 2009		BJ4786	Mr Jang Faa Sheng (Chinese Taipei)	Chang Lin Pao-Chun, 161 Sanmin Rd., Liouciu Township, Pingtung County 929, Chinese Taipei	Marshall Islands	Fishing in the Exclusive Economic Zone of the Republic of the Marshall Islands without permission and in contravention of Republic of the Marshall Islands' laws and regulations. (CMM 2007-03, para 3b)
Kuda Laut 03	Philippines	08 Dec 2023	Registry No. 12-0001812	DUM-4015	Alex L Cerina, Filipino	Tuna Explorers Incorporated	New Zealand	Fishing on the high seas of the WCPF Convention Area (High Seas Pocket One) without being on the WCPFC Record of Fishing Vessels (CMM 2019-07-para 3a)

51. The Chair noted that three of these vessels had been on the IUU vessel list for a very long time, but the last one had been recently listed.
52. The Philippines updated the meeting on the status of the Kuda Laut 3, which had been listed by WCPFC20. Legal action had been taken regarding the 3rd offence on February 21st 2024 and the vessel found guilty of various offences. This had required an administrative fine and a fine for non-compliance with VMS. The vessel's commercial fishing licence had been suspended. There

had been an appeal but the Adjudicator upheld the original judicial decision, and the vessel was currently confined to port pending the resolution of the administrative case against the vessel. Kuda Laut 3 was therefore not proposed by the Philippines for removal from the provisional IUU Vessel List.

53. Korea acknowledged that the Philippines was not proposing its vessel for removal from the IUU vessel list, but due process required that an update be provided in writing.
54. New Zealand, as the CCM that had proposed the listing in 2023, felt that the penalties, once paid, would be of adequate severity, but also looked forward to receiving the update in writing.
55. Vanuatu on behalf of FFA CCMs continued to recommend the retention of vessels currently on the WCPFC IUU Vessel List for 2024. There had been no new suitably documented information provided to TCC in accordance with CMM 2019-07, so TCC should not be recommending any change in status to any listings on the IUU Vessel List. Some vessels had been on WCPFCs IUU Vessel List for over 10 years and this is a serious concern for FFA CCMs, especially as these vessels were also still listed in other RFMO lists. FFA Members noted that they had raised the following as options to consider over the years:
 - a. The cooperation of CCMs to actively find out information about these vessels and inform the Commission, and that CCMs provide prompt advice of any information they come across about these vessels.
 - b. A letter from the Executive Director to other RFMOs conveying this same message for cooperation to locate these vessels, although no information had yet been forthcoming.
 - c. The inclusion of name and nationality of the vessel master in the WCPFC IUU Vessel List.

They applauded the Commission for the efforts taken since WCPFC17 which approved the inclusion of the “master’s name and nationality” on the WCPFC IUU Vessel List. FFA CCMs therefore supported the focus on cooperation and follow up on the information from WCPFC Secretariat.

56. TCC agreed to maintain the current WCPFC IUU Vessel list for 2025.

57. TCC20 referred to the nomination by Australia for the **LU RONG YUAN YU 139** to be placed on the draft IUU vessel list and agreed not to place the **LU RONG YUAN YU 139** on the provisional IUU vessel list following the imposition of penalties by the flag CCM, China, and the settlement of the case to the satisfaction of Australia.
58. TCC20 **recommended** to WCPFC21 that the four fishing vessels **NEPTUNE, FU LIEN No.1, YU FONG 168** and **KUDA LAUT 03** on the [WCPFC IUU Vessel List in 2024](#) remain on that list for 2025

AGENDA ITEM 5 – CNM REQUESTS

Relevant Paper: [TCC20-2024-07 rev1](#)

59. The Deputy Compliance Manager introduced Working Paper 07, explaining the applications received for CNM status in 2025.

Cooperating Non-Member Requests



Applicant	Date request for new/renewal for 2025 was received	2024 financial contribution paid*
Bahamas	22 June 2024 (new)	Yes
Curacao	26 July 2024	Yes
Ecuador	27 July 2024	Yes
El Salvador	28 June 2024	Yes
Liberia	09 July 2024 (new)	Yes
Panama	10 July 2024	Yes
Thailand	03 July 2024	Yes
Viet Nam	02 July 2024	Yes

TCC20-2024-06

60. In response to a question about why Bahamas had already paid a contribution for the year 2024 when they were not agreed to be a CNM, the Secretariat clarified that Bahamas and Liberia had not paid because they were not CNMs in 2024 and the “2024 financial contribution paid” column should have been marked “not applicable”.
61. In response to a question about whether Liberia’s payment received in 2024 would be used to cover their application in 2025, the WCPFC Finance and Administration Manager explained that the payment for their 2023 dues was submitted late, in 2024, so this could not be applied to their 2025 membership.
62. New Zealand asked if new CNMs had no previous history with the Commission, would the Working Group need to go through all the steps specified, including reviewing compliance. In reply, the Chair noted that at least one of these “new” applicants had a previous history with the Commission. However, it was up to the Working Group how to investigate this. The TCC Vice-Chair commented that each applicant was expected to make some commitment to complying with CMMs and other obligations, and the scrutiny of CNM compliance was in addition to that commitment, and not the only factor.
63. CNM applications were then further scrutinised and discussed by a Small Working Group chaired by the TCC Vice-Chair, Ilkang Na of Korea,
64. The CNM SWG Chair reported back to plenary on TCC Day 6, drawing attention to the report of the group in [07_rev2](#) (“CNM SWG – Draft recommendations for outcomes”)
65. Some applicants had missing information and were invited to provide this prior to the meeting. Some of this information had been provided. It was not possible to review compliance status completely because the CMR process would not be complete until WCPFC21 made its decisions in December. The outcomes of the CNM applications could be finalised at this stage also.
66. There were no further comments from plenary after reviewing these recommendations.
67. TCC20 provided the following **recommendations and technical advice** to WCPFC21 on Cooperating Non-Member (CNM) requests:

- a. TCC20 had reviewed the following eight applications for CNM status and was forwarding them to WCPFC21 for consideration: Bahamas, Curacao, Ecuador, El Salvador, Liberia, Panama, Thailand, and Vietnam.
- b. TCC20 reminded CNM applicants of the obligations included in CMM 2019-01, particularly paragraph 3 and paragraph 11(a), which states that CNMs shall “comply with all conservation and management measures adopted by the Commission.” It was noted that compliance issues of some applicants were pointed out during the CMR process.
- c. TCC20 reminded the applicants that WCPFC21 could further consider the applications in relation to the compliance status of each applicant in particular, noting that the CMR process would still be ongoing leading up to the Commission meeting.
- d. TCC20 noted that some required information, such as compliance and data submission status, etc, was not provided in the cases of Curacao’s and Vietnam’s applications and requested that those applicants provide such missing information before WCPFC21 meeting, by submitting revised applications to the Secretariat.
- e. TCC20 also reminded CNM applicants of the importance of attendance at the TCC meeting where the applications are considered and the obligation to provide all data required to submit in accordance with relevant conservation and management measures.
- f. TCC20 noted that Ecuador was not able to attend the meeting due to an unforeseen problem with the national power supply system.
- g. TCC20 noted the usefulness of the Commission’s new electronic reporting tools such as TSER (Transshipment Electronic Reporting System) which could alleviate the workload of the Secretariat, and encouraged the CNM applicants to use the tool if their vessels are to tranship at high seas.
- h. TCC20 also noted all the eight applicants’ statements of commitment to ensure payment of financial contribution during the meeting. TCC20 noted that the contributions of Curacao, Ecuador, El Salvador, Panama, Thailand and Vietnam for 2023 and 2024 were paid, confirmed by the WCPFC Secretariat during TCC20.
- i. TCC20 noted that Liberia paid their contribution for the 2023 in February 2024 and that CNM status was not granted for Liberia for 2024.
- j. TCC20 reminded that CNMs should ensure that financial contributions are paid in a timely manner.
- k. TCC20 noted that the review by TCC of all eight applications for CNM status was complete and recommends WCPFC21 consider all applicants for CNM status.

AGENDA ITEM 6 – COMPLIANCE MONITORING SCHEME (CMS)**6.1 Provisional CMR covering RY 2023**Relevant Paper: [TCC20-2024-08](#)

68. The Chair drew attention to the established “rules of the road” developed through successive years of implementation of the CMS and recorded in the CMS CMM and the Chairs process paper (WP08). It was noted that there were currently 101 compliance items to be assessed in the provisional CMR, down from 400 in 2023, including 12 quantitative limits. Additional compliance items that were not in the dCMR could be raised with the Chair. He reminded CCMs that the provision of additional verbal information at this meeting was limited to clarifications only, and that CCMs could not block agreement of their own assessments.
69. The appendices were outlined, and the question of whether the aggregate tables be included, whether in full or as subset, remained open and would be considered following the compliance review process. Following this discussion a draft Executive Summary would be compiled by the Chair and Secretariat and circulated late on Sunday for consideration during Day 5 of the meeting on Monday.

Discussion

70. The EU indicated that although it had not been able to participate in the Heads of Delegation meeting due to the travelling schedule, it did not want to restart any discussion already held. However, the EU stressed that concerning the accounting for the imbalance in observer coverage between the purse-seine and longline fisheries it did not believe the solution outlined would solve the problem. The EU indicated that it could support the suggestion not to review the CCFS aggregate tables in the absence of a clear sampling process, but would prefer to include the full set of aggregated tables in the report so members could draw their own conclusions for follow-up, and to also preserve a high level of transparency in this fishery.
71. The Chair noted that this had been a major subject of discussion for 2 years, and all CCMs had understood that TCC could not address this by continual revision of the Compliance Monitoring Scheme but needed to get on with the task of addressing imbalance in monitoring of different fisheries. On the question of inclusion of aggregate tables, he noted that the EU had proposed annexing the full set of tables, but this topic would be discussed later.
72. FFA CCMs supported the proposal not to review the aggregate tables, which would allow time for the methodology for subsampling to be finalised. Korea supported the FFA statement.
73. The Chair noted that TCC20 needed to confirm whether the compliance review process would be undertaken in open or closed session. The Chair further noted this was discussed at the Heads of Delegation meeting the previous day, and HODs indicated that there was no consensus to release non-public domain data. Therefore, the remainder of Agenda Item 6.1 will be conducted in closed session in order to remain in compliance with the agreed WCPFC data rules related to the treatment of non-public domain data.
74. The EU reiterated their longstanding position that this discussion should be held in open session but regretted that there seemed to be no possibility of progress at this meeting. Year after year, the Commission had always come to the same conclusion, and year after year there was no progress on the matter. The EU hoped that there could be a commitment by all CCMs by the end of this meeting on a clear roadmap for achieving the participation of all observers in all TCC

sessions. The Secretariat had demonstrated year after year that there was barely any non-public domain data discussed at these sessions.

75. Chair noted that Agenda Item 6.5 on future work for the CMS might be appropriate to raise such a roadmap.
 76. The USA echoed the EU concerns. It had also been a longstanding position of the United States to maintain an open session for observers in support of transparency and accountability in this process. They understood that other RFMOs were able to undertake compliance processes in an open manner, and the United States hoped that this Commission might be able to take up this issue in the future, perhaps through the CMS IWG.
 77. Accountability.Fish, addressed the TCC, urging WCPFC to increase transparency and accountability by allowing civil society observers in its compliance meetings. Accountability.Fish, dedicated to transparency in Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs), criticized WCPFC for consistently conducting crucial sessions on compliance reporting in secrecy, despite widespread commitments to openness under international agreements like the UN Fish Stocks Agreement. Highlighting that nearly 60 percent of the world's tuna supply is at stake, Qualid condemned WCPFC's exclusionary practices as harmful to its credibility and ocean sustainability efforts. Accountability.Fish pledged to continue advocating for open access to these discussions, emphasizing that without transparency, true accountability and sustainability cannot be achieved.
 78. Korea had long been a supporter of enhancing transparency of this organization, and was of same mind as the EU and the USA on this. Having said that, Korea was concerned about the statement made a few minutes ago that the WCPFC was the only RFMO that did not open its compliance review process to observers. There were other RFMOs that had the same arrangements, and Korea believed that not opening the CMR was not for the purpose of hiding anything or was for avoiding transparency.
79. TCC20 agreed not to review the aggregate tables this year due to issues arising from the trial sampling mechanism which made it clear that additional guidance was needed on how a sampling mechanism can be applied towards addressing the imbalance between the purse seine and longline fisheries.
 80. TCC20 held the CMR discussions in closed session despite the concerns expressed by some CCMs.
 81. TCC20 submitted the Provisional CMR covering RY 2023, containing its provisional compliance assessment, and **recommended** the report to WCPFC21 for its consideration and final assessment.

6.2 Addressing imbalance in CCFS

Relevant Paper: [TCC20-2024-09 rev 1](#)

82. The Chair noted there had been extensive discussions on the shape of the CMS as the scheme had been redesigned and amended, and how the information from the ROP was used in the CMS had been particularly discussed for the last 2 years.
83. WCPFC Compliance Manager Lara Manarangi-Trott and consultant analyst Steve Brouwer presented different aspects of the Secretariat paper 09.
84. This paper was an update of the 2023 TCC19 Working Paper. The aim was to provide updated information to assist TCC20 to review processes to refine how data collected through the Regional Observer Programme (ROP) would be used in the Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMS). This year's paper included updates related to the Revised CMS CMM adopted at WCPFC20 in 2023, specifically the scheme to address the imbalance between the longline and purse-seine fisheries for the identification of potential infringements going into the Compliance Case File System (CCFS) and it highlighted areas for consideration and advice by TCC to guide the future implementation of the scheme. Additional information related to the matter of ongoing cases was also provided in TCC20-10.
85. Working Paper 09 made the following recommendations to TCC20 on the issue of accounting for the high degree of sampling imbalance between the two main fisheries: to;
 - a. review the draft Appendix 3 for the provisional CMR with the subsampling approach applied, and provide feedback;
 - b. provide guidance to the Secretariat on how to calculate the sub-sample proportion so that it is reflective of both the longline and purse seine observer coverage rates;
 - c. provide guidance to the Secretariat on how to handle past years subsampling datasets. Do we either keep current subset selection and add on one year at a time in future years or do a complete new random sample of all years for each year's reporting?
 - d. consider the information in this paper, including the implications of applying the subsampling approach, and provide guidance to the Secretariat on how to use this subset of data for the other reporting prepared by the Secretariat, including in the dCMR noting paragraph 25 and 28 of CMM 2023-04; and
 - e. continue to support efforts by the Secretariat to further analyse available information to promote heightened understanding and awareness of fishing impacts in the WCPFC Convention Area.

Discussion

86. The Cook Islands, on behalf of FFA CCMs expressed appreciation of the Secretariat's work in addressing the data imbalance between long line and purse-seine fisheries, as highlighted in paragraph 15 of the measure. They appreciated the focus on ensuring that both fisheries were adequately represented in the CMS process, but recognised that the CMS process could not fully resolve this issue. They therefore emphasised the need for stronger minimum monitoring standards in the longline fisheries. Acknowledging that this would be the first year of implementing the new sampling scheme, they were open to further discussion with CCMs on refining and improving the approach.

-
87. Japan, for the purpose of understanding, asked that in some cases purse-seine observer coverage was less than 100%. Did that mean an observer was on board but the report had not been received, or was it because an observer was not on board?
 88. The WCPFC Compliance Manager noted that this information was in Tables 2 and 3, and the Analyst clarified that there were two factors to take into account: that the coverage rates were for the entire purse-seine fleet (not just 20°N-20°S) and also, during the COVID pandemic, purse-seine observer coverage rates were particularly low.
 89. The Scientific Services Provider noted that even though normal observer coverage in the tropical fishery is 100%, SPC does not necessarily receive all logbooks quickly, or at all. And sometimes some of the data from observer logbooks could not be validated.
 90. FSM spoke for PNA CCMs and suggested using a simple approach to broadly address balance without getting caught up in unnecessary detail. They thanked the Secretariat for the analysis in Working Paper 9. Addressing the imbalance of the CMS was an important issue for PNA and Tokelau, and applying the sampling approach to the purse seine observer data was an important element of that. They noted that Working Paper 9 sought further guidance from TCC as to how to apply the subsampled dataset for the purpose of paragraph 25 and 28 of CMM 2023-04. As a general comment, they were looking for a simple approach that would broadly address the imbalance without getting too caught up in detail. They had the following comments on the recommendations in the paper:
 91. On Recommendation (a) (to review the draft Appendix 3 for the provisional CMR, with the subsampling approach applied) PNA and Tokelau thought that the approach to Appendix 3 was useful. They also thought that some changes might be made to the way paragraph 15 of the CMM was applied in the paper. In particular, the coverage rate needed to be applied as a separate rate for each year and not as an average rate over a period of years, noting that the average 2018-2023 rate had been used in the paper. On this occasion, separating the sampled and excluded cases was useful to show the effect of the sampling. In future, of course, PNA and Tokelau expected the tables to only include the sampled cases.
 92. There was a question of what to do with the data now presented in Table 9 since this wasn't consistent with PNA CCM's view of how paragraph 15 should be applied. They were flexible on the use of the existing tables, and they didn't think it is useful to recalculate all the tables for TCC this year. Instead, they thought it useful for TCC to consider the current tables as an "initial data exploration", as the paper put it.
 93. As a separate point, they noted that the Marine Pollution data should only include prenotification code PN-A infringements. Even then, it seemed likely that many of the cases would not be infringements because the obligation in paragraph 2 of CMM 2017-04 applied only to discharge of plastic, while the reporting by observers covered discharges of any metals, plastics, chemicals or old fishing gear.
 94. On Recommendation (b) (to provide guidance to the Secretariat on how to calculate the sub-sample proportion so that it is reflective of both the longline and purse seine observer coverage rates), PNA and Tokelau thought that the sampling should follow the text and principle of paragraph 15.
 - For example, for the year 2023, the sampling rate would be 6.3% from Table 3.
-

-
- The estimated number of trips in 2023 was 2,098 (from Table 2).
 - So the no. of trips to be used for the sample was 133. This sample had to be drawn from the trips for which observer data was available.
 - In April 2024 this was 1,042, but this would increase over time.
 - The sample for each year would use the LL coverage rate for each year.
95. On Recommendation (c): (to provide guidance to the Secretariat on how to handle past years subsampling datasets. Do we either keep current subset selection and add on one year at a time in future years or do a complete new random sample of all years for each year's reporting?) PNA and Tokelau CCMs felt it clearly preferable to retain the historic sampling rather than to resample each year.
96. On Recommendation (d): (to consider the information in this paper, including the implications of applying the subsampling approach, and provide guidance to the Secretariat on how to use this subset of data for the other reporting prepared by the Secretariat, including in the dCMR noting paragraph 25 and 28 of CMM 2023-04); PNA and Tokelau considered that the sampling approach could potentially work well to address some of the major elements of the imbalance in the observer data that result in the current CMS outputs being of very limited value for assessing compliance of CCMs.
97. On how to use the sampled data, the understanding of PNA and Tokelau was that the sampled observer cases would be used for the dCMRs covered by paragraph 25 and more importantly, the aggregated tables covered by paragraph 28.
98. On the use of the Sampled Data this year, PNA and Tokelau recognised that the application of the sampling this year was just an initial data exploration phase. However, they thought this experience indicated that the sampling could be applied fairly easily and would clearly improve the value of the CMS outputs for assessing compliance by CCMs. They were open to the sampled data for this year being used as an example of how the process would work in future. However, that would not include the data on excluded cases. They thought the analysis of the excluded cases provides good information for TCC to show the effect of the sampling, but they did not agree to it being used in any additional way.
99. The SSP had some suggestions for the future. These generally aligned with PNA and Tokelau's suggestions, but the SSP thought that some of the text in the secretariat proposal might be confusing. In developing the methodology to address the imbalance in the CCFS, paragraph 26 of Paper 09 said *"The next step involved allocating each ROP purse seine trip on a WCPFC RFV vessel a unique trip identification number. From the full set of purse seine trips, a random selection of 6.2% was selected and these trips were identified as "subsample trips". All the remaining trips were identified as "excluded trips". All non-purse seine vessel trips were classified to also be "subsample trips".* The suggestion being that all purse seine trips would be randomly subsampled at a rate of 6.2%. This would imply that trips without ROP coverage/data could be sampled, which would not correspond to ROP coverage. It was the SSPs understanding that the number of trips to subsample would be calculated as 6.2% of the full set of purse seine trips, but that number of trips would then be randomly sampled from the ROP trips.
100. The Secretariat noted that WCPFC probably subsampled a slightly smaller subset of cases. One of the problems at the moment was that not all VMS trips were fishing trips. It would have been easier if there had been a trip list.
-

101. The WCPFC Compliance Manager explained that essentially what happened during an update of the CCFS was that the Secretariat would periodically receive an ROP dataset from SPC containing the latest extract of ROP observer data. The Secretariat would then run scripts over that observer dataset based on certain queries they had defined, where they had been able to link certain combinations of data fields to certain CMM obligations. And the outcome of that analysis then became the basis for compliance cases being created. In order to actually implement the sampling approach, the Secretariat had to find a way to rematch back to the SPC trips in their databases, get the percentages, and then track it back through to an outcome in reality that could be applied to the compliance case file system cases. So there were a number of different trip IDs that were used and matched. They took the percentage of purse-seine coverage and then applied it to the full set of purse-seine trips, and looked then to transfer to which ones were ROP, and it was a matter of then tracking back through. So in reality it probably was a smaller subset of cases that were subsampled than 6.2%, due to the way that the CCFS cases were created. At least that was the Compliance Manager's layman's understanding of the process, and could perhaps be clarified by others.
102. The Analyst felt that was a good explanation, but also mentioned another issue that had been mentioned by the SSP, and this was this issue with using trips identified from VMS data where some of them weren't actually fishing trips requiring observers. This was a problem that couldn't currently be resolved, but perhaps the Secretariat could work with SPC to further explore potential solutions. Once the list of fishing trips was obtained it would be relatively easy from there to sample it. But the matching of trip IDs was currently quite challenging.
103. He also mentioned that during the COVID years when the purse-seine observer coverage was very low, there was a risk of not finding any cases of potential infringement at all in the subsample. So TCC needed to be aware that those particular years were an exception, not the norm, and to take care that running the initial data exploration on atypical years did not create issues further down the line.
104. Fiji wanted to take the opportunity to recognise the essential work that had been undertaken here, and the progress achieved thus far. Fiji had had a chance to go through the online case file system that had been made available to members, and based on that experience they supported the comments made by their PNA colleagues, and also recognised the issues raised by SPC, particularly in regard to recommendation c. Fiji would like to support the recommendation that we do keep the current subset as a platform for us to more easily understand where we need to go, and then at the end to add on one year at a time for future references. There were other related issues that Fiji would like to discuss, but in view of the time constraint would do this in the margins of this meeting.
105. The EU expressed its doubts regarding the sampling concept and its impacts on the CMS. It noted the shortcomings of the initial approach proposed and suggest that in any future sampling scheme other factors be also taken into account, such as the respective levels of catch etc, to ensure better representativeness.
106. The Pew Charitable Trusts noted that the Secretariat had highlighted the importance of ROP observers in the business of the Commission. They agreed that, to date, the system had been
-

unfair and should be balanced across gear sectors. However, they put forward four points for CCMs to consider:

- Of the types of case put forward by observers, observer obstruction was arguably the most critical due to the importance of the information they provided. Looking at the sampled (pre-covid) data, the number of OAI cases that would be screened out (over 50 new and in progress cases reduced to 2 in 2019) by this subsampling was worrying. This effectively eliminated the ability of TCC to identify systemic issues – a core function of this committee.
- A key difference to note between longline and purse-seine was that with longline, we just didn't know – there might be issues and there might not. With purse-seine however, we did know and would be actively choosing to ignore most of it, which for a critical issue like observer obstruction would be very concerning.
- On the sampling rate issue raised by the Secretariat, it would be essential that the rate be determined relative to the actual purse seine coverage rate, not an assumption of 100% coverage - otherwise the system had the potential to become biased against the longline sector.
- Finally on a slightly tangential issue, the figure summarising CCFS highlighted two pathways for cases to be raised: through observers and through CCMs. Should there not also be an option for the secretariat to initiate cases given that they also occasionally identify issues? If so then all cases would be held within a single system.

107. The Marshall Islands, on behalf of PNA and Tokelau CCMs, shared Pew's concern about observer interference cases, but noted that these were almost all offences committed within PNA and Tokelau EEZs and would continue to be prosecuted in full by PNA CCMs themselves.

108. The Chair noted that the meeting still needed to clarify paragraph 15 of CMM 2023-04 (CMS) on addressing the imbalance in observer coverage for the purpose of assessing compliance, particularly the agreement of a sampling mechanism for developing a subset of observer case file reports for assessment that was equitable between different gear types with very different levels of observer coverage.

109. There being no immediate guidance from the floor, the Chair proposed to draft some text to provide a recommendation from TCC20 to WCPFC21 to guide work in the coming year.

110. The Chair also reminded participants that TCC needed to resolve the outcomes of this agenda item. He suggested that TCC task the Chair and Secretariat to prepare a paper for TCC21 that outlined the work that would need to be done in 2025 to analyse the options for subsampling the CCFS to take better account of the imbalance in observer coverage between longline and purse-seine fisheries.

111. These recommendations were later discussed and cleared by the meeting as follows:

112. TCC20 supported the Secretariat's efforts in seeking to improve the methodology used to sub-sample the CCFS so that it is reflective of the proportion of longline and purse seine observer coverage rates. TCC20 noted the results of the initial sub-sampling and **tasked** the Secretariat to work with the Scientific Services Provider to refine the methodology.

-
- | |
|---|
| <p>113. TCC20 tasked the TCC Chair and Secretariat to prepare a paper to further develop the sampling methodology for consideration by TCC21, taking into account the relevant parameters for implementation of a process in 2025.</p> |
|---|

6.3 Addressing outstanding CCFS cases (older than 24 months)

Relevant Paper: [TCC20-2024-10](#)

114. The Chair noted improvements by the Secretariat in the online CCFS. He also noted that a number of CCMs had informed the Secretariat, through the TCC20 Online Discussion Forum, about their statute of limitations legislation.
115. The WCPFC Deputy Compliance Manager provided other key points from 10. This paper was to review factors and processes affecting the CCFS and provide an update on tasks from TCC19. The report covered the aggregate table review and TCC consideration of open CCFS cases older than 2 years. She noted that there were no specific recommendations in this paper. It was an update on the work programme.

Discussion

116. PNG on behalf of FFA CCMs thanked the Secretariat for the paper. As anticipated, the paper highlighted the significant disparity between cases initiated by WCPFC CCMs (Article 25(2) cases) and those cases based on observer data, largely due to the 100% observer coverage in the purse seine sector. They recognized the importance of addressing the outstanding cases in the CCFS, particularly those older than 24 months, in a systematic manner. They understood that for some CCMs, these cases might fall outside the statute of limitations in their national laws. In addition, while FFA CCMs were committed to conducting investigations into alleged infringements for these cases, in some of their experience, many of these cases turned out to be false positives. In such cases, this had entailed a burdensome and time-consuming process with little to no resultant benefit. They were eager to see the progress of the ROP-IWG in exploring methods to streamline and optimize the flow of data into the CCFS, ultimately enabling more effective use of ROP data.
117. The Marshall Islands on behalf of PNA and Tokelau thanked the Secretariat for the paper and, in line with FFA statement made earlier on by PNG, felt that there was not much progress in this work after what was agreed at TCC19. It was obvious that the majority of cases on the CCFS accounts for PNA members waters on especially the Observer initiated cases. Most of these cases were outstanding since 2016 and remained a concern for PNA members, and should also be for TCC, because the CCFS process is ambiguous and affects CCMs ability to make immediate investigations. One key challenge faced with expeditiously closing out ROP cases in the CCFS was the delay before cases were notified in the CCFS, as stated in Working Paper 10. This difficulty was compounded by issues of vessels changing flags, master and crews' movements, and their recollections of incidents which occurred 1-4 years ago may not be accurate. They were expecting that TCC20 could make a clear decision to close these cases using the domestic statute of limitations and because of issues around to the change of flag, crews and others because these would cumulatively add to the existing list of outstanding cases that were not able to be closed.
118. China recalled that last year when TCC discussed a similar issue, they had expressed not legal limitation but practical limitation, where change in ownership confuses the responsibility. It was

not a legal limitation, and China hoped that reasons could be entered into the CCFS to explain why any case could not be pursued. China agreed with subsampling to solve the observer coverage imbalance and suggested TCC should also develop a mechanism to cut down the number of cases that cannot be addressed.

119. Nauru reinforced the statement earlier by the Marshall Islands, saying that closing outstanding cases remained a major concern for PNA and Tokelau CCMs, not because they were not doing anything about closing these cases but because the Commission had a CCFS process that could be held up by delays in flag state actions. They appreciated the Secretariat pointing out in paper 10 that it took 1-2 years to notify a case on the CCFS from when the observer trip was completed and even some cases took up to 4 years to be notified on the CCFS. Therefore, PNA and Tokelau could agree to close inconclusive cases that remained open on the CCFS. They saw it as crucial for TCC to move forward in efforts to improving the CCFS, but if TCC20 continues to defer decisions to the following year, new cases from 2022 and earlier would continue to be added to the already extensive list of unresolvable cases because of the CCFS's inefficient notification of cases.
120. The Chair noted the desire to resolve as much as possible here, but there were still likely to be some issues that would need to go to the Commission for decision. The Chair would talk to the Legal Adviser and interested CCMs and see what might be possible. These were issues that would need to be considered carefully.
121. After these discussions, the Chair developed a draft outcome text and brought it back to the meeting on Day 6, reminding the meeting of the discussion to date, and suggesting that TCC20 could recommend to WCPFC21 a tasking for the secretariat to incorporate more functionality in the CCFS to include information that might make it possible to close out certain categories of cases (for example where the fishing entity no longer existed or where the case had exceeded the national statute of limitations) and thus allow the remainder of cases to be concentrated upon. The meeting agreed to the following output.

122. TCC20 recalled that there were a number of reasons which would justify a CCM closing out CCFS cases older than 24 months, including legal limitations, such as statute of limitations, and practical limitations such as change of flag, new master, and departures from the fishing industry which made investigation and prosecution extremely difficult.

123. TCC20 noted that following tasking from WCPFC20, the Secretariat included the following categories in CCFS as the reasons for closing out cases that are identified as "Investigation not completed": crew/master changed, vessel or owner/operator no longer exists, date of event exceeds national statute of limitations, vessel flag changed and unable to progress with new flag state. **TCC20 recommended to WCPFC21** that a CCM should provide information justifying the closing out of a case which would be verified by the Secretariat. **TCC20 recommended** that the Commission **task** the Secretariat with reporting to TCC21 on the closed cases and on the progress in closing cases older than 24 months.

124. TCC20 expressed concern over the delay in including cases arising from ROP data in the CCFS and **recommended to the Commission** that the question of streamlining the inclusion of ROP data in the CCFS be a task for the **ROP-IWG**.

6.4 Provisional list of obligations for assessment in 2025 CMS

Relevant Paper: [TCC20-2024-11](#)

125. Working Paper 11 was presented by the WCPFC Compliance Manager, and was for the purpose of providing updated information to support TCC20 fulfilling its task of preparing a provisional list of obligations to be assessed in the following year's Compliance Monitoring Scheme. The paper also presented an update of WCPFC20 Working Paper 26 which had proposed a set of principles for selecting obligations to be assessed in the annual review of CCM compliance.
126. Paper 11 provided three annexes of supporting information:
- a. Annex 1 provided the list of obligations and categories presented in the dCMR for review by TCC20;
 - b. Annex 2 reviewed TCC's progress in applying Agreed Audit Points for Implementation Obligations, and was a reference list that supported the trial streamlining approach that tracked CCM progress in resolving their implementation gaps from previous year/s; and
 - c. Annex 3 provided an updated list of obligations where Audit Points are yet to be agreed on by the Commission.:
127. Working Paper 11 invited TCC20 to:
- a. Support the continuation of the streamlining approach to support tracking progress by CCMs to resolve their implementation gaps from previous year/s (based on Annex 2, Part B and Part C).
 - b. Recommend that the Commission task the Secretariat
 - i. to publish on the website information about the list of Implementation Obligations which TCC has confirmed that all applicable CCMs have met the Audit Point, and the applicable reporting year (based on Annex 2, Part A and future final CMRs),
 - ii. to include an enhancement into the Annual Reporting system which supports tracking of relevant CCMs implementation gaps,
 - iii. to further consider ways to streamline and clarify annual reporting requirements for CCMs, and
 - iv. to provide updates on these tasks to TCC21
 - c. Recommend to the Commission that it adopt a list of obligations for review in 2025 that is no more than fifty (50) obligations and that consists of:
 - i. No more than twelve (12) quantitative limit obligations;
 - ii. CMM 2014-02 9a IM Fishing vessels comply with the Commission standards for WCPFC VMS including being fitted with ALC/MTU that meet Commission requirements (see Annex 2, Part D);
 - iii. The sixteen (16) additional Implementation Obligations where TCC is yet to review Implementation using agreed Audit Points (see Annex 2, Part E);
 - iv. SciData 01 RP Estimates of Annual Catches, SciData 02 RP Number of vessels active, SciData 03 RP Operational Level Catch and Effort Data and SciData 05 RP Size composition data, CMM 2018-06 09 RP Submission by Member to ED a list of all vessels on national record in previous year, noting FISHED or DID NOT FISH for each vessel; and
 - v. Approximately sixteen (16) additional report and report deadline obligations, that reflect topics that would be useful for a closer focus by TCC in 2025, and

which brings the provisional list of obligations for review in 2025 to be no more than fifty (50) obligations in total.

- d. Where possible, also develop draft Audit Points for any obligations listed in Annex 3 that TCC proposes would be reviewed in the draft Compliance Monitoring Report (dCMR) prepared for TCC's review in 2025.

128. The Chair noted that a lot of work had been done last year with the hope that it would save time in the future, but the work did continue, obligations and CCM responses continued to change, and working paper 11 explained how the secretariat was trying to set up the system to deal with these issues. The agenda item would be held open to later in the meeting, after some discussion, rather than looking to approve the recommendations immediately.

Discussion

129. The Marshall Islands on behalf of FFA CCMs thanked the Secretariat for the paper. They agreed with the guiding principles for considering the list of obligations stated in the paper. They supported the recommendations in the paper. In addition to the recommendations in paragraph 21(b) of the paper, they suggested including another recommendation to task the Secretariat to provide, on an annual basis prior to TCC, an analysis of the obligations assessed over time including their compliance rates. This would help inform decisions about which obligations to include on the list in future years, aligning with the risk-based assessment approach. They understood that this was something that could be done from the system. They were also supportive of the recommendation to adopt a list of not more than fifty obligations for review in 2025 and agreed with the proposal in the paper. However, they wanted further explanation of the process for determining the specific obligations to be included in the list.
130. The Secretariat felt that the additional recommendation proposed was achievable and could be taken on, and would also consider ways for making information available in the form of reports that could be done through the online system.
131. The EU found this a thoughtful and useful paper and could support the general approach, but felt that some fine-tuning might be possible. Under recommendation (c) it was problematic to restrict the number of obligations to be assessed. Now that the streamlining process was complete, there was scope for perhaps adding some more obligations to make sure that as a minimum all quantitative limits were assessed each year.
132. The Chair recalled that there were about 15 quantitative limited obligations at the moment. This number of course might change from year to year, but there had been many discussions over the years, including through the development of the risk-based framework about the importance of the QL obligations.
133. Korea supported the recommendations in paragraph 21 of the paper, and the additional recommendations suggested by FFA CCMs and also wondered what process would be used to reduce the number of obligations from 55 to 50 before the Commission's decision.
134. The Secretariat said that it was definitely possible that all quantitative CMM limits could be actioned within the 50-obligation limit and thought that was the case at present. As for the process of prioritising the total workload down to 50, it had been anticipated that there would be some reflection during the course of the meeting as a result of considering the Compliance Monitoring Report, and the development of the TCC Workplan as priorities for the forthcoming
-

year took shape. It was suggested that the Secretariat work with the Chair to provide a starting point for a list based on the principles in the paper, and taking into account the additional comments and clarifications across the floor.

135. The Chair suggested this agenda item be left open and the Secretariat and Chair would develop a draft list to be returned to for discussion later in the meeting.
136. On day 5 of the meeting, a supplement to Working Paper 11 was posted containing Chair's proposal for a provisional list of the obligations that might be assessed in 2025, for consideration by TCC. The Secretariat explained that the feedback from the session on day 1 had been considered in conjunction with the principles outlined in Working Paper 11, and the provisional list contained:
- 16 quantitative limits for tuna and billfish,
 - 6 obligations for annual review,
 - 18 Additional Implementation Obligations where TCC is yet to review Implementation using agreed Audit Points (noting that other IM obligations have been reviewed or are otherwise covered by the trial streamlining approach for IM obligations), under the following categories:
 - Operational requirements for fishing vessels
 - Additional measures for tropical tunas
 - Observer activity related requirements, and
 - Mitigating impacts of fishing on species of special interest
 - 5 Daily catch and effort reporting obligations, and
 - 5 additional report (RP) and report deadline (DL) obligations – to be identified by TCC20 as being useful for a closer focus in 2025.
137. On quantitative limits, the EU noted there were 2 missing because there was an issue with the audit points, and inquired about how many other Quantitative Limits (QLs) were NOT listed in this provisional list of obligations to be assessed in 2025?
138. The WCPFC Compliance Manager identified paragraph 38 of the Tropical Tuna CMM (accommodating the increase in observer coverage on longliners including with EM), and the NP-SWO measure, where the commission has yet to agree the draft audit point. Others not included were transshipment on the high seas, or the northern observer coverage for fresh fish landings, and a couple of other transshipment obligations.
139. The USA encouraged TCC to consider evaluation of all Quantitative Limits. The USA suggested the CMM 2009-03 paragraph 3 about not shifting SWO effort from N of 20°N to S of 20°S would be useful to assess.
140. The Chair noted that this was classified as an implementation obligation, which was presumably why it was not under the QL list.
141. The Compliance Manager recalled that there had been occasions in the past when this was considered a QL but the Audit Points process now considers this obligation is an implementation obligation.
-

142. The Chair notes that the catch and effort reporting obligations didn't have audit points identified and had asked vice chair to take note that these require development.
143. Following some further discussion of details and drafting, the updated list of obligations was circulated on day 5 (as a supplement to rev 2 of Paper 11). Some of these were dependent on the commission adopting audit points for some of these obligations, and TCC20 had already worked on these and would provide recommendations to WCPFC.

144. TCC20 **recommended** the continuation of the streamlining approach to support tracking progress by CCMs to resolve their implementation gaps from previous year/s (based on [WCPFC-TCC20-2024-11, Annex 2, Part B and Part C.](#))
145. TCC20 **recommended that the Commission** task the Secretariat:
- a. to publish on the website information about the list of Implementation Obligations which TCC has confirmed that all applicable CCMs have met the Audit Point, and the applicable reporting year (based on [WCPFC-TCC20-2024-11, Annex 2, Part A](#) and future final CMRs),
 - b. to include an enhancement into the Annual Reporting system which supports tracking of relevant CCMs implementation gaps,
 - c. to further consider ways to streamline and clarify annual reporting requirements for CCMs, and
 - d. to provide updates on these tasks to TCC21.
146. TCC20 **recommended that the Commission** adopt the list of 52 obligations for review in 2025 set out in **Attachment C**. TCC20 recommended that the Commission that it adopt the following Audit Points:
- a. [CMM 2023-03 02 QL](#): The CCM reported in AR Pt2 its level of fishing effort of its fisheries taking North Pacific swordfish in the Convention Area north of 20N and the Secretariat can verify the CCM's reported information and confirm that the allowable limit has not been exceeded.
 - b. [CMM 2023-03 04 RP](#): The Secretariat confirms that CCM submitted a report of information on all catches and effort by CCM flagged vessels subject to the limits in paragraph 2 using the template at Annex 1 of [CMM 2023-03](#).
147. TCC20 **requested that the TCC Vice-Chair** develop draft Audit Points for any obligations that are listed in **Attachment C** that TCC20 proposes would be reviewed in the draft Compliance Monitoring Report (dCMR) prepared for TCC21's review in 2025 and for which Audit Points are required and submit these to WCPFC21 for adoption.
148. TCC20 **recommended that the Commission** task the Secretariat to provide on an annual basis prior to TCC an analysis of the obligations that have been assessed over time, including their compliance rating.

6.5 Future work to enhance the CMS

149. The Chair explained that there was no working paper for this agenda item, but a new TCC work plan needed to be developed, and this needed guidance from TCC to the Chair, the Vice-chair and to the Secretariat on all aspects of the TCC work that needed to be done in the coming years. Views would be very much welcomed on the remaining aspects of the CMS, and other future work to inform the development of the TCC work plan, and all CCMs should be fairly familiar with the outstanding work needed at this point. At this stage, views on the priority and the sequencing of this work were needed.
150. Korea suggested that the current workflow be kept, including audit points and the development of sampling schemes and the issues related to the online case files. But there was as yet no agreement how to move the corrective actions policy forward, so Korea suggested that we keep the corrective actions policy included in the work plan as a low priority and hoped that the future of that task could be discussed at the annual WCPFC meeting.
151. The EU did not think that they could share the suggestion just made by their colleagues from Korea. In the view of the EU, all three areas of future work identified were equally important, and TCC should be striving to move forward on all three fronts.
152. The Chair noted there had been no decision to remove anything from the list of work and TCC should be discussing prioritisation of the work identified here.
153. The Cook Islands on behalf of FFA members suggested that this be dealt with through the discussion of the TCC work plan, which they understood from the discussion under Agenda Item 3 would be undertaken after TCC, going into the Commission.
154. The Chair noted the sequencing. Some guidance was needed at this stage from TCC on how to draft the workplan, which needed to be updated before going to the Commission. The Chair could put together a revised plan himself but would be happy to receive guidance. One issue to bear in mind was to try and avoid front-loading all of this work in 2025, but spread it out.
155. The Ocean Foundation recognised the amount work done to improve the CMS, and felt all the work proposed would be useful. They noted that there were lessons to be learned on corrective actions from other RFMOs
156. TCC20 **tasked the TCC Chair, TCC Vice-Chair and Secretariat**, in developing the TCC work plan, to include items that will require future work over several years in an appropriate sequence for further discussion and consideration at WCPFC21.

AGENDA ITEM 7 – STATUS OF FISHERIES AND CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

Relevant Papers: [TCC20-2024-12](#), [TCC20-2024-13_rev1](#), [TCC20-2024-IP01v](#) (SC20 overview of Fisheries paper), [TCC20-2024-IP02](#) (Ecosystem and Climate Indicators)

Status of Fisheries

157. The SPC Oceanic Fisheries Programme Principal Fisheries Scientist (Data Management) Tiffany Vidal presented a report on the status of fisheries and updates on impacts of climate change, based on IP01 and IP02. It was noted that similar information had been presented to the recent SC20 meeting but this TCC presentation drew together information from several papers discussed at that meeting.

Discussion

158. The chair noted an interesting evolution in the status of stocks presentation over the years, and the gradual incorporation of climate change science had been an important part of this.

159. Indonesia thanked SPC for the information, including stock assessment, on Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) and climate change. They understood that the MSE process did not yet incorporate climate change aspects. Was there any intention to incorporate this?

160. SPC said that climate change scenarios would probably become incorporated into the operating models for Management Procedures but Rob Scott of SPC would be talking about the Management Procedure work later in the session.

161. The EU always found this a very useful presentation. But there was little reference to northern stocks and would be useful to have a picture of all the stocks under the WCPFC purview. They would welcome inclusion of northern stocks in future, and it would be good to highlight the positive change in the status of Pacific Bluefin Tuna.

162. SPC and the Chair thanked the EU for the suggestion.

163. The USA understood that SPC had significant resources related to climate change coming in now, and wondered if SPC could comment on how those were benefitting the commission and if that could be explained in a future presentation.

164. SPC noted that a lot of resources were predicted but not decided yet, so at this stage it couldn't be said exactly how much this broader SPC work would benefit WCPFC yet, but there would of course be benefit to WCPFC.

Susceptibility of WCPFC CCMs to climate change impacts

165. The WCPFC Executive Director Rhea Moss reminded CCMs of the background, and provided an introduction to TCC20 Working Paper 12 – the Secretariat's review of the scope and feasibility of an assessment of CMM susceptibility to climate change impacts and Assistant Science Manager Elaine Garvilles presented the paper to the meeting.

166. This paper had previously been presented at NC20 (NC20-WP-05), together with the Commission's Climate Change Work Plan and TOR for the Assessment of CMMs Susceptible to Climate Change (NC20-WP-04). The NC20 supported the proposed task in the Work Plan of coordinating with the ISC as it considers how to incorporate climate change advice into

management recommendations to NC. The NC20 also noted the importance of cooperation with other organizations, including the ISC and tuna RFMOs and RFMOs that manage species such as sardine and mackerel in the NPO, which are an important part of the ecosystem of northern stocks. The NC20, therefore, agreed to request the Chair to contact the North Pacific Fisheries Commission on potential cooperation in relation to climate change.

167. SC20 further reviewed this paper and provided recommendations on a draft Climate Change Workplan and draft Terms of Reference (TOR) for assessing WCPFC CMMs susceptibility to climate change impacts. SC20 acknowledged the collaborative efforts behind the Workplan and suggested that future drafts include status updates on SC tasks, resource requirements, and expected outcomes to better inform the Commission's decisions with an extension of the Workplan to 2027. The SC20 noted uncertainties related to data availability, the complexity of the CMMs susceptibility assessment, and the resources needed for this work. SC20 emphasized the need for ongoing discussions to clarify expected outcomes and resource needs and recommended refining the TORs to include Indigenous and traditional knowledge.
168. The purpose of this paper was to present the Secretariat and Scientific Services Provider's (SSP) findings on the scope and feasibility of assessing active Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs) to determine specific CMM provisions that may be susceptible to the impacts of climate change. This paper responded to a directive from WCPFC20 to present this information to the Science Committee, the Technical and Compliance Committee, and the Commission in 2024². It also provided additional information to supplement the assessment of CMMs susceptible to climate change regarding non-target, associated, and dependent species-related CMMs, MCS-related CMMs, and incorporating climate change impacts into the WCPFC harvest strategy framework.
169. CCMs were requested to consider general approaches for implementing the assessment of CMMs susceptible to climate change impacts, including consideration of an appropriate timeframe for completing the assessment and the required resources needed to support it.
170. The WCPFC Climate Change Co-leads, Berry Muller (RMI) and Kelly Kryc (USA) then presented Working Paper 13 – an update of the work by the Co-leads of the WCPFC climate change workplan – which proposed Terms of Reference for an Assessment of CMM Susceptibility to the Impacts of Climate Change (in Attachment B of WCPFC-TCC20-2024-13) and outlined the process by which the Commission could start incorporating climate change elements into, relevant Conservation and Management Measures.
171. CCMs were requested to review the Terms of Reference for CMM assessment and to provide advice on refining them.

Discussion

172. The Chair noted that this work was potentially helpful in helping articulate a clear role for TCC in considering climate change information, which it had struggled with in previous years.
173. Canada thanked the co-leads for this very important work and supported the draft workplan and the ongoing work. This would be a complex process but the workplan was a living document and could be adapted as the complexities unfolded.

-
174. Korea thanked the Co-leads for following up on the tasking from the last WCPFC Annual Session. Many RFMOs had made a commitment to addressing climate change, but WCPFC was the only tuna RFMO beginning to take steps towards implementation. WCPFC would need to work closely with other RFMOs including the NPFC, and requested those CCMs who were members of both RFMOs to make sure this work flowed through.
 175. Chinese Taipei felt this initiative was extremely important. On timing, they wondered what the criteria would be for deciding the initial subset of CMMs. They thought this initial appraisal should apply to all CMMs – all would be reviewed in the first year. On the requirement for incorporating indigenous and traditional knowledge, Chinese Taipei was not clear how this would happen. By visiting traditional communities and interviewing indigenous people? If so it could be a very lengthy process.
 176. Co-lead Kelly Kryc noted they had considered reviewing all CMMs in the first year, but this was thought to take too long, and some were obvious.
 177. Co-lead Berry Muller explained that for the identification and incorporation of indigenous knowledge, the intention was for the consultant to talk to CCMs about what knowledge was available and might be included.
 178. The Executive Director felt that the timeframe would need to enable all CMMs to be realistically assessed, even though some might be quickly decided for exclusion or inclusion, and the description of the SSP's initial review attached to the Working Paper would give an idea of what this might entail.
 179. Japan did not think all CMMs would need to be reviewed at the same time. The process should focus on the tuna stock CMMs as a test case. Japan thanked the USA & Chinese Taipei for providing a total of US \$75,000 to begin work on this issue. Japan asked if this fund could cover a consultant fee. If not the case, then FAC may need to consider a necessary budget in December.
 180. Co-lead Kelly Kryc noted that this was being done for the first time, so there was no rulebook. If it was necessary to assess all CMMs then it would also be necessary to prioritise them.
 181. The Executive Director explained that resources to sustain a consultant over a longer period would need to be in place if all CMMs would need to be assessed.
 182. The EU pointed out that the Commission had limited resources and there was a lot of other work on the agenda of subsidiary bodies, so it would be necessary to prioritise meaningful initiatives. They felt that the initiatives proposed here were rather academic and were not sure if they provided much added value for the work of WCPFC. The current version of the workplan did not provide clarity about the work, its outcomes nor the resources needed, although it was however understood to still be a work in progress. The SSP would also be involved in this work, and the EU didn't think this would add value to their work either. The 2 CMMs analysed so far seemed to be rather self-explanatory and the EU wondered if we needed to allocate resources and time to this. The EU was not saying this external CMM appraisal work should not be done, if others thought it useful, but just wanted to voice their concern that this initiative was not likely to assist in incorporating climate change into the WCPFC framework.
-

-
183. The USA asserted that having climate as an agenda item does appear to be achieving something. It provided a reminder of the uncertainty facing the commission. Agreeing action on this was a USA priority and according to the WCPFC20 outcomes it was also a priority of the Commission.
184. FSM, speaking on behalf of FFA CCMs, expressed gratitude to the Co-leads for their work, and acknowledge their consultative approach. Regarding the proposal, they supported the first task of ensuring that TCC continued to be updated on climate change information relevant to WCPO fisheries. They also recognized the substantial workload for the Scientific Committee, which they expected would help inform the TCC and Commission through Ecosystem and Climate Indicators, Report Cards, and the identification of gaps and needs to be addressed by this body. This included incorporating climate change into the process of developing monitoring strategies for management procedures. They supported SC20's advice to identify ongoing projects or activities that need to commence, along with the resources required, and the flow of outcomes from one Subsidiary Body to another. FFA CCMs believed this would help TCC understand whether any other tasks might be needed for TCC, and noted that this workplan would be a living document. They recognized that this could create a lot of work for the Co-leads, and asked whether the WCPFC Secretariat could support CCMs in this task.
185. On the CMM Assessment, the FFA CCMs thanked the Secretariat and SSP for the comprehensive paper and to the co-leads for drafting the TORs to support these important discussions. At the moment, it was unclear to us how the outcomes of this exercise would support the TCC in providing advice to the Commission. They also noted that the SC had requested i) a clear identification of the resources required by the Secretariat, the SSP, the Subsidiary Bodies and the Commission, ii) a comprehensive understanding of the information available or needed, and iii) the need for understanding how the expected outcomes of this assessment would support Subsidiary Bodies' ability to provide advice to Commission. They noted that a revised version had been posted the previous night, and thus they had not had enough time to consider the changes. They believed this required continued discussion at successive meetings. Given these outstanding uncertainties, they were not ready to endorse these TORs at this stage.
186. The Chair noted that there had been some different views expressed on the process of prioritisation and that it would be useful to resolve these.
187. The Executive Director saw that the interaction between the work of the commission and the issue of climate change was complex and difficult to operationalise. It would obviously be resource-intensive to review all the measures, but one way of approaching it might be to do a climate-focussed review of the south Pacific albacore measure in 2025. This should make it more obvious how all the different elements of WCPFC would participate in operationalising its new climate focus. Instead of trying to prioritise all the CCMs when there were many CCMs with many different opinions, to focus on one, which was already up for review.
188. Korea, Japan and New Zealand agreed that taking a review of the south Pacific albacore measure as a pilot project was a sensible approach that would allow TCC to better understand what was involved before making further decisions.
189. The USA also very much appreciated the approach and it aligned with some of the comments made by the USA earlier. There was an opportunity for a further engagement before the WCPFC meeting, and it was possible that more than one CMM could be included in the pilot assessment, for example the tropical tuna measure. Focussing on just one CMM might slow up the whole
-

process when some preliminary work had already been done on some other measures. For a general prioritisation, the USA would prefer to focus on target species and NTADS. The USA would also be happy to edit the TORs – to limit the initial assessment to *informing* the commission rather than advising – because the advice should come from subsidiary bodies. And the focus would be on TCC technical and implementation issues relating to climate change. But the reviewers could report (in a preliminary fashion) to other bodies before TCC. This initial assessment would take less than a year and report to TCC next year, and remain within existing available funds. And WCPFC would also have to make sure the text of the CMMs under review did not change before the review was complete.

190. China hoped the seabird mitigation measure could be a priority for review because migration patterns, and the quality of nesting and foraging habitat would be particularly affected by climate change.
191. Korea wanted to highlight USA's point about the consultant not providing advice but only information to assist the subsidiary bodies to provide advice to the Commission.
192. The Chair kept Agenda item 7 open until a recommendation, taking this discussion into account, could be drafted for consideration.
193. On Day 6 the Chair recalled the meeting to the climate change related work and asked that CCMs consider the "Commission's approach to an assessment of CMM vulnerability to climate change" presented in Working Paper 34. The meeting debated the paper paragraph by paragraph and agreed the following output.

194. TCC20 welcomed the presentation by the Scientific Services Provider (SSP) on the status of fisheries and updates on the impact of climate change and **recommended that in future the SSP** also provide information to TCC on the status of the Northern stocks.
195. TCC20 **requested that the Co-Leads on Climate Change**, in the lead-up to WCPFC21, revise the Draft Climate Change Workplan for submission to the Commission for consideration, taking into account the views and concerns expressed at TCC20 particularly the ongoing projects or activities that needed to commence, along with the resources required and the flow of outcomes from one Subsidiary Body to another.
196. TCC20 discussed the importance of implementing an assessment of Conservation and Management Measures susceptible to the impact of climate change, but expressed concern over:
 - a. the required Secretariat and SSP resources to support a comprehensive CMM assessment,
 - b. the value of the assessment,
 - c. how it would support the work of subsidiary bodies in providing advice to the Commission,
 - d. whether there would be a phased approach to a CMM assessment, and
 - e. the timeframe for completing an assessment.
197. TCC20 noted the draft Terms of Reference for the CMM assessment, presented in Attachment B in [WCPFC-TCC20-2024-13](#). TCC20 noted that most CCMs consider these TORs were subject to a clear understanding of the issues outlined above (paragraph 196), and **TCC20 requests the**

co-leads to present a revised version addressing these issues at WCPFC21 for the Commission's consideration.

198. TCC20 **recommended the Commission** consider a select number of CMMs for application of a climate change susceptibility assessment in 2025 once the Commission has endorsed the Terms of Reference referred to in paragraph 197 above.
199. TCC20 welcomed the contributions from the USA and Chinese Taipei of financial resources to support the integration of climate change into fisheries management of the Western and Central Pacific Ocean.

AGENDA ITEM 8 – SUPPORTING SCIENCE-BASED MANAGEMENT

200. The Chair introduced this agenda item, noting that for some time now questions had been asked about how TCC might strengthen its role in supporting science-based management, particularly as the Harvest Strategy Approach to WCPFC tuna fisheries was beginning to take form. There had also been a desire by WCPFC Chairs to work out how the subsidiary bodies could work better together to support the Commission. And last year, there had been some confusion expressed by some CCMs about TCC considering issues arising from SC before they got to the Commission.

8.1 CMMS with interpretation issues identified in the CMS (updates)

201. In regard to CMM obligations with interpretation issues, the Chair noted that there had been a lengthy discussion on [CMM 2012-03 para 2](#), and also [CMM 2018-06 para 11](#) (IMO numbers), and [CMM 2006-04 para 1](#) on vessels fishing for striped marlin south of 15°S. It was suggested these be considered in reverse order since the USA had just submitted a suggestion on this.

CMM 2006-04 (1) – Vessels fishing for striped marlin south of 15°S

202. With respect to CMM 2006-04 para 1, the United States provided the following draft recommendation for members' consideration:

TCC recommended that the Commission review the audit point for CMM 2006-04 paragraph 1 to clarify the meaning of 'vessels fishing for MLS south of 15°S'. Specifically, TCC recommended that the Commission adopt an audit point for CMM 2006-04 paragraph 1 such that it applies to 'Vessels fishing south of 15 degrees South with an annual catch of striped marlin in that area with striped marlin greater than 50% of the catch of potential target tuna (albacore, yellowfin and bigeye, southern bluefin, skipjack) and swordfish.'

This was by analogy to the 'fishing for' definition adopted for South Pacific albacore tuna, and language from the south Pacific albacore CMM had been used, replacing the term "South Pacific albacore" with striped marlin.

203. New Zealand on behalf of FFA CCMs thanked the USA for starting the discussion, but they were unsure how this definition would affect the reporting obligations under the CMM and whether it would effectively constrain the effort of vessels fishing for striped marlin. They thought the 50% threshold would result in a lot fewer vessels being identified as 'fishing for' striped marlin. They suggested tasking the SSP to provide some information on the current vessels and number

under this obligation and the percentage of SW striped marlin catches in relation to the proposed definition and also other catch thresholds. This would perhaps inform perhaps a more substantive discussion at either the Commission meeting in December or SC21 in 2025.

204. The SSP pointed out that the proposal here was a little different than for albacore. In particular, it would depend on if the MLS proportion was of the total catch or of a listed group of species.
205. The EU thanked the USA and felt that this proposal was very helpful. There was a need to clarify the concept of “targeting” or “fishing for” in all CMMs. But like FFA, they felt that this particular definition would result in few or no vessels being identified as actually fishing for striped marlin. There was no one definition that fit all fisheries, and they also wanted to see the proportions of MLS in the actual catch over the years.
206. Japan felt this was a good starting point, but needed more information. They recommended TCC undertakes further work, not makes an actual definition.
207. The USA withdrew their original proposal and suggested TCC try to find a solution. They had heard that information needed to be collected to inform this work, and perhaps the FFA suggestions on reporting should be taken to the Commission.
208. The EU wondered – if this is analytical work was to be done intersessionally – would it be useful to undertake similar work for the northern striped marlin stock as well?

CMM 2018-06 (11) – IMO numbers

209. The meeting then turned its attention to the IMO number Audit Point in CMM 2018-06 paragraph 11, and reporting when CCM vessels that are fishing in waters beyond their national jurisdiction did not have IMO numbers. There had been some discussion about whether the circumstances needed to be reported, and a discussion that homed in on the importance of the obligation for vessels fishing in waters beyond national jurisdiction to have IMO numbers. It would be classed as an exception if that was not the case. TCC had done a compliance assessment of this obligation, but it had been brought forward for clarification here. The Chair welcomed views from the floor.
 210. Korea had looked further at this CMM after the earlier discussion and noted there were actually 2 separate obligations under CMM 2018-06. One was paragraph 6s on the provision of IMO numbers and the other was paragraph 11 on the reporting of extraordinary circumstances when the IMO number was not provided. The non-compliance issue for the 6s obligation was quite clear, but was not included in the Audit points to be assessed.
 211. In revising the audit point, Korea believed that TCC needed to agree on whether or not non-submission of an IMO or LR number should be considered extraordinary. If a CCM had considered that the non-submission was due to clerical or administrative error, the CCM might not consider this as “extraordinary”. But if there was an extraordinary situation where the IMO number could be provided, the CCM could designate that situation as extraordinary and reporting in the annual report as such. So, what TCC needed to consider here was whether or not there was agreement that any non-submission of an IMO number should be considered extraordinary, and if any non-submission of an IMO number should be accompanied by a note in the annual report. Korea also noted that there was exactly the same provision under CMM
-

-
- 2013-04, which was the CMM for the unique vessel identifier. It also had in paragraph 2 the same obligation for reporting an extraordinary situation where the unique vessel identifier could not be provided
212. The Chair thanked Korea for doing this homework and noted that the key issue was that IMO numbers needed to be applied. The definition of “extraordinary” circumstances was tying the discussion in knots and different CCMs had different views.
213. Indonesia noted that in the Indian Ocean, wooden vessels had difficulty with IMO numbers. Was it the case in the Pacific that other numbers could be used?
214. The Chair noted that this Audit Point under discussion applied to vessels fishing on the high seas. The Chair in considering the question from Indonesia, sought clarification as to whether the vessels that have difficulty obtaining IMO numbers would be fishing in waters beyond the Indonesian national jurisdiction? In response, Indonesia confirmed that Indonesian vessels would fish on the high seas and would anticipate the same for their wooden vessels, which also had the capability to fish on the high seas, but it was difficult for them to get IMO numbers for safety reasons. They hoped it would be possible for the callsign to be acceptable as an identifier until the IMO process could be resolved, but that was only a suggestion in case these vessels did need to fish on the high seas.
215. The Chair thought this issue was slightly separate from the Audit Point issue, and was a little cautious about conflating issues in this discussion. It was suggested that there might be some discussion in in the margins with the Secretariat around the vessels that Indonesia was talking about, and drew attention to footnote 4 attached to Para 6 of the measure¹.
216. The Chair recalled the meeting to the current audit point for this obligation, and the need for some clarification on the compliance assessment approach that might need to be considered for resolution at the Commission.
217. The EU felt it might be useful to recommend that in future assessments Paragraph 6s and 11 were assessed together, because it seemed that this year it was only paragraph 11 that was assessed and this had created some problems.
218. New Zealand could go along with the EU suggestion of combining 6s and 11 assessment. The main problem was the reference to extraordinary circumstances. 6s said there was an obligation to have an IMO number and if there was no IMO number it had to be reported in the CCM Annual Report Part 2. It was immaterial whether this was because of a clerical error or something else. It was necessary to have an IMO number, and work needed to be done on paragraph 11 to clarify this.

¹ Footnote 4 attached to paragraph 6 of CMM 2018-06: – *“Effective 1 April 2020, flag CCMs shall ensure that all their motorized inboard fishing vessels of less than 100 GRT (or 100 GRT) down to a size of 12 meters in length overall (LOA), authorized to be used for fishing in the Convention Area beyond the flag CCM’s area of national jurisdiction have an IMO or LR issued.”*

CMM 2012-03 (02) – 5% observer coverage of fresh fish fisheries north of 20°N

219. The meeting then moved to the remaining item on their list of CMM interpretation issues. In CMM 2012-03 02 the Quantitative Limit (QL) of at least 5% observer coverage of fisheries for fresh fish product north of 20°N. Japan pointed out that there were different views on this among CCMs and suggested that TCC simply report this to the Commission and make no recommendation.
220. The Chair asked if the meeting could agree to a recommendation that WCPFC discuss the ongoing applicability of this provision, with no objection.
221. The Chair provided an opportunity for CCMs to raise any other examples of CMMs with interpretation difficulties that needed to be worked on. None were raised

222. TCC20 **tasked the SSP** to provide additional information on catches of SW striped marlin and NW Striped marlin, including as a percentage of total catch per vessel, in order to inform discussions on both Striped marlin stocks at SC21, TCC21 and WCPFC22 regarding the clarification of the term ‘fishing for’/‘targeting’.
223. TCC20 **recommended to the Commission** that in future assessments of CMM 2018-06, paragraph 6(s) and paragraph 11 be assessed in the same year. TCC20 **recommended to the Commission** that it consider adopting a clearer definition of what was meant by ‘extraordinary circumstances’ in [paragraph 11 of CMM 2018-06](#), or remove this phrase from paragraph 11.
224. TCC20 **recommended that the Commission** at WCPFC21 discuss the ongoing applicability of [paragraph 2 of CMM 2012-03](#).

8.2 Review of CMM 2015-02 SP albacore

Relevant Paper: [TCC20-2024-IP06_rev2](#)

225. The TCC Chair noted that the chair of the South Pacific albacore road map intersessional working group (SPAR-IWG) was online and this IWG would be meeting on 11th October.
226. The Fiji SPAR-IWG Chair (Moses Mataika) had briefed the 21st WCPFC Scientific Committee in August and explained that the next SPAR-IWG meeting had to be postponed because SPC was delayed in providing the necessary scientific advice in time as a result of difficulties caused by civil unrest, and briefly outlined plans for the next session. It was explained that the WCPFC Secretariat paper Working Paper 06 rev2 reviewed [CMM 2015-02](#) and associated analytical challenges. These had been discussed earlier in TCC, in the CMR process around baselines for quantitative vessel number limits.

Discussion

227. The Solomon Islands on behalf of PNA and Tokelau CCMs saw a strong link between IP06 and working paper 25. The use of the definition of ‘actively fishing for’ adopted by WCPFC20 was useful to quantify the obligations in the measure. However, from working paper 25 they understood verification of these obligations continued to be an issue. This was an important element when the Commission would be considering the development of Management

Procedures for different species, not only in quantifying limits but also in the evaluation of trade-offs.

228. The Cook Islands spoke for all FFA CCMs in recognising the value of the Secretariat’s Information Paper 6 and welcomed the suggestions for enhancing the Secretariat’s ability to verify CCM reports under the South Pacific albacore measure CMM 2015-02 and related ‘area-based limit obligations’. They supported a discussion by TCC of the suggestions, particularly to revise the RFV with an additional new data field ‘Area-based CMM limit obligation(s)’ in the Attachment 1 of the RFV SSPs [CMM 2022-05](#), to improve clarity in their verification process. In addition, they sought additional details from the Secretariat on the approach to this revision. In general, they would be interested to know the verification process to be used by the Secretariat for the South Pacific albacore management procedure once adopted, and for other similar species and their management procedures in the future.
229. The WCPFC Compliance Manager briefly presented IP06, which provided information for TCC20 a summary of data about CMM 2015-02 (South Pacific Albacore), including reports received by the Commission under CMM 2015-02 and its predecessor, CMM 2010-05. The decision that that the Commission had taken in December 2023, providing a definition for the purpose of assessing the South Pacific albacore quantitative limit² had certainly made it a much easier obligation for the Secretariat to prepare in 2024 and thanks were due to SPC for assisting with the compilation of the figures in Annex 1 of IP06.
230. Paper IP06 outlines that it would be useful for the Secretariat in preparing the draft CMR, if Flag CCMs could clarify the authorization description that they currently provide in the Record of Fishing Vessels in such a way that it would act in effect as declaration about whether they believe a particular longline vessel was operating under the rules of a particular catch limit or area-based effort limit. If the secretariat had the ability, at the level of an individual vessel, to identify the specific limits that applied to it, then they could then use WCPFC VMS and WCPFC catch and effort data related to each individual vessel, and be in a position to provide more detail and assurance to TCC and to the Commission for the verification of quantitative limits such as in CMM 2015-02, but also in other CMMs with a similar area-based catch or effort limit.
231. New Zealand thought this proposal was good in principle for area-based limits, but how would it help in the verification of in-zone catch by domestic vessels that were not required to be on the RFV. For example, New Zealand troll vessels were mainly domestic and weren’t on the RFV. In response, the Compliance Manager acknowledged that for domestic vessels that operated in a CCMs own waters, CMR assessments based on the CCMs self-reported information would continue. The main issue that IP06 was intending to address, related to vessels fishing mostly on the high seas, and this recognises that longliners operating within waters where an area-based catch or effort limit applies, may target different species. The suggestions in IP06, was intending to provide greater clarity on the targeting practices of each longline vessel over time

² The Commission agreed that the term “actively fishing for” used in CMM 2015-02 is applied to: “Vessels fishing south of 20 degrees South with an annual catch of albacore in that area with South Pacific albacore greater than 50% of the catch of potential target tuna (albacore, yellowfin, bigeye, southern bluefin), skipjack and swordfish.”

- as a flag CCM understands it, and as such the potential applicability of a CMM's area-based catch or effort limit.
232. China understood the current measure did not require the CCM to identify vessels when they provided catch composition data under this measure, just an anonymised number for the purpose of this particular exercise. But the proposal by the secretariat was for the vessel ID to be provided. Although China had declared a limit of 70 vessels these were not the same vessels from year to year, and this needed to be taken into account in the review. Also, this requirement should apply to the entire area, not just the area south of 20°S.
233. The SSP reminded CCMs that the WCPFC20 agreed definition (see footnote 2 of this report) includes Southern Bluefin Tuna in the catch composition calculation. But SBT was not currently a key species in the "Data to be Provided to the Commission", and the catch of SBT was now needed to calculate the proportion of albacore in the total catch to identify which vessels were actively fishing for South Pacific Albacore. This might also need to be taken into account when judging verifiability.
234. Chair asked FFA, who had wanted to bring this forward, if they wanted further work on this. It was clear there wouldn't be agreement on the secretariat recommendation arising from IPO6.
235. There being no further views expressed, the Chair noted that these questions might have to be picked up by the forthcoming SPAR-IWG if any definite advice was to be provided to the Commission
236. TCC20 confirmed that the SPA-IWG will meet virtually on 11 October to discuss the management of South Pacific Albacore.

8.3 Tropical Tuna CMM and FAD Management Options IWG

FAD Management and Monitoring

Relevant Papers: [TCC20-2024-16](#), [TCC20-2024-18](#)

237. The Chair of the FAD Management Options IWG (FADMO-IWG), Jamel James, drew attention to the recommendations of paper 16, and to the desirability of having a physical meeting of the FADMO-IWG in 2025, and to the recommendation in paper 18 (*Proposed FAD data fields and notes on their use for the work of the WCPFC*) for TCC20 to provide advice and recommendations to the Commission about the potential utility of, and/or any technical constraints to, the proposed data fields being included in a FAD Logbook to be collected by Vessel Operators.
238. The Solomon Islands representing the views of PNA and Tokelau thanked the FAD Working Group Chair for his report and leadership. They also thanked the Secretariat for their support to the Working Group. They thought good progress was being made in the Working Group. They agreed that a face-to-face session was needed as soon as possible, as they had suggested in Rarotonga, because of the technical content of several of the tasks. On priorities, PNA and Tokelau CCMs attached particular priority to the two basic data systems tasks – the FAD logsheet and the provision of satellite transmission data to the Commission. This was because it would not be possible, for example, to implement requirements for biodegradable FADs and increased

reporting on FADs, until a FAD logsheet was in place for FAD activity reporting. Otherwise, they see all the elements in the workplan as important.

239. Tuvalu spoke for FFA CCMs to thank the FADMO-IWG Chair for leading these discussions and providing such a concise summary. For the FFA Membership, Satellite Buoy Data Transmission, FAD logbooks and FAD recovery programmes remained priorities for discussion within the IWG, and they supported the Chair's suggestion of holding a face-to-face meeting back-to-back with TCC21. They also commended the Secretariat and SSP for their diligence in preparing paper 18 responding to SC requests, and they reiterated support to the PNA and Tokelau FAD Minimum Data Fields proposal.
240. The EU wondered if one meeting would be enough for all the different tasks on the table. Rather than prioritising the agenda, would it be possible to have more than one meeting? All of these topics were equally important. The EU hoped to be able to make concrete steps by this time next year. And CCMs should not forget that one of the taskings last year was to recommend which type of vessels were able to deploy FADs. This tasking seemed to have been forgotten.
241. The USA supported in-person meeting, possibly next to SC and TCC to resolve both scientific and technical issues.
242. The TCC Chair summed up the discussion, noting one tasking from WCPFC20 that was missed by TCC and suggesting the inclusion of several FAD issues in the draft future TCC workplan.

243. TCC20 **recommended that the Commission** at WCPFC21 agree to schedule in-person FAD Management Options IWG meeting(s) in 2025, adjacent to subsidiary body meetings, given the complexity and technical nature of the work to be progressed.
244. TCC20 **recommended that the Commission** at WCPFC21 task the **FAD Management Options IWG** to consider which vessels are permitted to deploy and service FADS.
245. TCC20 requested the Chair of the FAD Management Options IWG to bring advice to WCPFC21 on a work plan for the IWG for the Commission's adoption.

Interim steps for evaluating increase in bigeye longline catch limits

Relevant Paper: [TCC20-2024-15](#)

246. The Compliance Manager presented working paper 15: a discussion paper that had previously been presented to SC20 and now had some notes added describing the outcomes of SC20. TCC20 might consider if adjustments to audit points and annual reporting were needed. The paper confirms that there had been two notifications this year – from Korea and Chinese Taipei – to claim an increase in their longline bigeye catch limits based on a commitment to achieve a proportionate increase in minimum observer coverage – and the paper provided a table showing how the observer coverage would be done. The paper also looked at what would be needed to support TCC's assessment of compliance with the bigeye tuna longline catch limit when the compliance assessment was done.
247. China recalled working very hard to get the 10% observer coverage to qualify for an increase in the longline bigeye catch limit. But this year they had achieved 12.1% so China may make a
-

notification next year for a bigeye longline catch limit increase. China suggested that Electronic Monitoring be used as a supplement for observer coverage in the overlap area because IATTC now has minimum standard for EM, even if WCPFC does not.

248. Tokelau explained that the FFA CCM's position had been stated at SC20 and remained the same. That is, while acknowledging that CMM 2023-01 allows for increased observer coverage above 5% to be sourced from ROP or EM, the FFA CCM's position was that, in the absence of an agreed framework for EM, the interim solution was to default to coverage solely by ROP observers. This approach should be maintained while the Commission works out the details related to EM, and this was seen as the most straightforward interim solution, at least for 2024, and possibly extending into 2025 if necessary. Under this interim solution, the Annual Report Part 1 reporting requirement and the Secretariat's verification could be a simple extension of the current Audit Point.
249. Korea noted there was some discussion at SC20. Korea was one CCM which had said it might use EM to achieve 10%, but since there was no minimum standard yet they would need to use human observers. In which case the audit points may not need to be revised immediately. Korea also had a question regarding the increase of observer coverage with increase of catch limit. If Korea achieves only 6% observer coverage, which might permit a 2% increase in catch limit, would that be compliant? This was a hypothetical question.
250. China appreciated the question by Korea. This had been why the China fisheries authority had been hesitant to make a notification. Their understanding was that if observer coverage is increased from 5 to 10% it permits a 10% increase in catch limit, but had been worried in case the observer increase was not achieved.
251. The WCPFC Compliance Manager thanked all for the discussion, noting they needed to consider the audit points carefully to avoid being unable to respond next year to the kind of scenarios that had been raised by Korea and China.
252. The Chair suspended discussion on agenda item 8.3 on Bigeye catch limits so CCMs could consider how the audit point might be fine-tuned.
253. On Day 6 the discussion was resumed around the outstanding question regarding the audit point for increasing flag longline bigeye catch limits proportionate to an increase in flag longline fleet ROP observer coverage rate above 5% and the link between the regional observer program and electronic monitoring. There had been no firm proposals in the interim on how that draft audit point might be improved and thoughts were welcomed from the floor.
254. China said they had participated in the negotiation in 2023, and understood that if a CCM wanted to obtain a 5-10% increase of the catch limit it should increase the human observer coverage above 5% either by increasing human observers or by adding electronic monitoring. But the minimum standard was 5% at least for the human observer coverage of longline fishing as requested by the current measure. So, China understood that although the WCPFC had no minimum standard, the language was there regardless of what standard could be used is dependent on the CCM to decide. In conclusion China preferred that, as mentioned in the tropical tuna CMM, 5% human observer plus 5% electronic monitoring. They however understood the concern and suggested that perhaps the language should be something like "in

the absence of a WCPFC minimum standard for electronic monitoring, that the remaining 5% should be achieved by human observers". In the IATTC/WCPFC overlap area China noted that IATTC had adopted minimum EM standards in September 2024, and thought the IATTC minimum standard for observer coverage should be used by those CCMs with a vessel operating in the overlap area, and the vessel registered with both RFMOs should use IATTC Minimum Standard for the observer coverage.

255. The WCPFC Compliance Manager noted the provisional list of obligations had just been approved, but this was one obligation where further work on the audit point was needed. An asterisk had been placed against CMM 2023-01 para 38 indicating that that was an obligation where a decision would need to be made about whether a revised audit point was necessary or not. They had also included CMM 2018-05, annex C, paragraph 6, related to the 5% observer coverage. In considering a way forward, it would be useful to think about whether there was a need to revise the audit point in order to support TCC assessments next year and if so, what the process would be for finalizing those amendments in order to support those assessments? The Secretariat had provided a suggestion in paragraph 8, but understood from these discussions that might not quite meet what CCMs wanted.
256. The Chair recalled that TCC had now identified a list of audit points needing to be resolved and the TCC Vice-Chair had been tasked to look into these further before the Commission meeting. There had been a suggestion in the paper for resolving this Audit point, but in view of the discussion across the floor, it was suggested that this particular audit point, on Interim steps for evaluating increase in bigeye longline catch limits, had not been resolved and TCC might need to request the vice-chairs to include this in the provision of advice to WCPFC21. If there were any further thoughts on what the appropriate audit point should be for this work, to please send those thoughts through to the TCC Vice-chair for consideration in his advice to WCPFC21.

257. TCC20 **requested that the TCC Vice-Chair** review the Audit Point for the bigeye longline catch obligation [CMM 2023-01 38](#), taking into consideration the footnotes in CMM 2023-01 Attachment 1, Table 3 for consideration by WCPFC21.

258. TCC20, noting that CMM 2023-01 is reviewed annually, **recommended to the Commission** that it give consideration to the development of an audit point for CMM 2023-01, paragraph 48 (Other Commercial Fisheries).

8.4 Development of Monitoring Strategy for Skipjack tuna

Relevant Paper: [TCC20-2024-17](#) (SPC update of Skipjack Monitoring Strategy)

259. Rob Scott (SPC) presented Working Paper 17, explaining that the monitoring strategy was to routinely evaluate the performance of the management procedure (MP), to verify that it functioned as expected. The monitoring strategy should consider all aspects of the harvest strategy, including procedures for evaluating and testing MPs, the identification of any scenarios that should be added to the OM grid, the preparation and application of the EM, and the overall performance of the management procedure. Additionally, it identified changes in the dynamics of the fishery resulting from environmental, economic, or social factors that might have necessitated a reconsideration of the management objectives and the testing of alternative MPs.

-
260. This paper updated the skipjack MP monitoring strategy to reflect Commission discussions and observations at WCPFC20, addressed key issues that arose subsequently, and clarified areas for consideration by TCC20. SC20 had recommended the monitoring strategy be forwarded to the SMD, TCC and the Commission for their consideration.
261. The following outcomes arose from the discussion by SMD02 of the skipjack monitoring strategy:
- a. SMD02 expressed gratitude to the SSP for the updated skipjack monitoring strategy (WCPFC-SMD02-2024-BP-06), which, among other things, provided clear guidance on the technical advice that TCC could offer to the Commission. SMD02 endorsed the approach of not making adjustments to the key elements of the management procedure on an annual basis, but recommended that modelling be undertaken as part of the next review of the management procedures in 2026, including scenarios related to climate change.
 - b. SMD02 recommended that, as part of the next regular review of the skipjack management procedure, the Commission directly incorporate SEAPODYM and/or other model projections into the skipjack management strategy evaluation operating model grid projections.
262. The Monitoring Strategy itself was outlined in Table 1 of Paper 17, and guidance was sought from TCC20 on any additional issues and commentary to Table 1.

Discussion

263. Australia spoke for FFA CCMs, who felt that the skipjack monitoring strategy was an important tool to guide how the WCPFC monitored the performance of the MP so the Commission can ensure it stays on track and also identifies any issues that may arise. In relation to working paper 17, FFA members supported the recommendation made by SC20 for the Scientific Committee to provide feedback through the Online Discussion Forum in years when a WCPO SKJ stock assessment was not conducted, and supported the role for TCC in elements 1a and 1b of the SKJ monitoring strategy, because this would help determine if the SKJ MP is performing as expected. To undertake this task and in relation to element 1b and identification of information and gaps in available data, FFA Members noted that some revisions would be needed to Information Paper 9 to provide the data that TCC would need in future to monitor implementation of the SKJ MP. FFA CCMs were also interested in how the TCC Chair envisaged the TCC accommodating the work to monitor the performance of the SKJ MP. As the Commission moved to adopt more MPs, was it expected that their performance should be monitored under a standing agenda item, with working papers pulling together the specific information that the TCC would be considering? Or something else?
264. The TCC Chair felt it would probably be necessary to have a standing agenda item, but this would need to be decided after the SKJ MS had been considered by WCPFC.
265. Indonesia understood that the CPUE index from the Japan Pole and Line fishery had an issue because the fishery was declining. When would the index from the Purse-seine fishery come into use, and how long could the Japanese pole and line data be used? And would SEAPODYM be able to address climate and environmental impact on skipjack stock or would that require further work?
-

266. SPC noted that the Japan Pole and Line Fishery had declined so much in key skipjack assessment areas that the reduction in data was beginning to affect the reliability of the assessment, so SPC had already brought in some information from the purse seine fishery to fine-tune the CPUE index. SPC would look at the options and bring them to SC21 in 2025 where a decision would be made. They also noted that SEAPODYM was already being used to develop various parameters affecting the evaluation and the MP testing process.
267. The EU recalled that SC20 had not identified any Exceptional Circumstances and just wanted to check that the changes in the measure – the reductions in FAD closure period etc – did not need to be considered Exceptional Circumstances.
268. SPC noted there had been a great deal of discussion at SC20 on this. The decision there had been to maintain the existing agreement, which was to wait until next year before making a decision and then to formally test the effect of the changes on the MP. However, preliminary indications were that the changes to the FAD closure would not have great impact.
269. After noting that PNA and Tokelau had already provided some editing suggestions, TCC20 considered Table 1 in Paper 17 – the latest draft of the SKJ Monitoring Strategy that would be submitted to the Commission for agreement.
270. The Marshall Islands explained their proposed edits, noting it had been suggested that TCC pick up six tasks, and TCC would need to consider these.

TCC Responsibility	Proposed TCC20 Response
<p><i>1a. Regularly review/check the performance and outputs of the MP, including the indicators set out in Table 3, Annex III of CMM 2022-01 and provide advice to the Commission on:</i></p> <p>a. <i>Catch and effort levels for all fisheries subject to the MP relative to maximum levels specified under the most recent output of the MP.</i></p> <p>b. <i>Identify quality of information and gaps in available data that would affect ability to monitor the implementation of the MP relative to the MP outputs.</i></p>	<p>Additional information on relevant catch and effort for the fisheries subject to the MPs will be needed by TCC.</p>
<p>1b. <i>Check availability, quantity and quality of data necessary to run the MP (e.g) the estimation method)</i></p>	<p>TCC20: No new information</p>
<p>1c. <i>Identify any other data, as available, that might not be included in the MSE framework, that can inform on performance indicators (economic, social, ecosystem, etc.)</i></p>	<p>TCC20: No new information</p>
<p>2b. <i>Confirm the fisheries controlled by the MP, and the method of control, remains appropriate</i></p>	<p>TCC20: No new information</p>
<p>2c. <i>Provide technical assistance advice to identify exceptional circumstances (see CMM 2022-01 Annex IV) and recommend remedial action where necessary.</i></p>	<p>TCC20: No new information</p>
<p>3d. <i>Identify any improvements in data collection to either enhance the OM framework or reduce uncertainty included in the OM grid.</i></p>	<p>[TCC20: review whether this is an appropriate task for TCC.]</p>

271. The EU had no problem with proposed changes, but still failed to understand what the role of TCC was in most of these tasks. Most of them fall under the remit of SC, particularly the data issues. Again, no problem, but they wanted to know the purpose of bringing in TCC.

-
272. Japan had the same view as the EU. And one question – in 1a, what was the “additional information” on catch and effort that was needed by TCC?
273. SPC explained that some accreditation bodies were interested in having assurance that the MP was actually being implemented, and this was one area where TCC should have a role. Some of this additional information would help in breaking down an aggregated summary catch – as provided for some domestic fisheries – into its individual species to be compatible with the WCPFC process, for example.
274. The Pew Charitable Trusts supported the FFA statement about having a standing TCC agenda item on Management Procedures, noted that as more MPs were adopted there would be an increasing role for TCC. Issues such as receiving ROP data to verify the quality of data going into the MP etc. A constant pathway through TCC would be useful for reviewing all these issues, including whether there were issues that might trigger exceptional circumstances.
275. The Chair emphasised the need for setting up a recognised pathway between the subsidiary bodies on processes managed by the Commission. TCC’s role in the implementation of the Harvest Strategy Approach would probably be minimal at this early stage, but would increase with time. SC was reliant on data and one of TCCs roles was to consider the integrity of data and make recommendations on the programmes to collect data.
276. The USA also sought further explanation. Presumably the SC was tasked with providing scientific advice, and TCC was more to do advising on the management response to that advice. 1b on identifying the quality of information and gaps in data could be considered something that SC does already. However, if it refers to issues such as observer coverage, then that was under the TCC purview.
277. The Chair suggested that the specification of this inter-committee pathway be kept fairly general. The main point was to focus on the “T” in “TCC”. And there might not be a major role for TCC in the early stages. And noting PNA’s suggestion that TCC Responsibility 3d might not be appropriate for TCC, SPC had explained that this had been included to seek the response of TCC. It was suggested that this particular task (“Identify any improvements in data collection to either enhance the OM framework or reduce uncertainty included in the OM grid”) was more appropriate to SC.
278. The Chair felt that this had been a useful discussion. TCC had been asked to comment on and edit the monitoring strategy, and an updated version had been circulated as an incorporation into Paper 17_rev1. He asked if this could be adopted now and recommended to WCPFC21, noting that the final item was being removed as a TCC task and left with SC. There were no objections.

279. TCC20 **recommended that the Commission** adopt the SKJ monitoring strategy ([TCC20-2024 - 17_rev1](#)), noting the updates and input provided by TCC20.

280. TCC20 noted that, as the Commission adopts more Management Procedures, there could be a need for a standing item on the TCC agenda to consider Management Procedures.

8.5 Review of CMM 2018-03 Seabirds

Relevant Papers: [DP01 \(NZ\)](#) – Review of CMM 2018-03, [DP05_rev1 \(NZ\)](#) – proposed changes to CMM 2018-03, [OP01](#) Port-based outreach to support CMM 2018-03 (Birdlife), [OP02](#) Advice to TCC20 on straddling sets (Birdlife), [OP05](#) Statement (Birdlife)

281. New Zealand (Heather Ward) presented the outcomes of the working group sessions, noting that many seabirds foraging within the WCPO were declining at concerning rates. Bycatch in pelagic longline fisheries was the *most likely cause* for some species. Most pressing, the Antipodean Albatross was predicted to become **extinct** around 2070 if the current decline continued.
282. In view of this, in 2022 SC18 had recommended a review of CMM 2018-03 - the seabird measure, and New Zealand had led this informal process largely over 2024. Two informal virtual sessions had been held in February and May of 2024, along with the compilation of over 130 scientific papers. The findings of the review of the latest scientific evidence on seabird bycatch mitigation were discussed extensively at SC20.
283. Some key points were as follows:
- Effective combinations of bycatch mitigation methods are most needed in **waters South of 25°S**, which includes areas with currently reduced bycatch mitigation requirements (25°-30°S). In addition, **further mitigation implementation should be encouraged, particularly in the area 20°-25°**, without placing undue burden on SIDs.
 - Effective mitigation methods are available that minimally impact target catch. The intersessional review and discussions at SC20 have highlighted that CMM 2018-03 can be improved. Specifically, SC-EB-WP-06 put forward 16 recommendations that could significantly reduce seabird bycatch within the WCPO. This includes:
 - **Requiring 3/3** (tori lines, weighted branch lines, and night setting in combination), or proven stand-alone mitigation methods **south of 25°S**.
 - Including **underwater bait setters** as another proven stand-alone bycatch mitigation method, next to hook-shielding devices.
 - **Removing ineffective methods** currently included in the CMM (deep-setting line shooters, blue-dyed bait, and offal discharge management).
 - **Improving the specifications of branch line weighting**, particularly by decreasing the distance between the hook and the weight.
 - **Improving the specifications of Northern Hemisphere small vessel tori lines**, particularly by specifying requirements for aerial extent and requirements for streamers.
 - Making minor improvements of large vessel tori line specifications that improve their practicability.
284. TCC20 was tasked to further consider the suggested 16 recommendations in SC-EB-WP-06 – also set out in DP01 - in terms of technical, practical, and human safety aspects, and provide advice to the Commission to improve the effectiveness of CMM 2018-03. New Zealand had incorporated these 16 recommendations into a draft CMM on seabirds for consideration - which has been socialised at TCC20.

285. In terms of next steps: By 10 October 2024, New Zealand would circulate an updated version of the CMM. The text of the draft CMM would be unchanged since specific textual amendments were not really discussed at TCC – but it will include summaries of the key reasons, both science and technical implications, for the proposed amendments to the CMM.
286. New Zealand invited comments by 1 November 2024. New Zealand would then circulate an updated text by 6 November for consideration at WCPFC21 – and, hopefully, adoption.
287. Tonga spoke for FFA CCMs to express appreciation to New Zealand for its leadership and transparent approach in revising CMM 2018-03. They acknowledged the critical situation of seabirds in the WCPO and the impact that pelagic longline fisheries are having on them. They also recognised the need to improve monitoring and compliance with seabird mitigation requirements. Therefore, FFA members supported improving CMM 2018-03 to enhance its effectiveness, and encouraged CCMs to use the time through to the Commission to this end.
288. Australia thanked New Zealand for this work, acknowledging the poor status of many of these species and looking forward to an enhanced measure being adopted at WCPFC 21.
289. The EU thanked NZ for the proposal and the intersessional work. It expressed the view that that there was room for improving the existing proposal and hoped that the comments and suggestions made would assist in this endeavour.
290. ACAP commended New Zealand for leading the review and noted it was a collaborative transparent process based on the best available science.
291. TCC20 commended New Zealand’s work in leading the review of the seabird mitigation measure ([CMM 2018-03](#)) as mandated by WCPFC19 (2022) (para 328-329).
292. TCC20 noted that, based on science and ACAP best practice, SC20 had discussed 16 recommendations in SC20-EB-WP06 to improve the mitigation methods to reduce seabird bycatch from the longline fishery. TCC20 noted that New Zealand has advised these 16 recommendations had been considered in the preparation of the draft CMM for consideration at WCPFC21.
293. TCC20 noted that there would be an opportunity for CCMs to provide written feedback on the draft CMM by 1 November and further discussion of the draft CMM at WCPFC21.

8.6 Review alternative measures to shark finning prohibition (CMM 2022-04)

Relevant Papers: [DP03 \(Canada\)](#), [DP06 \(Japan\)](#), [TCC20-2024-14 \(Supporting information from CCM AR Pt2 Reporting for CMM 2022-04 paras 7 – 10\)](#)

294. The Chair introduced this agenda item. The Commission, in paragraph 712 of the WCPFC20 Summary Report, had directed CCMs who utilized alternative measures to the prohibition on finning in paragraph 7 of CMM 2022-04 to provide detailed information on the implementation and monitoring of those alternative measures in advance of TCC20, as directed in paragraph 11. The Commission also encouraged CCMs to report to TCC20 any enforcement difficulties that they encountered in the case of the alternative measures and how they have addressed risks

such as monitoring at sea, species substitution, etc. The Commission tasked the Secretariat to compile information with regards to the application of the provisions in paras 8 and 9 of CMM 2022-04. The information provided would be used by TCC20 and WCPFC21 to review the implementation of alternative measures. It was also recalled that SC20 had recommended a review of the CMM in 2027.

295. The alternative measures in paragraph 9 of CMM 2022-04 applied until the end of 2024. TCC20 needed to recommend to the Commission a path forward for 2025 and beyond.
296. Canada presented DP03 – Canada’s submission to support the review of the effectiveness of the alternatives to fins naturally attached. In light of the concerning proportion of non-compliance rates and suspected finning practices observed during Canadian enforcement operations in the North Pacific, Canada did not believe that the alternative measures in paragraph 9 were effective, and that they in fact facilitate the continuation of prohibited finning practices. The authorization of the alternative measures in paragraph 9 also presents inspection effort challenges, resulting in protracted inspections due to the additional time required by inspectors to match carcasses to fins, especially with use of the tagging system where carcasses may be stored in separate holds from the fins. Canadian inspectors had difficulties locating corresponding fins and carcasses, particularly where the tagging system was used, and in one case, were unable to find the corresponding amount of fins for 81 shark carcasses, which due to the current alternative provisions, could potentially require inspectors to completely remove all product from holds in order to be certain that corresponding fins were not at the very bottom – which would be a very unlikely scenario, but one that would be currently allowed with the tagging system. Observations made during Canada’s aerial surveillance efforts have also demonstrated that some vessels are likely not ensuring that corresponding carcasses and fins are matched as several vessels have been noted intermixing piles of loose fins on vessel decks. The continued authorization of the alternative measures in paragraph 9 provides an opportunity for fishers to “high grade” shark fins – the part of the shark that is exponentially more valuable than the carcass – providing an opportunity for fishers to retain more expensive larger fins and match them to smaller bodies or to less valuable shark species. Canada looked forward to submissions from other CCMs in accordance with paragraph 11 of CMM 2022- 04 and to discussions on the effectiveness of these alternative measures at TCC20 to inform the review of the measure in 2024. Canada was considering making a proposal to WCPFC to remove the option of using alternative measures from this CCM.
297. The USA appreciated Canada’s analysis and was concerned at the problems identified. The USA had worked with Canada on boarding and inspection and had also experienced the same problems. They supported Canada’s approach.
298. The EU said WCPFC had been waiting many years for some feedback on how the alternatives to the finning ban had been working. They were not surprised at the problems experienced during the HSBI operations. They would like to at least see a recommendation from TCC20 to take note of these finding and follow up.
299. New Zealand thanked Canada for their high seas boarding and inspection operations and their insight into shark finning activities in the Northern Pacific. New Zealand shared similar concerns to Canada - the use of “alternate measures” on the high seas. They supported strengthening of the shark measure in this respect. It was impractical for inspectors to determine whether alternate measures had been implemented properly. New Zealand has had this difficulty with
-

port inspections of foreign vessels that come into New Zealand ports – where it was virtually impossible to marry up frozen shark carcasses and frozen shark fins. And they appreciated Canada’s comments about the difficulty of marrying up tagged fins and carcasses.

300. With regard to observers on carrier vessels, they noted that there was scope to improve the minimum data required in relation to the transshipment of sharks and their fins, in accordance with paragraph 9 of the shark measure. In other words, greater clarity was needed on the quantities of sharks with fins naturally attached or quantities of sharks where alternate measures had been used (including that fins and carcasses had been adequately married up).
301. New Zealand also noted that the annual report on the ROP detailed the number of sharks and the associated fins which had been retained with trunks. This data appeared to be incomplete but suggested that only 5% of shark fins were reported to be retained with the carcass. In short, given the lack of monitoring of the longline fishery in the region CCMs needed to find ways to improve the monitoring and control of shark catches to ensure finning was not taking place. They appreciated Japan’s report on the inspection of two longline vessels in its port.
302. The Chair noted the Japanese paper referred to by New Zealand would be considered later.
303. Australia appreciated the comments made by New Zealand and the USA. There were major challenges in verifying that shark finning measures were being appropriately applied.
304. Chinese Taipei thanked Canada for offering the information that would facilitate the discussion. Chinese Taipei used alternative measures to ensure full utilisation of sharks. If high seas inspectors had difficulty identifying tags on carcasses and fins then this needed to be improved, and ways found for improving the communication between inspectors and vessels.
305. WWF thanked Canada for the robust analysis and USA and New Zealand for explaining their own difficulties. When these alternative measures was discussed in 2019 all of these problems were anticipated as being likely. TCC should be making the job of inspectors easier not harder. There were many countries now adopting “fins naturally attached” requirements and this proves that it can be done.
306. China for many years had a zero-retention policy for bycatch of sharks, which were recorded and discarded. China had no firm position on the proposal by Canada but wanted to reserve their right to come back to this discussion with a firm position. They noted that all these documents were from the enforcement point of view, but from the fisherman’s point of view this was their livelihood. Improvement was needed, but it needed to be considered also from the point of view of the extra difficulties caused to the fishermen.
307. Indonesia had a policy of full utilisation of the whole shark. Indonesia was currently socialising the possibility of using alternative measures and would need to have further discussions about the possibilities of these alternative measures being withdrawn.
308. Canada had heard Indonesia and understood that it might be best to home in on the fundamental issues before recommending simply removing the option of using alternative measures.

-
309. Japan presented DP06 – describing Japan’s implementation of CMM 2022-04 in accordance with paragraph 11. Sharks were fishery resources for Japan and almost every single part of the shark is consumed, not only fins, but also the meat, bone, and even the skin was used. For instance, many here knew about Wasabi – the Japanese horseradish – and the shark skin is used for the grating of Wasabi. They noted that the Fishery Act and related regulations require distant-water tuna longliners, offshore tuna longliners, and coastal tuna longliners to possess all parts of the shark excepting head, guts and skins, to the point of the first landing. In addition, Japan domestic regulations required tuna longliners to keep fins naturally attached in the WCPFC Convention Area, however as an exemption, the Fishery Act and related regulations allow fishermen to take either of alternative measures stipulated in paragraph 9 of CMM 2022-04. Most Japanese tuna longliners in the WCPFC Convention Area kept fins naturally attached, but some used alternative measures. So far Japan had not noticed any particular problems in verification but understood that Canada was noting problems with inspection on the High Seas. They asked if Canada was able to report non-compliance as a result of this inspection? If so, it meant that the compliance system for the measure was working because it allowed noncompliance to be pointed out. Japan further emphasized that the fishermen who use alternative measures comply the regulations to catch sharks even though choosing alternative measures demands extra work for the fishermen. If WCPFC deletes the alternative measures, the fishermen who follow the regulations lose their opportunities to use shark resources, although fishermen who has conducted fining continue their fining practice because such fishermen ignore any regulation entirely. Japan thought it better to tweak the alternative measure system to make it work better, and wanted to continue to have the option of using alternative measures.
310. In response to Japan’s question about whether the infractions had been reported, Canada responded that yes they had, but only where there was clear evidence. The alternatives actually made it very difficult for inspectors to obtain clear evidence and to be certain. And the time taken to try and collect this evidence took time away from the verification of other CMMs. Generally, an inspection should take less than 4 hours. There would probably be more infractions to report if it was possible to carry out the process of inspection more efficiently. the use of alternative not available and fins were naturally attached.
311. The EU thanked Japan for the paper and the additional information. These arrangements had been discussed for a long time, and it was made clear that the burden of proof lay with those who wanted these alternatives to be introduced. WCPFC had waited for four years to see proof that there were no loopholes created. And since there were only two vessels inspected over four years it did not provide a high level of confidence that this option did not create difficulties. Whereas others had presented robust evidence that it *did* cause problems. Which made it difficult to allow it to continue. The EU also wanted to know from relevant CCMs what proportion of their longliners used alternative measures for preventing shark finning without keeping the fins naturally attached. On what scale was the use of alternative measures?
312. The USA pointed out that the Audit Point required measures to ensure that carcasses and fins be easily identifiable. Like the EU they thought the compliance verification process could not be effective. In view of this they recommended that paragraph 9 be removed from CMM 2023-04.
313. The Chair drew the attention of the meeting to the fact that there were lapsing timeframes in both paragraph 8 and 9 the shark measure, CMM 2022-04, and TCC might need to recommend to WCPFC21 how these lapsing timeframes should be handled. The USA had suggested that the alternative measures paragraph (9) be deleted, but paragraph 8 – the requirement for vessels
-

to land sharks with fins naturally attached to the carcass – would also cease to operate at the end of 2024.

314. Responding to the EU, Japan said that last year three vessels chose alternative measures. That's why the number of inspections was small. Japan also mentioned that even if just one fisherman wanted to use alternative measures, then, as managers, we would want to allow the use of this alternative measure to that fisherman. And responding to the USA, Japan could not support the USA proposal of allowing paragraph 9 to lapse if paragraph 8 was to be extended. WCPFC should fine-tune the measure to make it more easily verifiable.
315. Chinese Taipei – suggests both paragraph 8 and 9 be retained to help fishermen while ensuring full utilisation of sharks. Based on Canada's experience, the main improvement needed would be to improve the tagging to facilitate inspection at sea in paragraph 9 subparagraph 3. We needed to help the fishermen to implement the provisions and did not agree to USA proposal.
316. China recalled that last year IATTC had a similar resolution, and it was not time-limited. But WCPFC needed to address paragraph 8 and 9 provisions this year because they expired automatically at the end of this year. WCPFC would not need to remove them because they would expire, and only paragraph 7³ would remain.
317. The Chair noted it would be a problem if TCC20 didn't make a recommendation to WCPFC21. As China had mentioned, WCPFC would be left with paragraph 7, and without any instructions on how to implement paragraph 7, TCC would continue to face difficulties in the coming years to provide advice and recommendations to the Commission on the implementation of the Sharks CMM.
318. Indonesia felt that the problem was in paragraph 8, and there was a need to have consultations with stakeholders about improving it.
319. The USA pointed out that paragraph 11 of the Sharks CMM required TCC20 to advise the Commission about effectiveness of the alternative measures in paragraph 9. The USA suggested that TCC20 advise the commission that the measures laid out in paragraph 9 were ineffective as alternative to paragraph 7.
320. The EU felt it important that TCC provides factual information about the evidence presented in this discussion to support the USA proposal. EU had also submitted a similar form of words for consideration, as follows:
- “TCC20 recommends that the Commission notes that:
- i) To date very little information was provided to TCC support the effectiveness of the alternatives measures under paragraph 9 of CMM 2019-04, including on the number of f/v implementing these alternative measures;
 - ii) Information from recent HSBI operations in WCPO demonstrates that the monitoring and control at sea of the alternative options under paragraph 9 of CMM 2019-04 (sharks) is very challenging and that the noncompliance rates observed

³ 7. CCMs shall take measures necessary to require that all sharks retained on board their vessels are fully utilized. CCMs shall ensure that the practice of finning is prohibited.

during at sea inspections further indicate that these alternative measures are not effective in ensuring the implementation of the finning ban.”

321. Japan wanted to work with other CCMs to improve the alternative measures, and suggested that TCC20 recommend this. The advice to WCPFC should not say that the measure was “ineffective” but that TCC encouraged CCMs to work together to improve the alternative measures
322. China felt that this TCC obligation should have been carried out last year. But they supported Japan and did not agree that the measure was ineffective.
323. WWF wanted to support the sentiments of Japan, Chinese Taipei, and Indonesia with respect to full utilization. That was what WWF would like to see as well. Logically and practically, full utilisation would be best achieved through “fins naturally attached”. There would be no question if there was full utilization or if the fins accompany the shark. The alternative measures actually allowed trunks to be separated from fins, which made it much easier to avoid full utilization. To that end, they thought it would be prudent to include language in the recommendation that states that “fins naturally attached” best achieves full utilization.
324. The Solomon Islands for FFA CCMs noted the challenges of the unresolved compliance issues with the Sharks Measure. They suggested that addressing these be prioritised at TCC21. They suggested tasking the Secretariat with preparing a review of CMM 2022-04 that examined the data requirements and obligations, implementation and compliance challenges and provided suggestions on how to address these challenges. This would inform the TCC21 consideration for clearer CMM texts and audit points to propose to the Commission for a decision.
325. The Chair suggested taking some time out to developing some possible recommendation text, based on the suggestions received from several CCMs, and to come back to this later.
326. On Day 6, the Chair noted that there was still no clear path forward on what to do with these shark CMM provisions in the year ahead, and paragraphs 8 and 9 would expire in 2024. TCC needed to suggest an approach, at least in the interim, to recommend to WCPFC21. Some evidence had been presented, based on the contrasting experience of 2 CCMs. And it had been suggested not to continue the alternative measures, but there had been other suggestions that they should not be removed. It was then proposed that be recommend that the secretariat prepare a review of the shark measure for consideration at TCC21 next year, but we still need to make a recommendation on paragraphs 8 and 9 to the Commission unless they are to automatically lapse. Extend one or both for 12 months? The Chair felt that letting both of these lapse would be a significant backward step.
327. EU didn’t see how TCC could recommend prolonging the alternative measures in paragraph 9 without having much information available to task the review. There was a diversity of views and, as a minimum, the EU wanted to see the views here reflected and a description of the HSBI experiences brought before the commission, noting to the commission that TCC could not review effectiveness due to lack of sufficient information, and pointing out the difficulties that were being created for WCPFC monitoring systems.
328. China thought the EU suggestion reasonable, but it was not true to say there was a lack of information, since Japan had provided some information. China did not provide information

because no shark is retained. Perhaps others should be encouraged to provide their information before WCPFC21 so a judgement could be made. China would prefer paragraph 8 and 9 to be extended for 3 years.

329. New Zealand wondered if we could we talk about improving ROP minimum data fields on retention of fins.
330. Canada pointed out that there had been no complaints about paragraph 8 and Canada would support a recommendation that paragraph 8 be rolled over, but more work needed to be done on the question of whether an alternative to keeping fins attached was appropriate, and if so, what might that alternative look like?
331. The USA agreed with Canada on rolling over paragraph 8. The Commission had tasked TCC to assess the effectiveness of alternative measures in implementing paragraph 7, and TCC had had that discussion. It seemed obvious that the alternative measures in paragraph 9 were ineffective for the implementation of the full utilisation measure in paragraph 7 because of the problems it caused for verification, and the USA would like to see that advice going to WCPFC21.
332. Japan said that paragraphs 8 and 9 had been adopted as a package and if one was deleted then both would have to be deleted. And there had been no consensus on effectiveness, so what TCC should recommend to WCPFC was that further work was needed.
333. Chinese Taipei pointed out that many members provided information through AR2 and other channels, and so information was available. Like Japan, Chinese Taipei also understood that paragraphs 8 and 9 are a package, because both expire at the same time. So they did not agree to delete 9 and keep 8, and were prepared to work with other CCMs on this.
334. The Chair recalled that Canada hadn't been suggesting deleting paragraph 9 but suggesting that the dates be deleted from paragraph 8 and further work be carried out on 9.
335. WWF felt it was worth recalling the background. These alternative measures were time limited pending actual evidence that the alternatives were effective. The burden of proof was on the proponents of paragraph 9. But this proof hadn't arrived. There had been one CCM which made a declaration involving only 2 data points to support the alternative measures. And one CCM which brought actual evidence involving multiple data points arguing that the alternatives were not effective. Also, it was not legitimate to treat paragraphs 8 and 9 as a package. There was nothing in the CMM or negotiations suggesting this to be the case. Provisions of CMMs were often considered independently. WCPFC did it all the time with the Tropical Tuna Measure. So, it was disingenuous to suggest that paragraphs 8 and 9 represented an inseparable package.
336. Australia suggested that TCC20 recommend the Commission roll over paragraph 9 for another year, to give CCMs more time to provide additional information and task secretariat to analyse it.
337. Canada reiterated that the intent of the tasking in paragraph 11 was not to question paragraph 8 but to determine if alternatives were effective. Rolling over paragraph 8 would be in line with the 2019 decision but keeping paragraph 9 without good evidence for judging it effective and with considerable evidence against it, would not be in line.
-

-
338. The USA agreed with Canada – it was important to note that most CCMs felt that alternatives were not effective, and like WWF they felt it was important that the Commission didn't keep returning to this every year. Paragraph 11 put a burden of proof on CCMs who proposed retaining paragraph 9.
339. Japan felt that there was no consensus on how long the Commission could extend paragraphs 8 and 9 as a package, so Japan's position was for TCC to note the variety of comments and continue to work on improving the measures effectiveness.
340. New Zealand supported the way forward suggested by Canada, the USA and Australia.
341. The EU suggested that it would be useful to see some draft outcome language to ask those implementing these alternative measures to provide information to prove their case before December – including how many vessels were using them, and which of the three options were being used by how many vessels. TCC would keep circling with no progress without further information. Perhaps these alternative measures could be improved, but without further information that was not possible.
342. The Chair noted that the Commission had also asked for that same information last year. He suggested pausing here, working on a suggested outcome, and coming back briefly later to finalise it. He noted that a fulsome record was being captured by the rapporteur to provide more background for WCPFC21.
343. The following outcome text was later agreed:

- | |
|--|
| <p>344. TCC20 noted with concern, the difficulty that has been identified by some CCMs during HSBI inspections and aerial surveillance and, in some cases, port inspections, in verifying compliance with the alternative measures in paragraph 9 of the Shark Measure (CMM 2022-04) and noted the different views expressed by CCMs on the effectiveness and the enforceability of alternative measures, including those outlined in DP03 and DP06.</p> <p>345. TCC20 agreed paragraph 9 on alternative measures needed improvement and encouraged CCMs to work together to bring a proposal to WCPFC21 in this regard.</p> <p>346. TCC20 noted that many CCMs expressed concerns that the provisions in paragraphs 8 and 9 of CMM 2022-04 will expire at the end of the year and recommended that the Commission at WCPFC21 adopt an approach that ensures the effectiveness of these provisions of CMM 2022-04.</p> <p>347. TCC20 recommended that WCPFC21 notes that, due to the lack of sufficient information, it has not been able to fully assess the effectiveness of alternative measures in paragraph 9 and reiterated the direction from the Commission at WCPFC20 and encouraged those CCMs that utilise alternative measures to submit detailed information to WCPFC21 in accordance with paragraph 11 on the implementation of alternative measures and how compliance has been monitored, to support the Commission's review of CMM 2022-04.</p> |
|--|

8.7 Review of CMM 2011-03 Cetaceans

Relevant Papers: [DP04 \(USA and Korea\)](#)

348. The USA presented DP04, proposing to require longliners to not retain cetaceans. At the moment there were no specific cetacean measures applying to longliners, just purse-seiners.
 349. Korea, as co-sponsor of this proposal, noted that some CCMs had already made comments and proposals, and they encouraged other interested CCMs to provide any view. They would be happy to work with other CCMs at this meeting and leading up to the WCPC meeting.
 350. Tokelau for FFA members thanked the USA and Korea for their proposal, and shared the sentiment about the need for improved data about interactions between cetaceans and longline fisheries. They noted that SC20 had scheduled the scientific review of this measure for next year. They also reminded proponent CCMs about the importance of undertaking genuine consultations with SIDS when drafting a 2013-06 assessment, and also of the need to submit Audit Points together with any CMM amendment or new proposals.
 351. Palau for PNA and Tokelau strongly supported the need for improved reporting on longline interactions with cetaceans. At the same time, they noted that the proposal would establish a triple reporting requirement for cetaceans, by observer, vessel logsheets and the flag state CCM. They were not sure of the value of the Part I reporting and were concerned about the additional reporting burden on small administrations. They considered that one way to address that was to either remove the Part I reporting requirement, or at least require it only for unobserved interactions.
 352. China noted that this proposal used ROP data, unlike the seabirds proposal which used so-called evidence from outside WCPFC. China would support it and suggested implementation later in 2025 to give time for domestic law to be developed. They proposed forwarding this proposal to the Commission.
 353. EU felt it would strengthen the existing framework on cetacean interaction in WCPFC fisheries. They would support it, but like Palau felt the reporting arrangements needed some additional work.
 354. Japan felt that the Commission should consider status of species when looking at new measures. Cetacean interaction with longliners generally involved small tooth whales of which stock status was generally healthy, and Japan had already provided comments to the proposing CCMs for their consideration.
 355. Chinese Taipei agreed with taking further measures and had also provided comments to the USA and Korea. They also felt some work was needed on reporting requirements.
 356. Indonesia generally supported work on the protection of cetaceans. But was this measure just for longline, and was it possible to include information about the interaction with purse-seine and other gear in Table 1? Perhaps this was already published and Indonesia hadn't seen it yet?
 357. In response to Indonesia's question, the USA replied that the proposal was specific to longline fisheries, and only prohibits retention and has no impact on other interactions.
-

-
358. Indonesia still wanted any information about purse-seine interactions with cetaceans. Table 1 only had information for longliners. In response, FSM on behalf of PNA suggested that the information to address the question posed by Indonesia was available in SC19-ST-WP-02 (Summary of bycatch in WCPFC longline fisheries at a regional scale, 2003–2021).
359. Australia supported the proposal and looked forward to further consultation before the Commission.
360. Canada strongly supported additional work to protect cetaceans and supported the intent of the proposal. Canada also had very strong views about protecting crew, especially during release of cetaceans, and had provided wording to the USA to help cover this.
361. Korea thanked delegations for their constructive comments. One fundamental intention of this proposal was to collect better data related to cetaceans, and as long as that objective was not compromised they were willing to adjust the reporting requirement in consultation with other CCMs. Some of the reporting was already in Annual Report Part 1 and although the proposed new reporting looked complicated, they assumed that the actual number of reports would not be numerous because cetaceans were rarely caught by longliners. They also reassured FFA CCMs that they would be working on a CMM 2013-06 assessment and Audit Points for the final proposal.
362. WWF thanked Korea and the USA for the proposal. They drew attention to the paragraph on page 3 of the paper noting that the SSP had indicated that current observer coverage levels in the longline fishery were not sufficient to provide an understanding of the spatial or temporal patterns of cetacean interactions, implying that the interactions and impacts are actually much greater than they appear. This was yet another example of the need for increased observer coverage overall, particularly on the longline fleet, and, as the USA pointed out, a source of inequity and unfairness in the cost and conservation burden of observer coverage among the respective fleets. WWF expressed support for the proposal and suggested that a discrete observer coverage increase requirement, to a level recommended by the SSP to address relatively low-incidence interactions such as with cetaceans and seabirds, be included in the proposal text.
363. TCC20 expressed general support for the proposal from the United States and Korea on proposed amendments to CMM 2011-03 for protection of cetaceans from purse seine and longline fishing operations ([WCPFC-TCC20-2024-DP04](#)), noting that the proponents will work with CCMs which expressed some concerns and/or interests in the lead up to WCPFC21 to progress the proposal.

AGENDA ITEM 9 – WCPFC’S MONITORING PROGRAMMES

9.1 CMM 2018-05 Regional Observer Programme

Relevant Papers: [TCC20-2024-19](#); [TCC20-2024-09](#); [TCC20-2024-RP02](#); [TCC20-2024-IP03](#)

364. The TCC Chair noted that the post of ROP-IWG Chair was presently vacant and invited nominations. An interim replacement could be appointed intersessionally and confirmed at WCPFC21.

365. In view of the difficulty that had been experienced in obtaining nominations for this role, WWF suggested Bubba Cook, the WWF Western and Central Pacific Tuna Programme Manager as a potential chair for the ROP-IWG, if there were no nominations forthcoming.
366. Palau for FFA CCMs nominated Lucas Tarapik Of PNG.
367. China seconded the nomination of PNG. And thanked WWF for the nomination but according to the Rules of Procedure of the Commission, any Chair of a Commission subsidiary body should come from a Contracting Party.
368. Chinese Taipei did not agree with China's interpretation of the Rules of Procedure, but would support the FFA proposal.
369. SC20 agreed that Lucas Tarapik was supported as the new Chair of the Regional Observer Programme Intersessional Working Group.
370. Karl Staisch, ROP Training and Certification Consultant (WCPFC Secretariat) presented Working Paper 19 which reported on ROP-IWG progress to develop proposals to change the Minimum Standard Data Fields for the ROP in 2024. He also drew attention to RPO2 – the annual report on the ROP itself
371. For the future, the ROP-IWG needed to review current work completed and discuss the way forward, including data requirements of CMMs, CMS, NTADs, Transshipment, EM, ER and other Commission agreed areas requiring the collection of ROP information and data.
372. It was recommended that SC20 note the importance of progressing and finalising updates to the ROP Minimum Standard Data Fields as soon as possible.

Discussion

373. FFA members felt that the removal of redundant fields in RPO Minimum Standard Data Fields did not clear the way for adding more fields, especially when data was being provided through other channels.
374. Nauru presented the views of PNA and Tokelau CCMs to thank the secretariat for the update on progress of the ROP-IWG and made some comments on the ROP-IWG Workplan 2023-2025. They noted that some feedback had been provided on workplan 1(b) – NTADs observer data fields, and 1(d) – removal of redundant ROP fields, which was prioritized for this year. However, they wanted to see the ROP-IWG move forward with the workplan priority tasking 1(c) – the review of ROP data standards and procedures, in 2025, because they saw some important challenges raised in Paper 09 concerning addressing the imbalances, and in Paper 10 concerning outstanding CCFS cases, that were priorities of concern to PNA and Tokelau CCMs. They asked that TCC20 consider noting the following:
- The ROP-IWG must review the pre-notification process adopted during WCPFC12 and develop a standardized process that is in accordance with Article 25(2) and in reference to CMM 2018-05 paragraph 11 towards the use of ROP data in the CCFS for the purpose of flag state investigations.
 - The experience to date that the CCFS processes for handling ROP data for investigation purposes does not meet its intended purpose.

- TCC needs to consider a more proactive CCFS process to manage the observer data flow for CCFS or investigation purposes.
- TCC needs to establish verification and validation processes, either at a debriefing process or a compliance vetting process of all ROP trip data, before the data is used in the CCFS in accordance with paragraph 11 of the ROP measure.
- Again, this is because of the disparity in the way that the CCFS processes, apply Commission MCS data for flag state investigation purposes for Convention Article 25(2) cases versus ROP data cases.

375. The WCPFC Compliance Manager observed that many of the PNA and Tokelau CCMs points were also pertinent to TCC20 Agenda Item 10, related to available data for verifying compliance. The Secretariat also suggested that more than one ROP-IWG meeting might need to be considered next year, given the priority and scope of the proposed work.

376. Marshall Islands supported the suggestion made by the WCPFC Compliance Manager.

377. TCC20 **agreed in principle** that many of the ROP Minimum Standard data fields were redundant, particularly those related to vessel details, and are better collected through existing processes, such as vessel registration or the RFV.

378. TCC20 welcomed the nomination of Mr. Lucas Tarapik (Papua New Guinea) as Chair of the ROP-IWG.

379. TCC20 **recommended that the Commission** at WCPFC21 task the **ROP-IWG** to prioritize in 2025 the review of the ROP Minimum Standard data fields, the review of the pre-notification process adopted during WCPFC12, and to develop a standardized process for the use of ROP data in the CCFS.

380. TCC20 **recommended that the Commission** at WCPFC21 schedules an in-person meeting of the ROP-IWG to be held adjacent with TCC21 in 2025.

9.2 Development of E-Monitoring Standards

Relevant Papers: [TCC20-2024-20](#); [TCC20-IP03](#). [TCC20-IP13](#) / [TCC20-IP14](#) ; [TCC20-OP06](#)

381. The ER&EM IWG Chair Shelton Harley of New Zealand provided an update on 2024 progress to finalise EM Standards, and noted WCPFC20 had asked the Working Group to bring some interim standards to WCPFC21 for adoption. There had been a thorough online session on 31st May, and two hybrid sessions just before and during this TCC20 meeting. The approach taken was very similar to IATTC, split into minimum requirements (MUST), and desirable but not mandatory (SHOULD) and less critical features (COULD). There remained only three or four issues to work through, including qualifications of analysts, which would require some more work to compile examples from other regions. Some proposed data fields would be circulated to IWG in the coming days. There would be two items delivered to the WCPFC21 meeting – a draft forward workplan and an interim set of standards for adoption.

Proposed forward workplan

Task	Working approach	Timing	Date to WCPFC
Proposed minimum EM data fields and standards	EREMIWG intersessional and SSP	Oct-Nov 2024	WCPFC21 (Nov-24)
Interim EM standards paper	EREMIWG intersessional	Oct-Nov 2024	WCPFC21 (Nov-24)
Review and/or develop templates for Part 1 EM program reporting and other parts of the EM standards where standardized reporting would be of value to members.	EREMIWG with SC and TCC review	Feb-Oct 2025	WCPFC22 (Dec 25)
Advice on potential changes to the interim EM standards to improve harmonization across RFMOs (based on outcomes of the ABNJ Tuna II "Electronic Monitoring Tuna RFMO Minimum Standards Harmonization Workshop" to be held in Dec-2024)	EREMIWG with SC and TCC review	Feb- Oct 2025	WCPFC22 (Dec 25)
Review EM data requirements based on relevant CMM requirements not already covered in the ROP minimum data fields	EREMIWG and ROP IWG with SC and TCC review	Feb- Oct 2025	WCPFC22 (Dec 25)
Develop a proposed assurance / audit process for EM standards for longlining based on ROP audit model	EREMIWG / WCPFC-Secretariat with SC and TCC review	TBC	TBC
Initiate work on EM standards for carrier vessels conducting transshipment for longline vessels.	EREMIWG and TS IWG with SC and TCC review	TBC	TBC

*Suggest one online IWG session and one Hybrid IWG session

382. The ER&EM IWG Chair noted that last two items in the draft forward workplan were likely to be much larger pieces of work, which might need extra resources. Online sessions followed by a hybrid session attached to a regular meeting would probably be the best way of progressing the work on these.

383. TCC20 was invited to:

- Welcome the progress Of the ER&EM IWG on interim EM standards.
- Reiterate the importance of agreeing interim EM standards at WCPFC21, recognizing that EM can be used by certain CCMS to meet obligations under CMM 2023-01.
- Encourage potential EM providers in the WCPFC region to prioritize development of common standards for EM records and ancillary logs to allow interoperability across EM software platforms.
- Endorse the high-level proposed for work plan for the ER&EM IWG for consideration by WCPFC21.
- Note: Circular 2024/43 "The Commission is expected to consider and decide at WCPFC21 on the resources required for continuation of the ER&EM IWG in 2025".

Discussion

384. The Chair noted TCC19 had made significant progress in progressing the EM standards, and the Commission now had a clear way forward, thanks to the leadership of Dr Harley.

385. Nauru spoke for FFA members to express gratitude to the ER&EM IWG Chair for the significant work undertaken since assuming the role and they acknowledged the progress made thus far, especially with the EM SSPs. On the issues raised in Paper 20, they had articulated FFA CCM positions on these during SC20 and other agenda items at this meeting, as well as at the Working Group, so would not reiterate them here. They recognised that further efforts were necessary and remained committed to actively participating in the ongoing work of the ER&EM IWG. They emphasised the importance of having interim EM data requirements if, as they had already stated at SC20, EM was going to be used to meet the longline independent observation coverage required under the tropical tuna measure. As suggested at the informal session, they

recommended that TCC20 task the ER&EM IWG Chair to prepare a paper on the proposed interim EM data requirements for the consideration of the ER&EM IWG going into, and at, WCPFC21. FFA CCMs also supported the adoption by TCC20 of the recommendations from the ER&EM IWG presented by the Chair.

386. Korea also supported the recommendation and looked forward to interim standards being adopted at WCPFC21.
387. Australia expressed gratitude to Shelton and to participating CCMs. They endorsed the workplan and noted that work remained to be done in coming years, but looked forward to adoption of interim EM standards at WCPFC21.
388. The EU also thanked the ER&EM IWG chair. EM was one of priorities for the EU at this meeting. They supported the recommendations and looked forward to adoption of interim standards.
389. Japan appreciated the ER&EM IWG Chair's work and looked forward to adoption of this very important standard.
390. The TCC20 Chair gave sincere thanks to Dr Harley for the leadership over the past year, and looked forward to more in the weeks to come.

391. TCC20 welcomed the progress of the ER&EM IWG on interim EM standards.
392. TCC20 reiterated the importance of agreeing to interim EM standards at WCPFC21, so that EM can be used by certain CCMs to meet obligations under [CMM 2023-01](#).
393. TCC20 noted the advice from the Chair of the ER&EM IWG regarding the importance of encouraging potential EM providers in the WCPFC region to prioritise development of common standards for EM records and ancillary logs to allow interoperability across EM software platforms.
394. TCC20 **endorsed** the high-level proposed work plan for the ER&EM IWG for consideration by WCPFC21. (**Attachment D**)

9.3 CMM 2009-06 Regulation of Transshipment

Relevant Papers: [TCC20-2024-21/21 suppl.](#), [TCC20-2024-32](#), [TCC20-2024-35](#), [TCC20-2024-RP03](#), [DP07/DP08 \(RMI\)](#)

395. USA co-chair of the Transshipment IWG Alex Kahl presented Paper 35 - the report of the IWG – to plenary. He noted that over 6 hours of productive face-to-face discussion had been held just before and during TCC. Further work would be done intersessionally to prepare a draft CMM for presentation to WCPFC.

Discussion

396. Japan thanked the co-chairs, but pointed out that in paragraph 3 of Paper 35 it said that the TS-IWG would work intersessionally to finalise recommendations, but later in the report it said it would work intersessionally to produce a draft CMM, and just wanted clarification.

397. The co-chair said the outputs would include a draft CMM but there were also other recommendations that didn't fit neatly into the CMM, such as advice to the ROP. So both would be produced.
398. Australia, speaking for FFA CCMs, reaffirmed the high priority that they placed on the review of the transshipment measure, as it remained a long-standing issue. FFA CCMs had consistently raised:
- The importance of conducting transshipment activities in port.
 - The need to enhance monitoring of any transshipment occurring on the high seas.
 - The necessity for independent review and verification of transshipment data.
 - Prioritization of electronic monitoring (EM) for transshipment activities.
 - Improved cooperation between WCPFC and IATTC, given the substantial amount of high seas transshipment taking place in the overlap area.
399. FFA CCMs reiterated their point made during the informal sessions, that whilst FFA CCMs made every effort to participate in the IWG's work, they would not agree to any provisions or measures that weakened the regulation of transshipment.
400. TCC agreed to capture the recommendations of the IWG in its outcomes.

401. TCC20 welcomed the work of the TS-IWG before and on the margins of its meeting, as directed by WCPFC20.
402. TCC20 noted that the TS-IWG will submit a revised draft CMM on transshipment to WCPFC21 by the proposal submission deadline, to include a [CMM 2013-06](#) analysis.
403. TCC20 noted the TS-IWG will work intersessionally via email to finalise its recommendations to WCPFC21 and submit the recommendations are part of its update to the Commission

9.4 CMM 2014-02 Commission VMS

Relevant Papers: [TCC20-2024-22_rev1](#); [TCC20-2024-RP01](#)

404. Secretariat VMS Manager (Albert Carlot) presented Paper 22 which incorporated updates to reflect the continued improvements made by the Secretariat to the WCPFC online system, and which took into consideration WCPFC20 outcomes.
405. It was suggested that TCC20 recommend that the Commission, at WCPFC21,
- adopt the updated VMS Standard Operating Procedures (Paper 22).
 - Consider whether:
 - amendments are required to [VMS SSPs 7.2.4](#) to provide clearer language in relation to this reporting requirement (i.e. protocol for inspecting States to inspect ALCs/MTU of other CCMs vessels at sea, includes reporting requirements for inspecting States) (*WCPFC20 Summary Report, paragraph 754(c)*)
 - further work is needed to enhance CCM's and Secretariat's practices to integrate and facilitate ongoing monitoring and compliance with [CMM 2014-02](#).

-
406. New Zealand on behalf of FFA CCMs noted that the proposed changes to the VMS SSPs would further improve data submissions from CCMs as well as Secretariat responses to the notifications generated automatically by the system or through the reports. They supported the proposed changes to the VMS SOPs and the recommendation in Working Paper 22. FFA CCMs noted that with enhanced capabilities and reporting mechanisms in the VMS Reporting Status Tool (VRST), relevant information and data on the status of the VMS reporting for each vessel active in the WCPFC RFV had become very useful in addressing the VMS data gaps. They encouraged all flag CCMs to utilise the online mechanisms made available for CCMs to upload or provide the data/information required to be provided (information on MTU activations, VRST, Manual position reports, MTU audit inspection results, fished/did not fish etc) and monitor on a regular basis to identify any data gaps that can be addressed.
407. Korea supported the changes proposed in the paper, but as suggested in the CMR discussion there would be some details to consider. To provide some context, Korea longliners had two VMS ALCs on board – one reporting to the flag state and one reporting to the Commission VMS. Korea monitored the flag state reporting unit only, in accordance with domestic law. With the introduction of VRST, they had changed the VMS SSP a little so the existing VMS SSP read, regarding non-reporting cases – in the event of non-reception of two consecutive positions, the secretariat shall notify the flag state *and* vessel master. In 2021 this had been changed to notify the *flag state* who would then notify the vessel master. By introducing the VRST would there still be notification of the flag state? Also, they had too great a workload monitoring the domestic VMS, and could not get additional budget to monitor VRST until it was a mandatory requirement. So they would continue to send data to the Secretariat by email in the event of VMS non-reporting. Or perhaps WCPFC could look at an automatic function on the VRST which would send notification to flag state in the event of nonreporting.
408. The WCPFC VMS manager said that this would be looked into. He noted incidentally that VRST was only for vessels reporting to the Commission. If a vessel was registered with FFA then FFA non-reporting procedures would need to be followed.
409. The USA felt this was a good question from Korea, but noted that the procedure never did require the commission to notify the flag CCM. It had just been done anyway. It should not be a major burden for a CCM to monitor the VRST.
410. Australia asked that if a manual report was not in the proper format and was uploaded automatically would this cause an error. Was the sender notified of this? In response, the VMS Manager said that the sender was not notified, but such a report would block the system and would need to be manually cleaned out of the queue.
411. Japan had long history of being scored as non-compliant on VMS issues and had spent an inordinate amount of time to solve these problems. They wanted to make two points about the NAF table of ANNEX B of SOP. They had made the same comments in 2021 through an email to the WCPFC. It was technical, so Japan would submit it in writing as a proposal for Annex B. After receiving Japan's technical comments, the Secretariat informed the meeting adjustments to the Annex B requested by Japan were achievable.
412. In relation to the comments made regarding VRST automation New Zealand further noted that there were tools made available by the Secretariat, through Trackwell, to automatically notify
-

CCMs when their vessels fail to report to WCPFC VMS. They encouraged members to utilise these tools to improve VMS monitoring.

413. The VMS Manager supplemented the earlier reply to Australia’s question and explained that the new feature would validate all the NAV strings before submission of the manual reports, so they didn’t require the WCPFC system to be manually unblocked if a wrongly formatted notification was received.
414. The WCPFC Compliance Manager appreciated the discussion and was keen to keep working with CCMs to understand their thoughts and problems and jointly figure out how to improve the commission’s service delivery to all CCMs.
415. Korea expressed appreciation to the Secretariat. They had found the VRST to be a very useful tool and the only problem was the need to continuously monitor the system to locate non-reporting events.

416. TCC20 **recommended to the Commission** at WCPFC21 that it adopt the updated VMS Standard Operating Procedures ([WCPFC-TCC20-2024-22_rev1](#)).

9.5 CMM 2017-02 Port State Minimum Standards

Relevant Papers: [TCC20-2024-RP07](#) ; [TCC20-2024-OP06](#)

417. CMM 2017-02 included provisions to assist developing CCMs, and provided for the development of a mechanism to provide funding support to SIDS (paragraphs 22 to 27). Until relatively recently, there had been limited implementation of port State measures by CCMs but matters were now advancing.
418. The WCPFC Deputy Compliance Manager briefly presented RP07, noting that the measure worked though CCMs who opted into the measure by designating one or more of their ports. The various elements related to Article 30 which helped develop the capacity of SIDS to implement port measures was described. CMM 2017-02 was supposed to have been reviewed in 2019, but that tasking had only recently been activated. TCC was invited to consider the timing of the review of the CMM, and discuss how the capacity assistance needs of SIDS might be further supported.

Discussion

419. Korea believed the Commission needed to review the measure to see what needed to be updated in 2025. Korea was working with FAO on a PSM implementation project and Korea encouraged SIDS port state members to participate in this project.
420. Tonga, speaking for FFA CCMs, noted that CMM 2017-02 on Port State Minimum Standards was an important measure in the fight against IUU fishing activities through sharing of information. Regarding recommendation (a) of the paper, FFA Members had established and implemented port state measures. Early this year, in a significant PSM development, FFA Members launched and started using an FFA Regional ePSM system. This added to an effective integrated MCS framework. They took pride in the work that they did to fight IUU fishing in the region, and these measures were tailored to the SIDS situation and context. In the same vein, FFA Members would

like to see a Port State Minimum Standard that reflects the uniqueness to the context of the region and membership of the Commission and one that balances the application of prescriptive port state measures with effective and equally prescriptive flag state controls to avoid increased rates of high seas at-sea transshipment in the Convention area.

421. Regarding recommendation (b) of the paper on assistance needs of SIDS, they saw paragraphs 22- 25 of the measure as critical to assist SIDS implementation of PSM. They were, however, very concerned by the delay in establishing the funding support mechanism due to limited implementation of CMM 2017-02, as stated by the paper. This was contrary to what the measure stated, for example, in paragraph 25. Finally, on a general point, FFA CCMs noted from the paper the Secretariat's engagement in sharing information with FAO in relation to implementation of the FAO PSMA and wanted to ensure that the information exchange was in accordance with WCPFC Data Rules. Data sharing arrangements should be on a reciprocal basis.
422. The Deputy Compliance Manager noted the RFV data being provided was public domain data. There was no non-public data provided, and the provision was just to facilitate the process.
423. The EU had noted that since the adoption of the measure in 2017, several CCMs had joined the FAO PSMA in a more effective fight against the IUU. At the same time when the WCPFC measure was adopted the EU felt this was to enable those not able to join the PSMA to contribute. However, only very few members had designated any of their ports and overall the CMM did not seem to have achieved its objectives.
424. Fiji outlined some of the advantages of implementing port state measures, and felt there needed to be a substantial review of the CMM since some CCMs had now acceded to the PSMA. The different levels of commitment were making things difficult, for example there was often poor response from flag States entering Fiji's ports. Fiji felt the review should start now so there was a clear pathway forward next year. Fiji had raised the same issue last year, but without agreement. Fiji noted that WCPFC has two CMMs that provide for independent inspections of vessels – during HSBI and when they entered port. It is the WCPFC's framework for the latter that Fiji is proposing be reviewed.
425. The Chair asked if Fiji was seeking a tasking for work to start before WCPFC21, noting that Korea had suggested 2025 to take account of any decisions from WCPFC21. In response, Fiji confirmed their interest in leading some initial intersessional work in advance of WCPFC21 to prepare for further discussions in 2025.
426. New Zealand pointed out that one aspect to note from the paper was that the CMM was there to complement not duplicate the FAO PSMA and they thanked the Secretariat for the work undertaken to align processes with FAO. Port inspections were one of the most effective MCS tools available to verify catches and ensure compliance with CMMs. They also supported comments made by Fiji, if not now then in 2025, to review the measure to better understand how it could be improved to progress implementation.
427. Vanuatu felt the need for review of the measure was critical and supported Fiji's proposals.

428. TCC20 recognised the strong support from CCMs to review the port state measures CMM and welcomed the initiative of Fiji to lead intersessional work prior to WCPFC21 on Port State Measures and to report to WCPFC21 on progress made and the further work required.
429. TCC20 **recommended to the Commission** that a review of [CMM 2017-02](#) (Port State Minimum Standards) be undertaken in 2025.

9.6 Review data access and data exchange arrangements

Relevant papers: [TCC20-2024-23_rev1](#) ; [Relevant annual reports](#) ; [RP02](#) ; [RP03](#) ; [RP07](#) ; [RP08](#) ; [RP09](#)

430. [WCPFC’s Rules for Data Protection, Access and Dissemination](#) were adopted in 2007 and 2009.
431. The WCPFC Deputy Compliance Manager presented Paper 23: a report on two taskings from WCPFC20: to establish data exchange arrangements with some RFMOs for transshipment-related data and information, and on data access issues in support of port inspection related processes.
432. TCC20 was invited to:
- task the Secretariat to provide an update to TCC21 and WCPFC22 on progress to establish data exchange arrangements With Other RFMOs.
 - discuss the inclusion of the linkage between CMM 2017-02 and the MCS Data Rules in the proposed review of the Port State Measures CMM in the TCC Work Plan to consider CNM access to some data to ensure they can effectively implement CMM 2017-02 and the PSMA requirements.
 - consider the interim options to alleviate the effect Of the MCS data rules on CNMs until the review of CMM 2017-02 is completed.

Discussion

433. Japan had question about transshipment observer reporting. TCC had agreed on the data fields for this 2 years ago, and last year it was reported that there were some difficulties in starting to use the agreed format by observers but according to this year’s report the Secretariat was now able to analyse them. How many reports had come in from transshipment observers and could the Secretariat explain what the data quality problem had been?
434. The Deputy Compliance Manager explained that the date set for implementation of observer reports from transshipment was 1 April 2023. But there was no established programme for collecting that data and some work was done mainly through SPC to work with observer programmes to establish protocols for training observers and developing procedures for collecting data. The training and set up had to continue well past April, which was the main reason for the delay.
435. SPC noted that there was a table 9 in IP03 which detailed the number of observer transshipment reports enumerated for 2023. It was understood that this was a testing phase for identification of gaps etc and would have improved in 2024.
436. The WCPFC Deputy Compliance Manager said that the issues of data quality were the usual species identification etc. issues. But some observers appeared to be just copying the master’s declarations rather than providing an independent assessment, and these cases needed to be

-
- teased out. This was a new process so it was necessary to be cautious before placing too much reliance on the analyses.
437. Japan thanked all concerned including the observers themselves. They were an important asset to the commission and Japan hoped and expected progressive improvement.
438. On data access for port inspection process, the Deputy Compliance Manager noted that the Secretariat had been talking to Vietnam who had been needing information to make decisions about whether or not to allow a vessel to enter. However, this data often required VMS data and transshipment information, and under the rules this was often restricted to members of WCPFC and not CNMs. Could TCC advise on any mechanism for providing a limited or temporary level of access until the review was completed and acted upon? A halfway house might be to indicate there was an interaction, flag, time, date and general area. This could be treated as a data request and documented and reported on in the annual reporting process. Another possibility was to provide that type of information in a list accessible by all CCMs through a portal.
439. There may be interest in exploring one of the two options in the paper, or additional ideas, specifically for Cooperating Non-Members. The second option could be fairer because it provided a solution that all CCMs could access and reduce some of the ongoing tasks for the Secretariat.
440. New Zealand spoke for FFA Members to support the first recommendation of the paper. However, they wanted to stress the need to ensure that the data exchange arrangements adhered to paragraph 29 of the 2007 Data Rules for the other organisation to provide equivalent data on a reciprocal basis and maintain the data provided to them in a manner consistent with the security standards established by the Commission. On the second recommendation on inclusion of the linkage between CMM 2017-02 and the MCS Data Rules, FFA Members welcomed this recommendation but in terms of any specific amendment to the Data Rules or 2017-02, FFA Members reserved their position on this until an actual text was available for consideration. On the final recommendation that related to the two interim Options proposed to alleviate the effect of the MCS data rules on CNMs, FFA Members did not see any issues with both Options, however, they could go with Option 2 as an interim approach. However, having said that, they asked if the data being requested were already adequately covered under the data rules.
441. Japan had a similar view to FFA on the first two recommendations, but a different opinion on third. Japan had some concern about special treatment of this CMM under the data treatment rules and needed to be cautious.
442. The USA commented on the interim solution options. USA could support option 1 or 2 as long as compliance was maintained with then data rules. 1a seemed particularly useful for VMS data requests. For TS, would it be possibly to merge the portal idea with the template idea in 1b. And perhaps it would be possible to develop a mock-up of what that might look like.
443. Korea hoped the intersessional work led by Fiji would include consideration of this. Korea was easy with either option but felt that the second option was less burdensome for the secretariat.
-

444. The Chair noted Fiji had been interested in PSM CMM review, and this had some intersection with this data issue. Perhaps it could all be wrapped up together in the PSM review process, along with the secretariat developing tools for implementation.

445. TCC20 **tasked the Secretariat** to progress data exchange arrangements with RFMOs (IATTC, IOTC, CCSBT, SPRFMO and NPFC) over 2025, noting the need for reciprocity in data exchange, and provide an update on progress to TCC21 and WCPFC22.

446. TCC20 **requested Fiji** as Lead of intersessional work on Port State Measures to include the linkage between [CMM 2017-02](#) (Port State Measures) and the MCS Data Rules in work on the review of the Port State Measures CMM, including with respect to the potential for CNM access to MCS data.

9.7 Scientific Data Gaps and relevant SC20 outcomes

Relevant Papers: [TCC20-2024-24](#) ; [TCC20-2024-IP04_rev1](#) ; [TCC20-2024-IP05_rev1](#)

447. The WCPFC Deputy Compliance Manager Eidge Sharp presented Paper 24 outlining the SC20 and NC20 outcomes concerning data gaps relevant to WCPFC monitoring programmes.

Proposed new voluntary additional longline operational data fields

448. SC20 had recommended that TCC and the Regular Session of the Commission consider the possible inclusion of these data (Table ST-01) in the “Scientific Data to be Provided by the Commission” (SciData) as voluntary reporting items, taking into account the broad implementation concerns of several CCMs with respect to the collection of these data.

449. Fiji noted that FFA CCMs supported the SC20 recommendations on longline operational data fields and also the addition of an activity code to identify any day when a transshipment at sea occurred.

450. Japan said they could go along with these proposals as voluntary reporting items

451. China understood this was voluntary but still needed time to consult with stakeholders. And understood that IOTC had put something similar forward that was not adopted.

452. The Chair noted that this was being forwarded to the Commission by SC20, and TCC had an opportunity to comment on technical feasibility, but this SC20 recommendation would be going to the Commission anyway.

SC20 recommendation for an additional code for the ACTIVITY field

453. Japan said that the additional code to identify any day when a "transshipment at sea occurs" was unnecessary because there was another data source to provide this information. This just created extra work for fishermen.

454. The SSP noted that this SC20 recommendation had actually been made to help clarify and remove ambiguity between the various data sources.

455. The USA felt the recommendation was useful, however, China and Chinese Taipei did not support this SC20 recommendation.

456. The Chair noted that although there was no TCC consensus on the technical feasibility of this SC recommendation, that it had been forwarded to the Commission from SC20, and would also be considered there.

Revisions to CMM 2018-04

457. SC20 had recommended that TCC and WCPFC clarify the requirements of CMM 2018-04 relating to the collection of turtle/fishery interaction data. Also, the SSP had been requested by SC20 to prepare a paper for SC21 on sea turtle data reporting requirements for vessels to record during fishing operations of both longline and purse seine vessels.
458. Fiji, speaking for FFA CCMs, noted that turtles were not explicitly included in logbook minimum data requirements, but supported this inclusion in annual reporting of Scientific Data to be Provided Decision to inform any future review of this CMM by TCC.
459. The WCPFC Compliance Manager drew attention to linkage between TCC20-2024-11 and this SC20 recommendation. Paper 11 had suggested that extra work needed to be done to clarify Audit Points and how TCC might assess this turtle obligation in future. The Secretariat commented that the SC20 tasking of SPC to report to SC21 would be useful in this regard.
460. China preferred that the data referred to in turtle paragraph (4) of the SC20 recommendations be provided “in a summary form”. And didn’t understand why this SPC tasking in paragraph 5 was limited to purse-seine and longline fisheries when other fisheries in the Convention Area also interacted with sea turtles.
461. SPC said that it would actually be useful to have this information for all Commission fisheries, but the recommendation on what fisheries to cover had been agreed by CCMs at SC20.

NC20 recommendations relevant to WCPFC’s Monitoring Programmes

462. The WCPFC Deputy Compliance Manager referred TCC participants to three recent recommendations arising from the Northern Committee meeting in 2024: a revised CMM for Pacific Bluefin tuna, a new CMM for MCS of Pacific Bluefin tuna and a letter of agreement to support the further development of a CDS for Pacific Bluefin tuna. These were more for awareness than technical feasibility analysis since some CCMs were not very familiar with NC discussions, not being members.
463. The EU understood that the basis for the NC recommendation regarding monitoring of Pacific Bluefin Tuna, and that IATTC had recently adopted a MCS measure that had some significant differences compared to what had been recommended by NC. It was the view of the EU that there would be merit in ensuring that there is consistency on this particular aspect between the IATTC and WCPFC measures, and they expressed its strong expectation that members of the NC would review that specific recommendation to mirror what had been adopted by IATTC.
464. Japan expressed some confusion. They noted that the Northern Committee had made a recommendation to the Commission, and felt that TCC should simply note it. It would be discussed at the Commission.
465. China hoped it would be forwarded to the Commission for adoption. The only issue for TCC to consider was that the Australia and New Zealand national Pacific Bluefin Tuna limits may be
-

over-used. They thought that at the Commission this inadequate catch limit for small fisheries could be increased a little, and not just for the South Pacific.

466. Korea noted that the NC/WCPFC interaction was unique. When the NC proposed a measure the Commission either adopted the measure or could send it back for further consideration. The text to be considered by the Commission was *agreed* text and there would be no further negotiation regarding the text.
467. The Chair would take one comment from the EU then would draw a line under the discussion. These issues had been brought to TCC's attention because they did intersect with TCC's work, but TCC did not have time to engage in a discussion about its interaction with the NC, and the interaction of the Commission with the work of the NC.
468. The EU felt that TCC was not the right place to discuss catch limits, but Monitoring, Control and Surveillance measures were under the remit of TCC, and paragraph 3 in the NC20 outcomes forwarded in TCC20-2024-24 was about the "Monitoring, Controlling, and Surveillance of Pacific Bluefin Tuna". TCC would merely be talking about the alignment of PBF MCS measures with the measures to be discussed at the Commission.

469. TCC20 **recommended** that the Commission at WCPFC21 include Table ST-01 set out in WCPFC-TCC20-2024-24 in the "Scientific Data to be Provided by the Commission ([SciData](#))" as voluntary reporting items, taking into account the broad implementation concerns of several CCMs with respect to the collection of these data.
470. TCC20 supported the request from SC20 to the SSP to prepare a paper for SC21 on possible sea turtle data reporting requirements for vessels to record during fishing operations, for longline and purse seine vessels, to be incorporated in the annual reporting of Scientific Data to be provided to the Commission ([SciData](#)).

9.8 CMM 2006-08 High Seas Boarding and Inspection Scheme

Relevant Papers: [DP02 \(China\)](#); [DP09 \(Australia\)](#); [TCC20-2024-RP04_rev1](#)

471. The High Seas Boarding and Inspection Scheme Annual Report in RP04 was not presented, but taken as read.
472. China was invited to present DP02 on "DNA Sampling, Weight Estimation during High Seas Boarding and Inspection Scheme, and Updating the Standardized Multilanguage Question". They had found that there could be significant discrepancies between the results of the testing procedure and the landing report. It would also be useful for the CMMs in the multi-language HSBI questionnaire to be updated. China proposed that TCC20 consider making the following recommendation to WCPFC21:
- "TCC20 noted the efforts made by several CCMs conducted high seas boarding and inspection in WCPO and DNA testing as well as the certain weight estimation method(s) used by relevant inspection team(s)t. TCC20 recommended that WCPFC 21 to task TCC to conduct work on the necessity and protocol for DNA testing, and WCPFC 21 to encourage CCMs that its high seas boarding team using the weight estimation method (s) could report

- to TCC 21 the details of the weight estimation method(s) used during high seas boarding and inspection operation for information and discussion. “
- “TCC20 recommended that WCPFC 21 to task the Secretariat to update the Standardized Multilanguage Questionnaire and report to TCC 21 for discussion and possible adoption at WCPFC 22”
473. France felt the High Seas Boarding and Inspection Scheme was particularly important and noted that fish catch in the hold was often difficult to calculate. They supported the paper’s recommendations.
474. Australia spoke for FFA CCMs and noted that combatting IUU fishing on the high seas required a group effort. They acknowledged RP04 from the Secretariat and appreciated the valuable contributions and effort from Inspecting CCMs in high seas boarding and inspections reported overall, in particular 2023. These efforts went a long way towards ensuring compliance with CMMs by all flag vessels operating in the WCPO High Seas. Over the years, FFA Members and partners had a strong interest in monitoring vessel activities on the High Seas. This was made possible through ongoing focus, intelligence analysis using available data and investments in FFA’s regular regional surveillance operations (FFA OP365, OP NASSE) using HSBI, Aerial Surveillance and Satellite Remote Sensing technology, even with limited resources. The FFA Members would continue to work with the Secretariat and Flag CCMs on reporting the results and necessary actions towards potential non-compliance matters. FFA CCMs noted DP02 from China with proposals to address 3 issues, relating to DNA testing, weight estimation, and the Standardized Multi-language Questionnaire on the implementation of HSBI. On these specific matters, FFA Members broadly supported the recommendations of DP02.
475. Australia noted that they used a multilanguage app called FishTalk. They felt that analysis of DNA samples was a useful tool for identifying catch misreporting and possession of prohibited species. But Australia did recognise that clear guidelines were needed for its application in an HSBI context and would support work on non-binding guidelines for how to do this. They encouraged more WCPFC CCMs to support HSBI. Australia supported the paper’s recommendations but would also like to see TCC recommend a broader body of work.
476. Japan thanked China for DP02, which was very informative. Japan had not been aware that DNA testing was being conducted during HSBI. Japan supported this recommendation and also asked of those CCMs using this kind of testing to provide an information paper on it. They also asked the secretariat to check if observer manuals in other RFMOs had information for weight estimation. And Japan was not aware of a multi-languages questionnaire that includes CMMs related information, but would be quite happy to support its updating.
477. The USA noted that they did not currently use DNA testing in HSBI but did use it in a number of other contexts and found it useful. They would support guidelines for standardising its application, and also guidelines for weight estimation.
478. China thanked CCMs for the very constructive feedback. They suggested some minor modification to the recommendation and would support the work proposed by Australia.
479. Chinese Taipei lent their general support. They echoed the comments by Japan and would be very interested in an information paper on the matter from those CCMs using those methods.

480. Canada was generally very supportive of any mechanism for improving the HSBI regime and development of guidelines for best practices for genetic analyses and other technical issues associated with HSBI.

481. After considerable discussion about the exact wording, TCC20 agreed the following:

482. TCC20 noted the efforts made by several CCMs conducting high seas boarding and inspection in the WCPO and noted DNA testing as well as certain weight estimation methods were used by relevant inspection teams.

483. TCC20 requested Australia along with interested CCMs to bring a paper to WCPFC21 on an intersessional process to develop voluntary regional guidelines and best practices for the use of tools in conducting high seas boarding and inspections including, but not limited to, DNA testing, weight estimation, assessment of bycatch mitigation methods, collection and dissemination of photo and video evidence, and to update the Standardized Multi-language Questionnaire and report to TCC21 for discussion and possible adoption at WCPFC22.

9.9 CMM 2021-04 Charter Notification Scheme

Relevant paper: [TCC20-2024-RP05_rev1](#)

484. The WCPFC Deputy Compliance Manager Eidge Sharp introduced Required Report 05 - the Annual Report on the Record of Fishing Vessels, which incorporated Charter Notification data, and noted that [CMM 2021-04 Charter Notification Scheme](#), would expire on 28 February 2025 unless renewed by the Commission.

485. Nauru spoke for FFA CCMs to recognise the importance of the CMM2021-04 in establishing all the requirements for notifying the charter arrangements, and the information that needed to be submitted for each chartered vessel. As this measure was set to expire in February 2025, FFA CCMs recommended that CMM 2021-04 be renewed or rolled over for another five years. They noted with concern that some flag CCMs had recorded the date of re-flagging, or of a significant refit, as the year the vessel was initially constructed. The correct value for the “year built” for a vessel should not change over time and the RFV system should lock this field from any further changes through CCM updates. The accuracy of this data was important to make the RFV data quality more robust and reliable.

486. Noting no further views, the Chair asked if TCC would recommend that the Commission extend the Charter Notification Scheme for another 5 years? In response, China said that if there was to be a new SP-ALB measure then this might be affected by a charter notification extension of 5 years. In view of this concern the Chair suggested TCC20 recommend renewal of the measure but leave WCPFC to decide for how long.

487. The Secretariat noted that there were occasional changes to CMM obligations, and the Secretariat would be proposing improvements for ease of use by CCMs when updating Charter Notifications in the online RFV system.

488. TCC20 **recommended that the Commission** renew CMM 2021-04 Charter Notification Scheme, recognising that paragraph 8 of [CMM 2021-04](#) sets an expiry date of 28 February 2025

AGENDA ITEM 10 – AVAILABLE DATA FOR VERIFYING COMPLIANCERelevant Papers: [TCC20-2024-25](#), [TCC20-2024-IP06_rev2](#)

489. The WCPFC Compliance Manager presented Paper 25 which was an update of Paper 19 at the previous year’s TCC (TCC19). This update on “Available Data for Verifying compliance in the Compliance Monitoring Scheme” was now a standing agenda item for TCC. The paper reviewed the status of available data currently used to support compliance reviews of individual obligations in the Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMS), and the Secretariat’s approach to evaluating compliance based on the available data, along with the Secretariat’s views on additional data sources that could strengthen WCPFC’s ability to independently verify compliance with key obligations in the future.
490. TCC20 had also been tasked by the Commission to consider whether any adopted audit points for Quantitative Limit obligations required additional verification sources or processes in order to facilitate compliance assessments (*WCPFC20 Summary Report paragraph 754 (f)*).
491. The WCPFC Compliance Manager drew the attention of TCC20 to the following definitions:
- **verify** – “to make certain or prove that something is true or accurate”
 - **independently verified** – “there was no influence of control in any way by other people, events or things, when checking or proving that something was true or correct”.
This might be done by using data on the same event acquired from multiple sources, or by ensuring that at least some of the data was collected through monitoring programmes that operated independently of the CCM whose compliance was being reviewed.
492. TCC20 was invited to provide advice and to recommend approaches that would strengthen the independent verification of key obligations in future WCPFC compliance reviews, including through recommendations to relevant intersessional working groups for further work.
493. Kiribati, speaking for FFA members thanked the secretariat for a high-quality paper.
- On vessel capacity limits, they supported the Secretariat’s suggestion for the Commission consider adding a data field to the RFV to allow CCMs to report via the RFV whether or not any vessel capacity limits applied to a vessel, to facilitate the Secretariat’s ability to independently verify CCM compliance with capacity limit obligations.
 - On “Vessels fishing for” type limits, they supported the Secretariat’s proposed recommendation requiring CCMs to notify the WCPFC, through RFV updates, on key information that would assist the Secretariat to clearly identify vessels on the RFV that were authorized to operate under a CCM’s applicable “fishing for” type limit.
 - They also noted that a range of relevant WCPFC IWG-led work (ROP, TS, ER&EM) was crucial for improving the availability of independently verified data to support the CMS review process. In this regard, they urged TCC to expedite this IWG work.
494. Regarding the secretariat proposal to add a new field to the RFV, Japan restated their position that they could not go along with this. Regarding SP-ALB the Commission had successfully defined “to fish for” and would like to see how it works. Japan also noted that fishing authorization systems varied amongst CCMs and it was not simple to put this information into the RFV, so Japan did not support this paper.
-

-
495. PNG, speaking for PNA and Tokelau CCMs supported the FFA statement and also thanked the secretariat for a high quality paper. They supported the proposals in the paper to address the need for verification of capacity limits and area-based limits, and for information on target species. However, They felt that any new requirements for information on the RFV should be targeted at specific information needs. For example, they would not support applying the “Target Species” information requirement for purse seine vessels if that was not necessary for verification. They would also not expect the area-based CMM limit information requirements to be applied where the limits were zone-based rather than flag-based, as in the purse seine EEZ and high seas effort limits.
496. China agreed with the statement by Japan.
497. The WCPFC Compliance Manager suggested there was a bigger question for TCC to think about going forward: the fact that there was still a great deal of reliance on self-reported information. Should TCC consider opportunities to ensure that more independently verifiable information is available to support reviews of implementation of CMMs, or is TCC satisfied that the reviews of implementation of obligations, in particular of compliance with quantitative limits, are as rigorous and verified as they needed to be. And if they were not, what tools are needed to address that?
498. The Chair noted the lack of consensus on the recommendation for an additional data field for the RFV. The Chair noted the broader importance of this agenda item on verifying compliance, and encouraged TCC participants to reflect on the points in paper.

AGENDA ITEM 11 – LABOUR STANDARDS

Relevant Paper: [TCC20-2024-26](#)

499. The co-Chairs of the Labour Standards IWG, Heather Ward (New Zealand) with Putuh Suadela (Indonesia) provided an update on 2024 progress towards the development of a draft CMM proposal. The co-chairs noted that in 2024, there had been very good progress – through two virtual workshops and email correspondence – to develop the text of a binding measure on labour standards for crew on fishing vessels. During TCC20, there had been a very constructive working group session on Day 4 of TCC to further discuss the remaining issues in the text, which included:
- the role of crew providers;
 - remuneration standards;
 - breach of contract by crew members;
 - informing the Secretariat on the death of a crew member or an allegation from a crew member to a port CCM;
 - notification of next of kin/designated contact if there is a missing crew member;
 - the definition of “vicinity” for alerting other vessels for a search and rescue mission;
 - the question of ceasing all fishing operations if a crew member dies or is missing;
 - the grounds for a port State to take action on the allegation of a crew member; and
 - entry into force of the CMM.
500. The co-Chairs of the Labour Standards IWG, advised that an updated iteration of the text – with co-Chairs’ proposals to try and resolve issues – would be circulated on 10 October. Comments
-

would be invited by 1 November, and a revised text would be posted by 6 November with a view to discussion at WCPFC21 – and hopefully adoption – as envisaged by WCPFC20.

501. Japan appreciated the progress that had been made on this issue this year and thanked the co-chairs. They looked forward to discussing it at WCPFC21.
502. Fiji thanked the Co-chairs on behalf of FFA CCMs for the substantial work done on the draft labour standards and the progress made over the last year and in the recent working group. Crew labour standards, and ensuring that work aboard fishing vessels was safe, decent and worthwhile, was a key priority for FFA Members. They recognised that CCMs had additional work in front of them, particularly for the implementation of a measure which requires national inter-agency consultations as the process moved towards the Commission meeting and beyond. FFA Members remained committed to seeing this important work progress, to improve lives across the region. They looked forward to working with others to realise this improvement going into the Commission meeting in December.
503. The EU welcomed the progress made, despite a few issues remaining, and looked forward to seeing the next iteration of the proposal at the next commission meeting in view of the adoption of a CMM.
504. The USA thanked the Co-chairs for their work in moving this forward. The USA was looking forward to seeing this CMM adopted at the next Commission meeting.
505. Korea also wished to thank the co-Chairs, and looked forward to progress at the next Commission meeting.

506. TCC20 commended New Zealand and Indonesia for co-leading the work to develop a binding CMM on labour standards for crew on fishing vessels.

507. TCC20 noted the progress on the text in 2024 and CCMs undertook to provide further written feedback on the draft CMM to co-Chairs by 1 November to enable further discussion of the draft CMM at WCPFC21.

AGENDA ITEM 12 – SUPPORTING CCMS WITH MONITORING AND EVALUATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF COOPERATIVE MCS TOOLS

Relevant paper: [TCC20-2024-27](#)

508. The WCPFC Deputy Compliance Manager Eidre Sharp presented Paper 27 which responded to TCC19 tasking the Secretariat to support CCMs by developing training resources and learning aids; to propose additional support aids and to seek further advice from TCC20 on other areas of need for CCMS; and to update the Guidance on annual reporting.
509. The systems upgrades and developments had been partly driven by trying to transition away from SharePoint as an unsupported system. All changes were aimed at reducing the workload on members and the secretariat. The progressive rollout of different elements of the system had been sequenced as follows:
- 2020 TSER E-reporting (high seas transshipment notifications and declaration reporting)

- 2022 – enhanced online Compliance Case File System (CCFS)
 - 2023 – enhanced Record of Fishing Vessels and CMM system
 - 2024 – enhanced Annual Report part 2 online system, and refinements to Record of Fishing Vessels to improve ease of use by CCMs for charter notification management
 - 2025+ – enhanced Compliance Monitoring Report system, other reporting support
510. Details of 2023-24 outreach activities were described, along with the efforts to resolve the bottleneck around annual reporting.

Discussion

511. Chinese Taipei highly appreciated the Secretariat response to requests.
512. Papua New Guinea, on behalf of PNA and Tokelau, extended their deep appreciation to the Secretariat for their support during the 2nd PNA Compliance Workshop held in early August this year in Majuro. It had been particularly helpful to small PNA administrations with flag fleets in improving their response to the reporting requirement in the CMS. They looked forward to more collaboration of this type with the Secretariat into the future to continue improve on their efforts and capacity to meet Commission obligations. As a further step, PNA and Tokelau had one suggestion regarding the VMS system tools, specifically the use of VRST to resolve VMS data gaps. The VMS reporting data gap issue reflected in the overall dCMR was a major challenge for PNA members. It was not a major technical issue, but stemmed from the lack of how to efficiently provide the required information. Perhaps the Secretariat could look at the regular audits done on the VRST utility to trigger an email notification to Members about any VMS reporting gaps or inconsistencies. This would help CCMs in promptly resolving these gaps without it being left to the CMR process to identify VMS data gaps.
513. The Secretariat noted that the VRST is currently limited to directly reporting vessels, but they were proposing to implement a more regular process instead of everything being crammed into the Annual Report and only getting resolved at CMS time.
514. The EU also appreciated the support from the secretariat in developing these tools.
515. TCC20 expressed appreciation to the Secretariat for the IT upgrades and the training and guidance provided to CCMs by the Secretariat and TCC20 **recommended** that such support to CCMs continue.

516. TCC20 supported the Guidance set out in Annex 1 of [WCPFC-TCC20-2024-27](#) for CCMs on how to respond to obligations in the ARPt 2 and the CMR, and in particular as a living document to be updated as required.

AGENDA ITEM 13 – SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS OF DEVELOPING STATES

Relevant Papers: [TCC20-2024-28](#) (List of Assistance Needs); [TCC20-2024-29](#) (CMM 2013-07 Summary Reporting)

13.1 Capacity Assistance Needs

517. The Chair noted that consideration of the special requirements of Developing States pursuant to Part VIII of the Convention was a standing agenda item (Rule 2(h) of the WCPFC Rules of

Procedure). The TCC Workplan 2022-2024 contained a list of possible areas of support to build capacity of SIDS. TCC20 was asked to consider Paper 28 which included requests for capacity development assistance from developing states and participating territories that had been identified through annual reporting and the CMS, for inclusion into the WCPFC Strategic Investment Plan, and to note the capacity assistance needs and Capacity Development Plans (in Paper 28) and the summary from 2024 Annual Report Part 2 CMM 2013-07 annual reports covering RY2023 (in Paper 29).

518. Niue, speaking for FFA CCMs, acknowledged the CCMs who had contributed to the various funds that supported capacity development of developing States and territories, including participation at TCC through the Special Requirements Fund. Under Agenda Item 9.5 concerning CMM 2017-02, FFA Members emphasised the establishment of support mechanisms for SIDS. They again urged TCC and the Commission to prioritise these obligations. Additionally, they wished to highlight the importance of scheduling and adequate resources for FFA members, as these were crucial for enabling small delegations to effectively engage in TCC deliberations.

519. TCC20 **referred CCMs** to the capacity assistance needs and Capacity Development Plans listed in ([WCPFC-TCC20-2024-28](#)) and the Summary from 2024 Annual Report Part 2 CMM 2013-07 annual reports: RY2023 ([WCPFC-TCC20-2024-29](#)).

13.2 Implementation of CMM 2013-06

Relevant Paper: [TCC20-2024-30](#) (Implementation of CMM 2013-06 on the criteria for the consideration of CMM proposals)

520. The Executive Director introduced Paper 30 on “Implementation of CMM 2013-06 on the criteria for the consideration of Conservation and Management proposals”. This agenda item would be a standing item for TCC starting with TCC20, following a directive from the Commission at WCPFC20. The “2013-06 checklist” had been implemented mainly on an individual CCM basis rather than by the Commission since its adoption. Last year the Commission had tasked TCC with assessing implementation of, and compliance with this CMM during the previous calendar year. To date, the provisions of CMM 2013-06 had not been assessed under the Commission’s Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMS) and none of its provisions were included in the list of obligations to be assessed in the 2024 Compliance Monitoring Report (CMR) covering 2023 activities. There had been two outcomes from the CMS-IWG’s consideration in 2023 of Audit Points for CMM 2013-06:
- The CMS-IWG recognized that paragraph 3 was an obligation on the Commission, and this led to the Commission’s decision that TCC review implementation of CMM 2013-06 as a standing agenda item; and
 - The Commission adopted a Report (RP) Audit Point for CMM 2013-06 paragraph 1 (WCPFC19 Summary Report, paragraph 753 (a) and (b)).
521. The Compliance Manager noted that the approach proposed in Paper 30 to the task of reviewing compliance with CMM 2013-06 was based on the principles of Articles 30 and 10 of the WCPFC Convention. The range of impacts that each SIDS and Territory CCM could experience, and the range of development Objectives and circumstance of each SIDS required a pragmatic approach and a certain degree of subjectivity. It was clear that an assessment of compliance by the Commission would naturally not be as straightforward as for individual CCMs against other obligations, most of which are now based on audit points, and there were dual (maybe multiple)

responsibilities required across the membership to make a meaningful assessment Of CMM 2013-06.

522. Working Paper 30 considered the approach to reviewing compliance with paragraphs one to four of CMM 2013-06 sequentially.
- a. Regarding paragraph 1 the commission already had an agreed audit point for this obligation, through the Annual Report Part 2. We might want to consider that this was working adequately and if this information was appropriate.
 - b. On paragraph 2 (implementation) in some cases a SIDS might need to indicate that a disproportionate burden had occurred, which would require a process for verifying that and recommending a response;
 - c. Paragraph 3 applied to the Commission and was make sure any new proposal had a checklist. This might have three levels – was a list submitted, was there consultation with FFA members and had FFA members reviewed and concurred with the checklist.
 - d. Paragraph 4 applied to CCMs cooperating towards compliance – reviewing the mitigation actions taken by the Commission in response to Capacity Development needs identified through the CMS or elsewhere in WCPFC decision-making processes.
523. There might also be obligations for the avoidance or mitigation of disproportionate burdens on SIDS implicit in certain CMMs – for example, marine pollution and port state standards, that might be considered under this particular compliance assessment.
524. Working Paper 30, invited TCC20 to consider certain approaches for reviewing and assessing the Commission’s implementation of, and compliance with, CMM 2013-06 for the 2023 reporting year:
- a. Assess compliance with paragraph 1 based on the adopted Audit Point: *The Secretariat confirms receipt of a report outlining efforts by the reporting CCM to cooperate, either directly or through the Commission, to enhance the ability of developing States, particularly the least developed among them and SIDS and territories in the Convention Area, to develop their own fisheries for highly migratory fish stocks, including but not limited to the high seas within the Convention Area.*
 - b. Agree that an assessment of implementation and compliance by the Commission with paragraph 2 of CMM 2013-06 was dependent on (1) the demonstration by a SIDS or territory of a disproportionate burden caused by a conservation action, and (2) a corresponding mitigating action taken by the Commission, as reflected in the WCPFC20 Summary Report or adopted CMM or other decision.
 - c. Agree that an assessment of implementation and compliance by the Commission with paragraph 3 and paragraph 4 should be based on:
 - (i) confirmation that a CCM submitted a completed 13-06 checklist together with any new proposal (including a proposed amendment to an existing measure) , and
 - (ii) consideration of the approach taken to assess compliance with paragraph 2, to ensure that where Capacity Development Needs are identified for a SIDS or participating territory, through the Compliance Monitoring Scheme, that adequate assistance or other quality or improvements and corrective actions have been taken or are in progress to address the identified Capacity Development needs by the Commission in accord with paragraph 4.
-

For future assessments, TCC20 was also invited to recommend that the Commission adopt reporting guidelines, and consider any necessary revisions to the Audit Points, to further standardize CCM reporting against paragraph 1 in Annual Report Part 2.

525. The Chair provided a personal perspective based on previous involvement in a number of fisheries management bodies, and pointed out that the implementation of Article 30 was a particular hallmark of this Commission. And the way that CMM 2013-06 was applied was key to demonstrating how the commission was implementing it. The analysis and proposals by the secretariat provided a considered approach.

Discussion

526. Korea thanked the Secretariat for the paper. CMM 2013-06 was an important element for implementing article 30. They were comfortable with subparagraphs a and b of the recommendation but were struggling with how the Commission would implement c. Submission of a checklist could be considered, but sub-subparagraph (i) fell under subparagraph a. It was very subjective and it was up to the commission to determine impact on SIDS. Instead of (i) TCC needed to develop a process to determine the collective objective for the Commission in this regard, and individual CCMs responsibility for this collective objective.
527. The Executive Director indicated that the paper followed the tasking from WCPFC20 to TCC20 to assess compliance for the previous calendar year. It might not be realistic at this stage of the meeting to go through the record with this approach without first being comfortable with the approach. TCC might need to admit to WCPFC21 that it could not achieve this immediately and would need to work through the process first.
528. The Chair suggested that CCMs should talk about the process now and make some progress.
529. Palau, speaking for FFA CCMs made it clear that they welcomed the paper on the assessment of obligations of CCMs and the Commission in relation to the operationalization of Article 30. For them, it was important to ensure SIDS and territories continued to participate meaningfully in the work and decision-making process of the Commission.
530. Vanuatu explained the views of FFA CCMs in relation to three recommendations of the paper on the proposed assessment approach of implementation and compliance to the four paragraphs of CMM 2013-06 as follows:
- **For paragraph 1**, FFA Members agreed to the proposed assessment approach based on the adopted audit point. They agreed that this was a Report type obligation for both CCMs and the Commission. They noted the issue on CCMs reporting and supported the development of a standard reporting template or reporting guidelines. FFA Members would be happy to lead this work with other CCMs.
 - **For paragraph 2**, FFA Members noted the suggested assessment approach but their view was that the obligation under this paragraph was a joint responsibility for SIDS and Territories as well as the Commission rather than SIDS and territories alone. Whilst SIDS and Territories would lead in determining whether a disproportionate burden existed, their view was that the Commission also had a role to play. An example was looking at non-compliance over time as an indication of disproportionate burden on SIDS and Territories; identifying measures that incorporate assistance mechanisms; e.g. funding mechanisms (under CMM 17-02 para. 25) and ensuring those mechanisms were

established and activated to support SIDS and Territories. They also pointed out that while the text in paragraph 2 was clear that it was a Commission obligation, individual CCMs had been submitting proposals.

- **For paragraph 3**, they noted that the criteria in paragraph 18 of the paper partly reflect the draft audit points submitted by FFA Members in 2021 where they had suggested all three criteria in paragraph 18.
- **For paragraph 4**, FFA Members agreed to the proposed assessment approach. In addition, their view was that mitigation measures could also be considered in response to an obligation where a SIDS or Territory had been non-compliant over time. They saw that as a possible indication of a transfer of a disproportionate burden onto that SIDS or Territory.

531. The USA made it clear that they placed high priority on implementing CMM 2013-06 for all SIDS including USA territories. They understood this was specific to CMM proposals, and had not considered it to date to apply to broader proposals. The USA understood the intention was perhaps to broaden this to all proposals and wonders if that was in fact the case.
532. Chair proposed that the participants might need to think about this question overnight, to consider all the feedback provided, and look at the proposed recommendations the following morning, possibly with revisions.
533. The EU said they were already reflecting on the comments. From a TCC perspective, was it even possible to assess compliance with a measure that was completely subjective? Audit points were now the benchmark and TCC might need to think about whether this CMM was fully fit for purpose and a good vehicle for achieving what it was supposed to achieve.
534. The Executive Director replied that this was exactly the issue that had been considered in approaching this task – of trying to find a really clear direction for what compliance with CMM 2013-06 could look like. It would require a qualitative, pragmatic approach.
535. TCC came back to this agenda item on Day 6 to consider the draft recommendation suggested in Paper 30. Korea suggested that subparagraph c (i) be removed and transported into subparagraph a.
536. The EU noted that this was the first time the Commission had formally considered assessing compliance with CMM 2013-06 so it would be useful to understand different CCMs understanding of the process. They believe subparagraph 3 was the responsibility of all CCMs and not just about submitting a list, but that the CCM proposing a CMM had engaged in dialogue and received a response.
537. The USA asked for more time to consider this more carefully. FFA also requested further time because it was a complicated recommendation, and this was the first time that many had seen it.
538. The Chair noted that these recommendations were from Paper 30, which had been uploaded 30 days previously but postponed the discussion until after the Day 6 midday break. A revised recommendation was later provided as follows:
-

- 1) TCC20 recommends to the Commission at WCPFC21 the below approaches for reviewing and assessing the Commission's implementation of, and compliance with, CMM 2013-06 in future years:

a) Assess compliance with paragraph 1 based on the adopted Audit Point, which is amended as follows:

~~— The Secretariat confirms that a CCM submitted a completed 13-06 checklist together with any new proposal (including a proposed amendment to an existing measure).* (*fn: With the exception that where a new proposal was further negotiated, a 13-06 checklist was not required for any subsequent iterations of that proposal.) and has consulted with SIDS and territories in the completion of the checklist; and SIDS and territories have reviewed and concurred with the information in the checklist.~~

~~— [The Secretariat confirms that the SIDS affected by provision of the proposal have provided feedback for the finalisation of the checklist.]~~

539. Considering the text revision, which would require a CCM submitting a CMM proposal to ensure that it "has consulted with SIDS and territories in the completion of the checklist; and SIDS and territories have reviewed and concurred with the information in the checklist", Korea felt that they would never be able to meet the deadline for submission of proposals if they had to consult with SIDS before submission, and were hesitant to add the text suggested by the EU and FFA.
540. The EU understood that TCC was now discussing how an assessment should be made, and the need for consultation should not affect the process of submitting a CMM. But this was the first time they had seen this text.
541. The Marshall Islands suggested that CCMs remind themselves about Article 30, and that it involved a basic principle – the need for consultation to avoid a disproportionate burden of conservation falling on SIDS and Territories.
542. Korea suggested a compromise. They would be willing to consult on a CMM proposal but had concerns about meeting deadlines if the consultation involved response and acceptance as separate steps, and they suggested shortening the added text to read "and has consulted with SIDS and Territories in considering the proposal"
543. The Chair reminded CCMs that this discussion was about an audit point, not about modifying the CMM itself.
544. The EU wanted more time to consider this. They felt there was some confusion here between paragraph 3 and paragraph 1, and did not want to rush consideration at this point in time.
545. The Marshall Islands agreed that more time was needed in order to develop a recommendation for the Commission.
546. The USA could agree with the Korean proposal, but also wanted to consult with territories for their opinions as well.
547. The Chair ruled that this recommendation should be held back, but that TCC would need to inform the Commission that there had been no agreement on the audit point and that it would

need further discussion at WCPFC21. The current draft language for the first part of the 2013-06 audit point would be taken to the Commission for further work.

548. The Secretariat drew attention to the remaining parts of the proposed draft audit point recorded in WCPFC-TCC20-2024-36 which had been uploaded 90 minutes previously.
549. Given the lack of discussion, Nauru said that their preference would be to note the discussion thus far and recommend that the Commission should task TCC21 to continue this discussion towards agreement of this audit point.
550. The Chair however strongly encouraged CCMs to consider the working paper, and to discuss this outstanding issue at the WCPFC meeting in Suva to see if a resolution was possible without needing to delay the issue for another year.

551. TCC20 **recommended that the Commission** at WCPFC21 task TCC21 to continue discussions on approaches for reviewing and assessing the Commission's implementation of, and compliance with, [CMM 2013-06](#) with a view to finding a way forward.

AGENDA ITEM 14 – ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

14.1 WCPFC Information and Network Security Framework

Relevant paper: [TCC20-2024-31](#)

552. The Secretariat (Executive Director and IT Manager) were invited to present Paper 31 which provided an update to TCC20 on activities undertaken by the Secretariat since TCC19 to secure the Commission's online databases and other information management systems. This paper also provided information on the Secretariat's plans over the next 12-18 months to develop a cyber and information security governance framework relevant for the WCPFC, and aimed at minimizing and mitigating risks to WCPFC data and information security in the future.
553. Overall, the findings from the two penetration (PEN) tests suggested that the Secretariat's security posture was robust. Continuous efforts by the Secretariat's ICT team to identify and resolve issues before they arose had contributed to this relatively strong security posture. The risk score from the online training placed the WCPFC above industry average for a similar organisation type and size, however the high-risk findings from the internal PEN test proved the need to constantly evolve and assess training effectiveness.
554. The expanded security audit of the Commission's online databases and IT infrastructure would form part of the larger security governance framework that the Secretariat envisioned as necessary for the organization. In early 2025, the Secretariat would focus on the development of a security risk register through an exercise to identify and assess the potential security risks that might apply to an organization such as the WCPFC. The outcome of this exercise was expected to inform the nature of an organizational framework for information and cybersecurity relevant to the WCPFC.

Discussion

555. Indonesia thanked the Executive Director and IT Manager for their presentation and recognised the developments in IT services at WCPFC, which had been extremely useful for users.

556. Tonga, speaking for FFA CCMs, appreciated the PEN tests, both internal and external and supported the secretariat's promotion of testing and the development of the security framework.

557. TCC20 supported the Secretariat's planned work related to the WCPFC Information and Network Security Governance Framework.

14.2 Required resources

558. TCC20 was requested to discuss and provide advice and recommendations to FAC18 and the Commission on the resources required to support TCC20 outcomes, including points discussed that related to the future TCC Workplan for 2025 and subsequent years.

559. The TCC Vice Chair and Executive Director had been tracking the TCC20 discussion with a view to assessing resource needs and found that most of the issues had been anticipated. There had been an addition of in-person FADMO IWG and ROP IWG meetings, and the intersessional work continued to grow, requiring adjustment of internal resources to meet the needs of the membership.

14.3 Election of Officers

560. CCMs had been asked to nominate officials to fill the roles of TCC Chair and TCC Vice-Chair for 2025-2026. However there had been no nominations, and no nominations were forthcoming from the floor.

561. Korea asked about the possibilities of the current Chair and Vice-chair serving for another term or a year if there were no nominations.

562. The Chair suggested that it would be best to leave it open at this point, because a decision might be made by WCPFC21.

563. The WCPFC Legal Adviser pointed out that Rule 8 of the Commission Rules of Procedure said that the term of office for Officials of the Commission was 2 years and incumbents were eligible for re-election. Also, there was no rule preventing a Chair from being elected for more than two consecutive terms, although it had been common practice for these roles to be held for 2 terms.

564. The Chair noted that had been one nomination for a vacant IWG Chairship. Mr Lucas Tarapik from PNG was acclaimed by the meeting for the role of Regional Observer Programme IWG Chair.

565. TCC20 **recommended to the Commission** that it consider the appointments of TCC Chair and TCC Vice-Chair at WCPFC21.

566. TCC20 **recommended to the Commission** that it appoint Mr Lucas Tarapik (Papua New Guinea) as ROP-IWG Chair

14.4 Next meeting

567. The Chair nominated a date for TCC21 in FSM. There were no objections.

568. TCC20 **recommended to the Commission** that TCC21 be held in Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia, from Wednesday 24th September to Tuesday 30th September 2025

AGENDA ITEM 15 – OTHER MATTERS FOR TCC INCLUDING ADVICE FROM THE TCC20 ODF

569. The only substantive input from the Online Discussion Forum was from CCMs notifying their Statutes of Limitations, if any. There were no other issues which HODs hadn't already asked to be addressed in the agenda.

AGENDA ITEM 16 – CLEARANCE OF TCC20 RECOMMENDATIONS

570. The draft Outcomes Report was cleared by the meeting for posting on the website, pending receipt of any corrections or comments

AGENDA ITEM 17 – CLOSE OF MEETING

571. Australia thanked the Mat Kertesz (Australia) for his great efforts over the course of the last four years as TCC Chair.

572. Nauru thanked the Chair on behalf of FFA CCMs.

573. Korea agreed with Australia's explanation of the great value of the Chair and also thanked Ilkang Na (Korea), who had served both as TCC Vice chair and head of the Korean delegation.

574. Fiji echoed the sentiments of colleagues across the room, and also thanked the Secretariat. They also took the opportunity to remind the meeting about the process for Fiji hosting WCPFC21 and not to hesitate about contacting the organisers for any assistance they might need.

575. The Chair thanked Fiji in turn for invitation and offer of help.

576. The head of the EU delegation thanked the Chair and the hosts FSM, he expressed appreciation to Fiji and looked forward to seeing delegates in Suva.

577. The USA recognised the Chair and the Secretariat for their work, and were excited about the direction that WCPFC was headed in. They also wanted to thank Mr Terry Boone of the USA delegation, who was a co-Chair of the VMS-SWG, for his service since this would be his last TCC.

578. FSM thanked the Chair, Vice-chair and Secretariat, and said as host country they always enjoyed this occasion. They wished everyone safe travels home.

579. The Executive Director thanked the Chair, especially for pushing TCC to complete the provisional Compliance Monitoring Report in record time – 1 day. She acknowledged Albert Carlot for his work over the years in establishing the Commission VMS. Albert had been there from the start in 2009 when the first VMS annual report had been provided to WCPFC.
580. The Chair provided some brief thanks, especially to Albert and Terry. There had been significant improvements in the commission VMS during this period. And the work of TCC committee had evolved. This meeting in particular, and the progress made across a number of matters for consideration at WCPFC21, would hopefully have made the Commissions Chair and WCPFC delegates deliberations a little easier. The Chair remarked that being chair of a WCPFC subsidiary body was a great job because of all the support provided by the Secretariat. This TCC meeting will be a memorable one.
581. TCC20 closed at 18:16 on 1st October 2024.

ATTACHMENT A – List of Confirmed Participants**20TH REGULAR SESSION OF THE TECHNICAL & COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE****POHNPEI, FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA**

24 September - 1 October 2024

265 confirmed participants took part in TCC20, with 103 of these participating online.

CHAIR**Mat Kertesz**

Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
Director, Multilateral Fisheries
mat.kertesz@agriculture.gov.au

Madeleine Miller

AFMA
Senior Policy Officer
madeleine.miller@afma.gov.au

AUSTRALIA**Patrick Sachs**

Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
Director
Patrick.Sachs@aff.gov.au

CANADA**Heather Wood**

Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Director, International Fisheries Policy

Dustin De Gagne

Fisheries & Oceans Canada
Senior Compliance Program Officer

David Power

AFMA
Manager
david.power@afma.gov.au

CHINA (ONLINE PARTICIPATION)**Liu Xiaobing**

Shanghai Ocean University
Visiting Professor
xiaobing.liu@hotmail.com

Emily Lawson

Australian Fisheries Management Authority
Senior Fisheries Officer

Jianwei Li

Rongcheng deepsea fisheries manager
clarknz@hotmail.com

Jacob Tapp

Australian Fisheries Management Authority
Senior Policy Officer
jacob.tapp@afma.gov.au

Li Chunhong

CNFC Overseas Fisheries Co., Ltd.
Manager
lichunhong@myyahoo.com

Jenny Grant-Curnow

DFAT
Ambassador

Li Yan

China Overseas Fisheries Association
Coordinator
liyan@cofa.net.cn

Lakshmi Gudipati

Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
Senior Policy Officer
lakshmi.gudipati@aff.gov.au

Sun Chong

China Overseas Fisheries Association
Deputy Director of Highsea Fisheries
suncongbeiwai@aliyun.com

Xiaojie Dai
Shanghai Ocean University
Professor
xjdai@shou.edu.cn

Yang Xiaojun
SHAN DONG LIDAO OCEANIC TECHNOLOGY
COMPANY LIMITED
Manager
Lidaohaiyang@sina.com

Zhe Geng
Shanghai Ocean University
Stock Assessment Scientist
zgeng@shou.edu.cn

Zhou Cheng
Shanghai Ocean University
Associated professor
c-zhou@shou.edu.cn

COOK ISLANDS

Bermy Ariihee
Ministry of Marine Resources
Observer Coordinator
B.Ariihee@mmr.gov.ck

Lualua Tua
Ministry of Marine Resources, Government of
the Cook Islands
Director, Offshore Fisheries Division
l.tua@mmr.gov.ck

Viv Fernandes
Consultant
Fisheries adviser
vivfernandes@hotmail.com

EUROPEAN UNION

Stamatis Varsamos
European Commission, Directorate General
for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Unit B2:
RFMOs

Head of the European Union Delegation
Stamatios.VARSAMOS@ec.europa.eu

Ignacio de Leiva
European Union
Fisheries Attache
Ignacio.de-leiva@eeas.europa.eu

FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

Louisa Movick
National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority
Legal Advisor
louisa.movick@norma.fm

Arthur Segal
NORMA
Debriefer
arthur.segal@norma.fm

Barbara Hanchard
c/o FSM National Oceanic Resource
Management Authority
Consultant
barbara@hanchard.net

Dan Gilmete
NORMA
EM/ER Coordinator
dan.gilmete@norma.fm

Daniel Johnny
FSM - NORMA
Fisheries Compliance Officer/ Data Technician
daniel.johnny@norma.fm

Efren Eliou
FSM National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority
CDS Officer
efren.eliou@norma.fm

Eliaser Edward
FSM National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority
Certified PIRFO Debriefer
eliaser.edward@norma.fm

Eugene Pangelinan

Norma

Consultant

e.pangelinan@norma.fm**Francisco Sigrah**FSM National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority

OBS Debriefer

francisco.sigrah@norma.fm**Jamel James**FSM National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority

Assistant Director

jamel.james@norma.fm**Jeffrey Tilfas**

Department of Justice

Acting Attorney General

jeffsm DOJ@gmail.com**Marko Kamber**

Caroline Fisheries Corporation, Inc.

CEO

marko@cfctuna.net**Mathew Chigiyal**National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority (NORMA)

Deputy Director

mathew.chigiyal@norma.fm**Mavrick Adolf**National Oceanic Resources Management
Authority(NORMA)

Electronic Reporting Officer

mavrick.adolf@norma.fm**Nathaniel Nanpei**National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority (NORMA)

Senior Fisheries Officer

nathaniel.nanpei@norma.fm**Prileen Martin**FSM National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority

Compliance Data analyst

prileen.martin@norma.fm**Robert Nakasone, Jr.**

FSM Department of Justice

Assistant Attorney General

rnj.fsm@gmail.com**Shawn Walter**FSM National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority

Assistant Biologist

shawn.walter@norma.fm**Tosuo Irons Jr**FSM National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority

Observer Debriefer/Trainer

tosuojr.ironsonorma.fm**Yvonne Falieapiy**FSM National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority

Fisheries Compliance VMS Analyst

yvonne.f@norma.fm**FIJI****Meli Wakalowaqa Raicebe**

Ministry of Fisheries

Acting Principal Fisheries Officer - Offshore

Fisheries Management Division

raicebe.meli@gmail.com**Epi Batibasaga**

Ministry of Fisheries

Fisheries Officer Industry and Trade

batibasaga@gmail.com**Moses Nainoka Mataika**

Ministry of Fisheries Fiji

Fisheries Officer Offshore Fisheries

Management Division

mataika.moses@gmail.com**Waisea Aka**Ministry of Fisheries - Offshore Fisheries
Management DivisionFisheries Technical Officer - Enforcement and
Surveillance

waisea.c.aka@gmail.com

FRANCE

Elodie Seznec

ministère of the overseas territories
France

INDONESIA

Mumpuni Cyntia Pratiwi

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of the
Republic of Indonesia
Capture Fisheries Production Management
Officer
mumpuni.cpratiwi@gmail.com

Amrih Joko Waspada

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Marine and Fisheries Resources Surveillance
Analyst
amrihjoko@gmail.com

Fayakun Satria

National Research and Innovation Agency
Head of Research Center for Fishery
fsatria70@gmail.com

Febrianto Wardhana Utama

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Fisheries Surveillance Analyst
ipeb38@gmail.com

Lalu Lutfi Nizzami

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Junior Specialist of Capture Fisheries
Production Management

Putuh Suadela

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Deputy Director of Fish Resources
Management in IEEZ and High Seas,
Directorate General of Capture Fisheries
putuhsuadela@gmail.com

Rangga Yudha Nagara

Ministry of Foreign Affairs
govt official
rangga.nagara@gmail.com

Renata R. Irene Sondang

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of the
Republic Indonesia
Fisheries Inspector
srenata@gmail.com

Saraswati

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of the
Republic Indonesia
Capture Fisheries Production Management
Junior Officer
cacasaras@gmail.com

JAPAN

Haruo Tominaga

Fisheries Agency of Japan
Director for International Fisheries
Coordination
haruo_tominaga170@maff.go.jp

Masahide Kannou

Fisheries Agency of Japan
Staff, International Affairs Division
masahide_kanno210@maff.go.jp

Akihito Fukuyama

Japan Far Seas Purse Seine Fishing Association
Managing Director
fukuyama@kaimaki.or.jp

Hidefumi Yatomi

Cubic-i Ltd.
Technical Director
yatomi@cubic-i.co.jp

Hiroyuki Yoshida

Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative Association
Director
yoshida@japantuna.or.jp

Kazushige Hazama

National Offshore Tuna Fisheries Association
of Japan
Manager
hazama@kinkatsukyo.or.jp

Kenichi Sakuragi

Fisheries Department
Director
kenichi_sakuragi@kyokuyo.co.jp

Mako Iioka
mako_iioka540@maff.go.jp

Meiko Kawahara
Taiyo A & F Co., Ltd.
Deputy General Manager
m-kawahara@maruha-nichiro.co.jp

Naruhito Okuda
Japan Far Seas Purse Seine Fishing Association
ADvisor
n-okuda@kaimaki.or.jp

Shiho Morimoto
Cubic-i Ltd.
Staff
morimoto@cubic-i.co.jp

Shinji Hiruma
Fisheries Agency of Japan
International Affairs Division
shinji_hiruma150@maff.go.jp

Yuhei Otsu
Fisheries Agency of Japan
Staff, International Affairs Division
yuhei_otsu880@maff.go.jp

KIRIBATI

Kaon Tiamere
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
Development
Acting Director, Offshore Fisheries Division
kaont@mfmrd.gov.ki

Benina Rekenibai
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
Development
VDS Data Technician
beninar@mfmrd.gov.ki

Uati Tirikai
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
Development

Senior Compliance Officer, Licensing
Compliance Division
uatit@mfmrd.gov.ki

NAURU

Erana Aliklik
Nauru Fisheries & Marine Resources Authority
Chief Executive Officer
alikelik.nauru@gmail.com

Larry Notte
Nauru Fisheries & Marine Resources Authority
Acting Fisheries Enforcement Officer
larrynotte4@gmail.com

Malgram Dowabobo
Nauru Fisheries and Marine Resources
Authority
Observer Coordinator
mdowabobo@gmail.com

Monte Millar Depaune
NFMRA
Deputy Chief Executive Officer
monstartuna@gmail.com

Phil Togamalo
NFMRA
Flag State Assistant Officer
ptogamalo@gmail.com

NEW ZEALAND

Heather Ward
Ministry for Primary Industries
Principal Advisor
Heather.Ward@mpi.govt.nz

Andrea Gilbride
New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and
Trade
Senior Policy Officer
andrea.gilbride@mfat.govt.nz

Dave Goad
Department of Conservation, New Zealand
Technical Advisor
goad.dave@gmail.com

Hilary Ayrton

Ministry for Primary Industries
Senior Fisheries Analyst
hilary.ayrton@mpi.govt.nz

Igor Debski

Department of Conservation
Principal Science Advisor Marine
idebski@doc.govt.nz

Johannes Fischer

Department of Conservation
Science Advisor

Jordan Owczarek

Ministry for Primary Industries
Compliance Adviser, International Fisheries
jordan.Owczarek@mpi.govt.nz

Mandy Leathers

Department of Conservation
Senior Advisor, International
mleathers@doc.govt.nz

Shelton Harley

Independent
ER&EM IWG Chair
sheltonjharley@gmail.com

NIUE**Josie M Tamate**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission
Chair
josie.tamate@gmail.com

Quentin Hanich

Australian National Centre for Ocean
Resources and Security (ANCORS) - Uni of
Wollongong
Advisor
hanich@uow.edu.au

PALAU**Everson Sengebau**

Division of Oceanic Fisheries, Bureau of
Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries &
the Environment
Compliance Officer
ebs6ya@gmail.com

Zilah Dirremeang Oiterong-Chin

Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and
Environment
Licensing and Revenue Officer
dirremeang@gmail.com

PAPUA NEW GUINEA**Gisa Komangin**

National Fisheries Authority (NFA)
Executive Manager, Monitoring Control &
Surveillance
gkomangin@fisheries.gov.pg

Adrian J Nanguromo

National Fisheries Authority
Acting Observer Program Manager
ajnanguromo@gmail.com

Benthly Sabub

National Fisheries Authority (NFA)
Fisheries Management Officer, Tuna Fishery
bsabub@fisheries.gov.pg

Davewills Nungu

National Fisheries Authority
Manager - Catch Documentation &
Certification Unit
davewills.nungu@gmail.com

Esmond Dalle

National Fisheries Authority
Monitoring Control & Surveillance
edalle@fisheries.gov.pg

Glenda Barry

PNG National Fisheries Authority
Manager, Compliance & Enforcement
gbarry@fisheries.gov.pg

Xavier Pokajam

National Fisheries Authority PNG
a/VMS manager

xpokajam@fisheries.gov.pg

PHILIPPINES

Alma C. Dickson

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Fisheries Consultant
alma_dickson@yahoo.com

Benjamin Felipe Jr. Tabios

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Adviser
benjotabios@gmail.com

Dr. Angel B. Encarnacion

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR)
Director II / OIC - Assistant Director for Technical Services
adotech@bfar.da.gov.ph

Floyd Tiu Laurel

Frabelle PNG Limited
Director
floyd@frabelle.net

Glenn J Padro

Department of Agriculture - Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Senior Fishing Regulations Officer
gpadro@bfar.da.gov.ph

Isidro Tanangonan

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Aquaculturist II
itanangonan@bfar.da.gov.ph

Joeren Yleana

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Supervising Aquaculturist
joerenyleana@yahoo.com

Maria Joy Mabanglo

BFAR Philippines
System Analyst
mj.mabanglo@gmail.com

Marlo Demo-os

DA-BFAR

Aquaculturist II

mbdemoos@gmail.com

Rafael Vallente Ramiscal

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR)
Resource Person/Adviser
rv_ram55@yahoo.com

Rommel Adolf Diciano

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Chief, Conservation and Environmental Protection Section
rdiciano@bfar.da.gov.ph

Rosanna Bernadette B. Contreras

Socksargen Federation of Fishing and Allied Industries, Inc.
Executive Director
fishing.federation@gmail.com

Roy Gabinete

Frabelle Fishing Corporation
External Affairs Supervisor
roy.gabinete@frabelle.net

Sisenio Jhun Pagalan Jr

Trans-Pacific Journey Fishing Corporation
Exec. Asst. for Int'l Affairs
slp@tuna.ph

Suzette B. Barcoma

National Fisheries Research and Development Institute
Senior Science Research Specialist
suzettebarcoma@gmail.com

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Ilkang Na (TCC VICE-CHAIR)

Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
Policy Officer / Multilateral Fisheries Negotiator
ikna@korea.kr

Choi Joohyun

Silla Company, Ltd.
Staff
jhchoi@sla.co.kr

Geun-ho Jang

Fisheries Monitoring Center of the Ministry of
Oceans and Fisheries
FMC, Korea
fmc2014@korea.kr

Jae-geol Yang

Korea Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Center
Policy Analyst
jg718@kofci.org

Jae-Yoon Jeong

Silla Company, Ltd.
Operation Team Staff
yjeong@sla.co.kr

Jeon Jae Kyeong

DONGWON INDUSTRIES CO., LTD.
GENERAL MANAGER
jkjeon@dongwon.com

Jooyoun Lee

Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
Policy Analyst
sporyoun@korea.kr

Jung-re Riley Kim

Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
Head of Fisheries Negotiation Unit
riley1126@korea.kr

Ma Hyunjin

Silla Co., Ltd
Assistant Manager
hjma@sla.co.kr

Namhee Kim

SILLA CO., LTD.
Assistant Manager
kimnh@sla.co.kr

Soohyun Back

Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
Assistant Director
kindbacksoo@korea.kr

Taerin Kim

Delegate Member

Advisor

sharak@korea.kr

REPUBLIC OF MARSHALL ISLANDS**Laurence Enos Edwards, II**

Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
Legal Counsel
ledwards@mimra.com

Beau Bigler

Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
Chief Fisheries Officer
bbigler@mimra.com

Berry Muller

Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
Deputy Director - Oceanic and Industrial
Affairs Division
bmuller@mimra.com

Junjie Pan

Pan Pacific Food(RMI) Inc.
General Manager Assistant
panjunjie@skmic.sh.cn

Makbi Bwijkko

Marshall Islands Marine Resources
Authority(MIMRA)
Observer Compliance Officer
mbwijkko@mimra.com

Melvin Silk

Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
MCS Officer
msilk@mimra.com

Steven Shen

pan pacific fishing
ship agency
shyby2017@gmail.com

Stevenson Graham

MIMRA
Boarding Officer
sgraham@mimra.com

SAMOA

Glory Fuimaono

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Assistant Chief Executive Officer (ACEO) Legal
or Legal Advisor
glory.fuimaono@maf.gov.ws

Moli Iakopo

Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries
Principal Fisheries Officer
moli.iakopo@maf.gov.ws

SOLOMON ISLANDS**James Teri**

Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
Deputy Secretary Technical
jteri@fisheries.gov.sb

Douglas Aitorea

Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
Compliance Officer
daitorea@fisheries.gov.sb

Rinah Harry Mark

Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
Senior Legal Officer
RMark@fisheries.gov.sb

CHINESE TAIPEI**Ding-Rong Lin**

Fisheries Agency, Ministry of Agriculture
Director, Deep Sea Fisheries Division
dingrong@ms1.fa.gov.tw

Chun-iu Lee

Fisheries Agency, Ministry of Agriculture
Project Assistant
chuniu1025@ms1.fa.gov.tw

Huei-Wen Lin

Patrol Division, Coast Guard Administration,
Ocean Affairs Council
Officer
wonderful8r97@gmail.com

I-Sheng Wu

Fisheries Agency, Ministry of Agriculture,
TAIWAN

Project Assistant

isheng0108@ms1.fa.gov.tw

Joseph Chia-Chi Fu

Overseas Fisheries Development Council
Director
joseph@ofdc.org.tw

Joy Hsiangyi Yu

Fisheries Agency, Ministry of Agriculture
Section Chief, Pacific Ocean Fisheries
Management Section, Distant Water Fisheries
Division
hsiangyi@ms1.fa.gov.tw

Tzu-Ching Yu

Overseas Fisheries Development Council
Secretary
evan@ofdc.org.tw

Wen-Yu Chen

Pacific Ocean Fisheries Management Section,
Distant Water Fisheries Division, Fisheries
Agency, Ministry of Agriculture
Specialist
chenwenyu@ms1.fa.gov.tw

Wenyng Wang

Fisheries Agency, Council of Agriculture,
Executive Yuan
Section Chief, International Fisheries Affair
Section, Deep Sea Fisheries Division
wenyingw456@gmail.com

Yun-Hu Yeh

Central Police University
Dean, Department of Marine Police
yunhuyeh@gmail.com

TONGA**Losaline Savelini Otukolo**

Ministry of Fisheries
Principal Fisheries Officer
losilini@gmail.com

Mele Fehoko Atuekaho

Ministry of Fisheries
Deputy Chief Executive Officer

TUVALU**Tupulaga Poulasi**

Tuvalu Fisheries Department
Principal Fisheries Officer
etuati.ptauia@gmail.com

Scott Pelesala

Tuvalu Fisheries Department
Senior Vessel Monitoring System Officer
spelesala@gov.tv

Uni Liufau

Tuvalu fisheries Department
Compliance Officer
uliufau@gov.tv

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**Alex Kahl**

NOAA Fisheries - Pacific Islands Regional
Office
International Fisheries
alex.kahl@noaa.gov

Amy Gradin

U.S. Embassy Kolonia
Economic/Consular Officer
GradinAM@state.gov

Craig Heberer

The Nature Conservancy
Deputy Director, TNC Tuna Program
craig.heberer@tnc.org

Elizabeth O'Sullivan

NOAA GCES
Enforcement Attorney
elizabeth.osullivan@noaa.gov

Emily Reynolds

NOAA Fisheries, Pacific Islands Regional Office
Fishery Policy Analyst

Gerald Leape

Pew Charitable Trusts
International Government Relations
gleape@pewtrusts.org

Jason Philibotte

NOAA Fisheries
International Fisheries, Division Chief
jason.philibotte@noaa.gov

John Peschon

NOAA Fisheries
Observer Program

Katrina Poremba

NMFS
Fisher Policy Analyst
katrina.poremba@noaa.gov

Kelly Kryc

National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration
Deputy Assistant Secretary for International
Fisheries
kelly.kryc@noaa.gov

Maile Norman

United States Coast Guard
Coast Guard District Fourteen Enforcement
maile.c.norman@uscg.mil

Martina Sagapolu

NOAA Office of Law Enforcement, Pacific
Islands Division
Assistant Director, Office of Law Enforcement
martina.sagapolu@noaa.gov

Merna Saad

Department of State
Foreign Affairs Advisor
saadmn@state.gov

Terry Boone

NOAA Fisheries Office of Law Enforcement,
Pacific Islands Division (NOAA OLE/PID)
VMS Manager

Tyler Lawson

NOAA Fisheries
Fish Biologist
tyler.lawson@noaa.gov

William Gibbons-Fly

American Tunaboat Association
Executive Director
wgibbons-fly@atatuna.com

VANUATU

Tony Taleo
Vanuatu Fisheries Department
Deputy Director Offshore
ttaleo@fisheries.gov.vu

Felix Toa Ngwango
Vanuatu Fisheries Department
Principal Compliance Officer
ftngwango81@gmail.com

Yakar Silas
Vanuatu Fisheries
Fisheries MCS-E Officer
ysilas@fisheries.gov.vu

FRENCH POLYNESIA

Thibaut Thellier
Marine Resources Department
Fisheries officer
thibaut.thellier@administration.gov.pf

Anne-Marie Trinh
Marine resources department
Fisheries officer
anne-marie.trinh@administration.gov.pf

Vaiana Joufoques
Marine Ressources Department
Data manager
vaiana.joufoques@administration.gov.pf

NEW CALEDONIA

Mickael Lercari
New Caledonia Government (Fisheries
department)
Fisheries and environment officer
mickael.lercari@gouv.nc

TOKELAU

Solomua Ionatana

Tokelau Fisheries Management Agency
Manager, Fisheries Licensing & Access
tualen@gmail.com

Feleti Tulafono
Tokelau Fisheries Management Agency
Director
ftulafono@gmail.com

Lesley Gould
Tokelau Fisheries Management Agency
Fisheries Advisor
lesleykgould@gmail.com

CURAÇAO

Andy Frans
Fisheries Monitoring Center
Operator
andy_frans73@yahoo.com

Carl Michael Suarez
Ministry of Economic Development
Fishery Operator
michael.suarez@gobiernu.cw

Stephen Mambi
Ministry of Economic Development of Curacao
Policy advisor
stephenmambi@yahoo.com

ECUADOR

Arturo Cabrera Hidalgo
Ecuador
Ambassador of Ecuador
arturocabrera@hotmail.com

Rebeca Espinoza-Bernal
Ministry of Production, Foreign Trade,
Investments and Fisheries
Fisheries and Aquaculture Policies Specialist
respinoza@produccion.gob.ec

PANAMA

Maria Sierra
Aquatics Resources Authority of Panama
Chief of Fisheries Monitoring Center

msierra@arap.gob.pa

Pablo Amaris

Aquatic Resources Authority of Panama
Deputy Director of Inspection, Monitoring and Control

pamaris@arap.gob.pa

Mario Aguilar

Aquatic Resources Authority of Panama
International Technical Cooperation Analyst

meaguilar@arap.gob.pa

Melissa Aguilar

Aquatic Resources Authority
In Charge of Compliance

maguilar@arap.gob.pa

Raul Delgado

Panama
Industry

rauldelgadoq@gmail.com

THAILAND

Sarayoot Boonkumjad

Department of fisheries Thailand
Fisheries Biologist, Senior Professional Level

sarayootb@fisheries.go.th

Chonlada Meeanan

Department of Fisheries, Thailand
Fisheries Biologist, Professional Level

nanaeem33@gmail.com

Jidapa Setthatham

Department of Fisheries Thailand
Fisheries Biologist, Practitioner Level

jidapa.stm@gmail.com

Jitpisut Sanboonpeng

Department of Fisheries Thailand
Fisheries Biologist, Practitioner Level

pompam58@gmail.com

Suthasinee Manoonphatyporn

Department of Fisheries, Thailand
Fisheries Biologist, Professional Level

sutha_sutha@hotmail.com

Thira Rodchevid

Department of Fisheries Thailand
Fisheries Biologist, Professional Level

thirar.dof@gmail.com

Thitirat Rattanawiwat

Department of Fisheries Thailand
Fisheries Biologist, Practitioner Level

milky_gm@hotmail.com

Tirabhorn Yothakong

Department of fisheries Thailand
Fisheries Biologist, Professional Level

tirabhorn@gmail.com

Titipat Tongdonkruang

Department of Fisheries, Thailand
Fisheries Biologist, Practitioner Level

g.titipat@gmail.com

VIETNAM

Vu Duyen Hai

Department of Fisheries
Head of Capture Fisheries Division

vuduyenhai10@gmail.com

ACCOUNTABILITY.FISH

Louise Oualid

Accountability.Fish
Communications Fellow

louise@accountability.fish

AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF ALBATROSS AND PETRELS (ACAP)

Dimas Gianuca

Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels
Seabird Bycatch Working Group Vice Co-convenor

dgianuca@gmail.com

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL CENTRE FOR OCEAN RESOURCES AND SECURITY (ANCORS)

Adam Ziyad

University of Wollongong
PhD Student
az653@uowmail.edu.au

Bianca Haas

Australian National Centre for Ocean
Resources and Security
Research Fellow
bhaas@uow.edu.au

BAHAMAS**Jahangir Md Munawar Hussain**

The Bahamas Maritime Authority
Regional Director (Asia)
jhussain@bahamasmaritime.com

BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL**Stephanie Borrelle**

BirdLife International
Marine & Pacific Regional Coordinator
Stephanie.Borrelle@Birdlife.org

GLOBAL LAW ALLIANCE**Chris Wold**

International Environmental Law Project
Of counsel
wold@lclark.edu

**INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA
COMMISSION (IATTC)****Brad Wiley**

IATTC
Policy Officer
bwiley@iattc.org

Marlon Roman

IATTC
Bycatch Program
mroman@iattc.org

INTERNATIONAL MCS NETWORK**Youky Susaia Jr**

International MCS Network
MCS Consultant

youkijr@gmail.com

**INTERNATIONAL SEAFOOD SUSTAINABILITY
FOUNDATION (ISSF)****Claire van der Geest**

ISSF
Advisor
claire.vandergeest@gmail.com

LIBERIA**Frederick Varnie**

Liberia Maritime Authority
Director for Research and Planning
varnierosa2016@gmail.com

Yvonne Clinton

Liberia Maritime Authority
Deputy Commissioner International Vessel
Registration

PACIFIC COMMUNITY (SPC)**Colley Falasi**

Secretariat of the Pacific Community
Fisheries Data Audit Analyst

Graham Pilling

Pacific Community (SPC)
Deputy Director FAME (OFF)
grahamp@spc.int

Leontine Baje

Secretariat of the Pacific Community
Fisheries Advisor
leontineb@spc.int

Malo Hosken

Oceanic Fisheries Programme - Pacific
Community
Regional ER and EM Coordinator
maloh@spc.int

Paul Hamer

Pacific Community
Principal Scientist
paulh@spc.int

Shaazreen Saista Bi

The Pacific Community (SPC)
Fisheries Data and Capacity Development
Specialist
shaazreenb@spc.int

Tiffany Vidal

SPC
Principal Fisheries Scientist (Data
Management)
tiffanyv@spc.int

Timothy Park

Secretariat of the Pacific Community
Senior Fisheries Advisor (Fisheries
Monitoring)
timothyp@spc.int

**PACIFIC ISLANDS FORUM FISHERIES AGENCY
(FFA)****'Ana F. Taholo**

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
Compliance Policy Advisor
ana.taholo@ffa.int

Allan Rahari

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
Director of Fisheries Operations
allan.rahari@ffa.int

Jason Raubani

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
MCS Policy Advisor
jason.raubani@ffa.int

Joyce Samuelu-Ah Leong

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)
Fisheries Management Adviser
joyce.samuelu-ahleong@ffa.int

Kasipo Teo

Forum Fisheries Agency
Legal Officer
kasipo.teo@ffa.int

Leonard John Rodwell

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
Fisheries Development Adviser

leonard.rodwell@ffa.int

Lianos Triantafillos

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)
Fisheries Management Advisor
lianos.triantafillos@ffa.int

Ludwig Kumoru

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)
Director Fisheries Management Division
ludwig.kumoru@ffa.int

Marina Abas

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)
Fisheries Management Advisor
marina.abas@ffa.int

Ramesh Chand

Forum Fisheries Agency
Manager - Vessel Monitoring System
ramesh.chand@ffa.int

Yaniba Alfred

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)
Catch Documentation Scheme Technical
Adviser
yaniba.alfred@ffa.int

PARTIES TO THE NAURU AGREEMENT (PNA)**Brian Kumasi**

Office of the Parties to the Nauru Agreement
Policy Manager
Brian@pnatuna.com

Joseph Kendou

PNA Office
Compliance Officer
joseph@pnatuna.com

Les Clark

PNA
Adviser
les@pnatuna.com

Sangalofa Clark

PNAO
Chief Executive Officer
sangaa@pnatuna.com

PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS**Glen Holmes**

The Pew Charitable Trusts
Senior Officer
gholmes@pewtrusts.org

Jamie Gibbon

The Pew Charitable Trusts
Manager

THE OCEAN FOUNDATION**Dave Gershman**

The Ocean Foundation
Officer, International Fisheries Conservation
dgershman@oceanfdn.org

WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE (WWF)**Bubba Cook**

World Wide Fund for Nature
Western and Central Pacific Tuna Programme
Manager
acook@wwf.org.nz

WCPFC SECRETARIAT**Aaron Nighswander**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Finance and Administration Manager
aaron.nighswander@wcpfc.int

Albert Carlot

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
VMS Manager
albert.carlot@wcpfc.int

Eidre Sharp

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Deputy Compliance Manager
Eidre.Sharp@wcpfc.int

Elaine Garvilles

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Assistant Science Manager

Emma Mori

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Project Management Assistant
emma.mori@wcpfc.int

Jeannie Nanpei

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
RFV Officer
jeannie.nanpei@wcpfc.int

Joseph Jack

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Compliance Officer
Joseph.Jack@wcpfc.int

Karl Staisch

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
ROP Coordinator
karl.staisch@wcpfc.int

Kilafwasru Albert

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
ROP Data Entry Technician
Kilafwasru.Albert@wcpfc.int

Lara Manarangi-Trott

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Compliance Manager
Lara.Manarangi-Trott@wcpfc.int

Lars Olsen

WCPFC WPEA-ITM Project
Project Manager
olsenpacific@gmail.com

Lucille Martinez

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Administrative Officer

lucille.martinez@wcpfc.int

Milo Abello

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
VMS Officer
milo.abello@wcpfc.int

Natsuko Akinaga

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
HR Officer
natsuko.akinaga@wcpfc.int

Nicole Solomon

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Secretary/Receptionist
nicole.solomon@wcpfc.int

Penelope Ridings

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Legal Advisor
pennyridings@yahoo.com

Rhea Moss-Christian

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Executive Director
rhea.moss-christian@wcpfc.int

Ricardo Belmontes

IATTC
Policy and Compliance Officer
rbelmontes@iattc.org

Samuel Rikin

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
IT Officer

samuel.rikin@wcpfc.int

Stephen Brouwer

Parties to the Nauru Agreement
Consultant
steve@saggitus.co.nz

SungKwon Soh

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Science Manager
sungkwon.soh@wcpfc.int

SureAnn Poll

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
ROP Data Entry
sureann.poll@wcpfc.int

Tim Adams

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Meeting Rapporteur
tim.adams@gonedau.com

Tim Jones

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
IT Manager
tim.jones@wcpfc.int

Virginia Ezekias

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
VMS Officer
virginia.ezekias@wcpfc.int

ATTACHMENT B – Draft Provisional List of TCC Work for 2025

Note: This list does not include ongoing annual TCC tasks. The TCC Priority core business tasks (standing Agenda Items) from the previous plan period are itemised in Annex 1 to this Attachment.

- a. Amending CMM 2009-06 on Transshipment
 - Continue and complete discussions on pending points (Impracticability, e-reporting, etc.) and provide recommendations to the Commission
- b. Development and implementation of CMM for EM
 - Consider and provide advice on outputs (interim EM standards) of the EREM WG
 - develop a draft CMM on EM
- c. Analysing framework for the management and control of chartered vessels
 - Provide advice on any necessary modifications to the CMM for Charter Notification Scheme
- [d. Labour standards]** subject to WCPFC21 outcome
 - Continue and complete discussions on pending points (whether to cover observers, role/obligation of crew provider, etc.) and provide recommendations to the Commission
- e. Compliance Monitoring Scheme
 - Audit points: finalise outstanding audit points and continue developing and applying audit points for new and revised obligations
 - Corrective action:
 - Participation of observers in the CMR process :
- f. Enhancing compliance with CMM 2014-02 (VMS)
 - Continue exploring ways to minimize and address the incidents of discrepancies between Commission VMS data and national VMS data
 - [Consider enhancing certain functionalities of VRST]
- [g. FAD Management]** subject to WCPFC21 outcome
 - Consider which type of vessels should be allowed to conduct FAD-related activities
- h. ROP
 - Review and develop recommended modifications to ROP data fields taking into account of data requirements arising from new/amended CMMs, CMS, SSI, EM/ER, etc.
 - Prioritize progress on the review of the ROP Minimum Standard data fields and the pre-notification process adopted during WCPFC12, and develop a standardized process for the use of ROP data in the CCFS
 - Consider the question of streamlining the inclusion of ROP data in the CCFS and provide advice
- [i. South Pacific Albacore]** subject to WCPFC21 outcome
 - Continue the work of the IWG with an aim to draft a new CMM for submission to the Commission
- [j. Seabirds]** subject to WCPFC21 outcome
 - Continue review of CMM 2018-03 with an aim to draft a revision of CMM 2018-03 for submission to the Commission
- [k. CMMs with interpretation issues]**
 - Define “fishing for” and/or “bycatch”? CMM 2006-04 para.1, northern stocks CMMs, etc.
 - Define “extraordinary circumstances” in CMM 2018-06 para.11] Guide
- l. Port State Measures
 - Consider needs for possible amendments of CMM 2017-02 to better support the WCPO region and all CCMs

- Discuss the assistance needs of SIDS including technical assistance, capacity building and the development of a funding mechanism to support the ongoing work of SIDS to develop and implement port State measures as provided for in CMM 2017-02 paragraphs 22-27
- m. Data Access and Data Exchange Arrangements
 - Progress data exchange arrangement with other RFMOs (IATTC, IOTC, CCSBT, SPRFMO and NPFC), in relation to transshipment activity, observer reports and carrier vessel data
 - Consider the linkage between CMM 2017-02 and the MCS Data Rules in the context of supporting CCMS' implementation of port state measures and provide recommendations to the Commission
- [n. Addressing outstanding CCFS cases?
 - Consider criteria/process to close out old cases older than 24 months]
- o. Shark finning prohibition
 - Review the data requirements and obligations, implementation and compliance challenges in relation to the CMM for Sharks, and make recommendations to the Commission on how to address these challenges
- p. HSBI
 - Update the Standardized Multi-language Questionnaire for discussion and possible adoption at WCPFC22
 - Develop non-binding regional guidelines for HSBI
- [q. Available data for verifying compliance
 - Explore potential approaches that would strengthen independent verification of key obligations in future WCPFC compliance reviews]
- r. TS-IWG
 - Provide advice/support to EREM WG in relation to the work on EM standards for carrier vessels conducting transshipment for longline vessels

ANNEX – TCC Priority core business tasks (2022-2024) (standing Agenda Items)

- a. Monitor and review compliance with conservation and management measures and other obligations stemming from the Convention.
 - b. Assessment of IUU fishing vessel nominations and review of fishing vessels currently on the IUU vessel list
 - c. Review of Cooperating Non-Member applications.
 - d. Monitor obligations relating to Small Island Developing States and territories.
 - e. Review the implementation of cooperative measures for monitoring, control, surveillance and enforcement adopted by the Commission and make such recommendations to the Commission as may be necessary.
 - f. Review Annual report(s) of the WCPFC Secretariat, which should address relevant technical and compliance issues, which may include HSBI, ROP, VMS, RFV, Data Rules, transshipment, port State measures, and note the Executive Director's report on these matters, the Secretariats anticipated forecast of work commitments for TCC, and other issues as appropriate.
 - g. Provide technical and compliance-related advice to support the development of harvest strategies, including consideration of the implications of harvest control rules.
 - h. Review the ongoing work of the Intersessional Working Groups (IWG) noted in Section 3.
 - i. Review information about technical and compliance matters arising under existing CMMs.
 - j. Make technical and compliance related comments on proposed CMMs.
-

ATTACHMENT C – Provisional List of Obligations to be assessed in the 2025 CMS

Fifty-two (52) obligations are proposed. The inclusion of some of the listed obligations (**), would be subject to updated or new Audit Points being adoption at WCPFC21. If the total list of obligations with Audit Points is less than fifty obligations, then additional report (RP) or reporting deadline (DL) obligations could be added.

23 Quantitative Limit Obligations

- [CMM 2006-04 01](#) **QL** *Limit number of fishing vessels fishing for MLS south of 15S to 2000 – 2004 levels.*
- [CMM 2009-03 01](#) **QL** *Limit number of vessels fishing for SWO south of 20S to the number in any one year between 2000-2005.*
- [CMM 2009-03 02](#) **QL** *Limit the catch of SWO by its vessels in area south of 20S to the amount in any one year during 2000-2006.*
- [CMM 2009-06 29](#) **QL** *Limit on purse seine vessels transshipment outside of port to vessels that have received an exemption from the Commission. Where applicable, flag CCM authorisation should be vessel-specific and address any specific conditions identified by the Commission.*
- [CMM 2009-06 34](#) **QL** *Ban on high seas transshipment, unless a CCM has determined impracticability in accordance with para 37 guidelines, and has advised the Commission of such.*
- [CMM 2010-01 05](#) **QL** *NP striped marlin catch limits applicable to CCMs with vessels fishing in the Convention Area north of the equator: commencing 2011.*
- ******[CMM 2012-03 02](#) **QL** *CCMs shall achieve 5% coverage of the effort of each fishery fishing for fresh fish beyond the national jurisdiction in area N 20N. ***
- [CMM 2015-02 01](#) **QL** *Limit on number of vessels actively fishing for SP ALB south of 20S above 2005 or 2000-2004 levels.*
- [CMM 2016-02 02](#) **QL** *Vessels in EHSP may report sightings of any other fishing vessel to Secretariat*
- [CMM 2019-03 02](#) **QL** *CCMs take measures to ensure level of fishing effort by vessels fishing for NP ALB is not increased*
- [CMM 2023-01 24](#) **QL** *Purse seine EEZ limits (for skipjack, yellowfin and bigeye tuna) and advice from other coastal CCMs of EEZ limits to be applied.*
- [CMM 2023-01 25](#) **QL** *High seas purse seine effort limits applying 20N to 20S.*
- ******[CMM 2023-01 38](#) **QL** *Bigeye longline annual catch limits for 2024-2026, with adjustment to be made for any overage and certain CCMs may also increase the catch limit by committing to proportionate increase in observer coverage level above the minimum 5% ROP coverage level. ***
- [CMM 2023-01 41](#) **QL** *Bigeye longline catch limits by flag for certain other members which caught less than 2000t in 2004.*
- [CMM 2023-01 43](#) **QL** *Limit by flag on number of purse seine vessels >24m with freezing capacity between 20N and 20S.*

- [CMM 2023-01 44](#) **QL** CCM reported whether it replaced any of its flagged large scale purse seine vessels in the previous year and has advised the Commission that the replacement vessel did not result in an increase in carrying capacity or an increase in catch or effort levels.
- [CMM 2023-01 45](#) **QL** Limit by flag on number of longline vessels with freezing capacity targeting bigeye above the current level (applying domestic quotas are exempt).
- [CMM 2023-01 46](#) **QL** Limit by flag on number of ice-chilled longline vessels targeting bigeye and landing exclusively fresh fish above the current level or above the number of current licenses under established limited entry programmes (applying domestic quotas are exempt).
- ******[CMM 2023-01 48](#) **QL** Limit on total catch of certain other commercial tuna fisheries (that take >2000Mt of BET, YFT and SKJ). ******
- [CMM 2023-02 02](#) **QL** Total effort by vessels for Pacific Bluefin limited to 2002 - 2004 levels in Area north of 20N.
- [CMM 2023-02 03](#) **QL** Pacific bluefin tuna catch limits for Japan, Korea and Chinese Taipei applying from 2022.
- [CMM 2023-02 04](#) **QL** Pacific Bluefin 30kg or larger catch limits, by flag for certain other members.
- ******[CMM 2023-03 02](#) **QL** CCMs take measures to ensure fishing effort by fisheries taking more than 200mt of NP SWO N20N per year is limited to 2008 – 2010. ******

6 Obligations recommended for annual review

- [CMM 2014-02 9a](#) **IM** Fishing vessels comply with the Commission standards for WCPFC VMS including being fitted with ALC/MTU that meet Commission requirements;
- [SciData 01](#) **RP** Estimates of Annual Catches
- [SciData 02](#) **RP** Number of vessels active
- [SciData 03](#) **RP** Operational Level Catch and Effort Data
- [SciData 05](#) **RP** Size composition data
- [CMM 2018-05 Annex C 06](#) **RP** CCMs shall achieve 5% coverage of the effort in each fishery under the jurisdiction of the Commission
- [CMM 2018-06 09](#) **RP** Submission by Member to ED a list of all vessels on national record in previous year, noting FISHED or DID NOT FISH for each vessel

18 Additional Implementation Obligations where TCC is yet to review Implementation using agreed Audit Points

(Note that other IM obligations have been reviewed or are otherwise covered by the trial streamlining approach for IM obligations).

Operational requirements for fishing vessels

- [CMM 2006-08 07](#) **IM** Fishing vessels to accept HSBI boardings by duly authorised inspectors, and as applicable Members to ensure compliance of its authorised inspectors with the HSBI procedures.
- [CMM 2014-02 9a](#) **VMS SSPs 5.4 - 5.5** **IM** VMS Manual Reporting procedures.
- [CMM 2018-06 04](#) **IM** Vessels authorization requirement.
- [CMM 2023-01 32](#) **IM** Purse seine vessels are not to operate under manual reporting during FAD closure period.

Additional measures for tropical tunas

- [CMM 2009-02 03-07](#) **IM** FAD Closure Rules - high seas.
- [CMM 2009-02 08-13](#) **IM** Rules for Purse seine catch retention, including reporting - high seas.
- ******[CMM 2023-01 13](#) **IM** Purse seine 1 1/2 month FAD closure (1 July - 15 August). ******
- ******[CMM 2023-01 14](#) **IM** Annual advice on choice and implementation of one additional month high seas purse seine FAD closure (April, May, Nov or Dec) ******
- [CMM 2023-01 16](#) **IM** Required FAD design and construction specification requirements to reduce the risk of entanglement of sharks, sea turtles or other species (effective 1 Jan 2024).
- [CMM 2023-01 21](#) **IM** Each purse seine vessel is limited to no more than 350 FADs with activated instrumented buoys.
- [CMM 2023-01 26](#) **IM** CCMs not to transfer fishing effort in days fished in the purse seine fishery to areas N20N and S20S.
- [CMM 2023-01 30](#) **IM** Purse seine catch retention requirements (20N - 20S).
- [CMM 2023-01 Att 2 04](#) **IM** Philippines to ensure its flagged vessels report sightings of any fishing vessel to the Commission Secretariat (vessel type, date, time, position, markings, heading and speed).
- [CMM 2023-01 Att 2 08](#) **IM** Philippines to monitor landings by vessels operating in HSP1-SMA and collect reliable catch data by species.

Observer activity related requirement

- [CMM 2009-06 13](#) **IM** CCM shall ensure that vessels they are responsible for carry observers from the WCPFC ROP to observe transshipments at sea.
- [CMM 2023-01 33](#) **IM** Requirement for purse seine vessels to carry a ROP observer.
- [CMM 2023-01 34](#) **IM** 100% purse seine coverage: specific rules for vessels fishing exclusively in areas under its national jurisdiction.

Mitigating impacts of fishing on species of special interest

- [CMM 2022-04 16](#) **IM** Requirements to minimize bycatch of sharks in longline fisheries between 20N and 20S (effective 1 Jan 2024).

5 Daily catch and effort reporting obligations

- ****[CMM 2022-06 01](#) IM/RP** Requirement to ensure the master of each vessel completes an accurate electronic log of every day that it spends at sea on the high seas of the Convention Area as specified (effective for most vessels as of 1 Jan 2024). **
- ****[CMM 2022-06 02](#) IM/RP** Requirement that information recorded by the master of each vessel each day with fishing operations shall, at a minimum include the information as specified. **
- ****[CMM 2022-06 03](#) IM/RP** Requirement that the master of each vessel fishing in the Convention Area provides an required information to its national authority within 15 days of the end of a trip or transshipment event. **
- ****[CMM 2022-06 04](#) RP** Requirement to provide operational catch and effort data recorded by the master of each vessel each day with fishing operations to the Commission, and where possible in accordance with the agreed SSPs. **
- ****[CMM 2022-06 05](#) IM/RP** Requirement that the master of each vessel fishing in the Convention Area provides an accurate and unaltered original or copy of the required information pertaining to the current trip on board the vessel at all times during the course of a trip. **

Additional report (RP) and report deadline (DL) obligations could be considered

- It is suggested these reflect topics that would be useful for a closer focus by TCC in 2025

****** Inclusion will be subject to updated or new Audit Points adoption at WCPFC21 ******

ATTACHMENT D – Proposed forward workplan for ER&EM IWG

Task	Working approach	Timing	Date to WCPFC
Proposed interim EM data requirements	EREMIWG intersessional	Oct-Nov 2024	WCPFC21 (Nov-24)
WCPFC paper containing recommendations for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum EM Technical standards • Minimum EM data requirements • EM program reporting requirements • Forward IWG workplan 	EREMIWG intersessional and Chair	Oct-Nov 2024	WCPFC21 (Nov-24)
Review templates for Part 1 EM program reporting and other parts of the EM standards where standardized reporting would be of value to members.	EREMIWG with SC and TCC review	Feb-Jun 2025	
Provide advice on changes to the interim EM standards that would improve harmonization across RFMOs (based on outcomes of the ABNJ Tuna II “ <i>Electronic Monitoring Tuna RFMO Minimum Standards Harmonization Workshop</i> ” to be held in Dec-2024)	EREMIWG with SC and TCC review	Feb-Jun 2025	
Review EM data requirements based on relevant CMM requirements not already covered in the ROP minimum data fields	EREMIWG and ROPIWG with SC and TCC review		
Develop a proposed assurance / audit process based on ROP model	EREMIWG / WCPFC-Secretariat with SC and TCC review		
Initiate work on EM for LL transshipment both the LL and carrier vessel to allow adoption of EM standards for LL transshipment	EREMIWG and Transshipment IWG with SC and TCC review		