



TECHNICAL AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

Twenty-First Regular Session

24 September to 30 September 2025

Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia (Hybrid)

PROGRESSING THE REVIEW OF CMM 2017-02

WCPFC-TCC21-2025-19A

17 September 2025

Submitted by the PSM-WG Chair

Purpose

1. This paper presents an analysis of [CMM 2017-02](#) *Port State Minimum Standards* in relation to key points of focus for amendments to this measure as discussed by CCMs at PSM-WG01 in March 2025. ([Summary and Conclusion of Meeting](#)).
2. It also includes a high-level comparison of CMM 2017-02 with the UNFAO Port State Measure Agreement (PSMA) and with other tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (tRFMOs) port CCM measures to facilitate CCMs consideration of the focus relating to the potential for “harmonisation and standardisation”.

Introduction

1. In 2024, the Commission agreed to establish a working group led by Fiji to undertake review of CMM 2017-02 in 2025. The review was to include the linkage between CMM 2017-02 and the MCS Data Rules, including with respect to the potential for CNM access to MCS data. ([TCC20 Outcomes, paragraph 63](#)).
2. Paragraphs 28 – 29 of CMM 2017-02 also provide guidance on such a review:
Periodic review
28. The Commission shall review this measure within 2 years of its entry into force, which shall include but not be limited to an evaluation of its effectiveness, and any financial and administrative burdens associated with its implementation.
29. In the review of this measure, the Commission may consider additional elements such as notification requirements, port entry, authorization or denial, use of ports, and additional inspection requirements.

Areas of focus for a review

3. CCMs provided further guidance on the scope of the review during the PSM-WG1 meeting held in March 2025 which was summarised in the Chair’s Summary Report as:
 - a. Identification of gaps in the current CMM and where additional details would be useful, such as on port arrivals and denial of port access, and what inspections could cover.

- b. Review of data sharing arrangements with a view to strengthening data exchange requirements within the WCPFC Data Rules and considering how those data sharing arrangements will be applied.
 - c. Identification of implementation challenges and the applicability of the measure.
 - d. Review of requirements in existing CMMs that relate to Port State measures in order to maximize the linkages and ensure the CMMs are integrated.
 - e. Consideration of the scope of existing provisions of the measure relating to capacity building for SIDS and whether these were sufficient.
 - f. Harmonization and standardization of data requirements with those of the PSMA and other tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (trFMOs).
4. The PSM-WG01 noted that there was a need for analysis of CMM 2017-02 to identify potential gaps that could support CCM consideration of amendments to this measure.
 3. **Annex 1** (Table 3) outlines the areas of focus from PSM-WG1 (see paragraph 3 above) and identifies any related obligations in CMM 2017-02, noting that these may not fully address the requirements needed to deliver each area of focus.

Discussion

5. The next section presents additional areas that the Chair has identified as useful for PSM WG participants to consider in the review of CMM 2017-02.

CCMs with designated ports under CMM 2017-02 and CCMs that are parties to the PSMA

4. **Table 1** below shows the WCPFC [CCMs that have implemented CMM 2017-02](#) and those that are [parties to the PSMA](#). 10 CCMs have notified WCPFC of designated ports under CMM 2017-02, and 24 CCMs are parties to the PSMA.

Table 1. Status of CCMs who have notified of designated ports under CMM 2017-02 and those that are parties to the PSMA.

	SIDS WCPFC Members and Participating Territories	Non-SIDS WCPFC Members	Cooperating Non-Members
CCMs who have notified of designated Ports under CMM 2017-02	France (French Polynesia, New Caledonia), Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu	Australia, Japan, New Zealand, the Philippines, United States of America	Thailand
CCMs who are parties to PSMA as at 18 August 2025	Fiji, France (French Polynesia, New Caledonia), Republic of Marshall Islands, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu	Australia, Canada, China, European Union, Indonesia, Japan, Republic of Korea, New Zealand, Philippines, United States of America	Bahamas, Ecuador, Liberia, Panama, Thailand, Viet Nam

Special requirements of Small Island Developing States and participating territories (SIDS)

6. CMM 2017-02 took effect in February 2018 and was to be reviewed within two years. Implementation of the CMM was voluntary until such time as CCM's designated ports and/or contact points. The above table shows that since that time, most SIDS have chosen not to designate ports under CMM 2017-02.
7. Paragraphs 22 -27 of the CMM provide examples of the types of assistance that could be required and requires CCMs to cooperate to establish appropriate mechanisms to provide technical and/or financial assistance to deliver those needs, building on, but not limited by, the key capacity or resource assistance and those mechanisms set out in paragraph 4 of CMM 2013-06.
8. The two-year review period reflected the Commission's priority to develop a mechanism for providing assistance to SIDS, which was scheduled for presentation to the Commission at WCPFC16 in 2019. This timing ensured that the measure could be reviewed within two years. Paragraph 25 also states that the establishment of the mechanism was noted to be "critical in SIDS' decision making processes about whether to designate their ports under this CMM."
9. As the required mechanism has not been agreed and the review of CMM 2017-02 not progressed, this would be a priority for the work of the PSM-WG.
10. As guidance develops through Commission discussions in this WG, the WG will be able to respond appropriately through proposed amendments to CMM 2017-02.

Potential areas to consider in harmonization with tuna RFMOs

5. In relation to other tRFMOs, there are existing [Memoranda of Understanding](#) that generally enable reciprocal data exchanges that include for monitoring, surveillance and control purposes. In the case of CCSBT and IATTC, there are also Memoranda of Cooperation (CCSBT and IATTC) that provide more specific details on the type of data exchange. Once specific amendments to CMM 2017-02 are clearer, an assessment can be made as to whether any changes to these arrangements are necessary.
6. Across tRFMOs, there is a broad alignment on the core principles of port state measures, particularly the designation of ports, the requirement for inspection procedures and the general exchange of information. However, key gaps remain that hinder full harmonization. These include inconsistent obligations or minimum standards for port entry, arrivals, denial and inspection on IUU grounds, the absence of uniform real-time reporting standards and a weak cross-referencing with other MCS or relevant tRFMOs measures. Differences also exist in the binding nature of capacity building requirements and support for developing CCMs, particularly SIDS. More detail associated with this assessment is provided in Table 4 (**Annex 2**).

Next steps for progressing proposed amendments

11. **Table 2** below provides the list of priority areas and presents some initial points for discussion taking into account the discussions from PSM-WG1 and the additional information presented in this paper. The priority areas and points for discussion are presented without ranking and are not intended to limit the scope of areas for review.
12. The Chair invites participants to provide further views to elaborate on each of the five areas and the initial list of points for discussion set out in **Table 2**.

Table 2: Proposed scope of review for CMM 2017-02

Priority areas for review	Initial list of points for further discussion
1. Support for SIDS and developing States and implementation challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consider reviewing the adequacy of current assistance provisions. ii. Consider establishing an operational funding facility. iii. Consider defining clear burden-sharing mechanisms with triggers for assistance. iv. Consider developing metrics to monitor delivery of capacity building and support. v. Consider reviewing how flexibility of the measure affects consistent implementation. vi. Consider assessing barriers faced by SIDS and developing States (legal frameworks, inspector training, MCS capacity). vii. Consider examining the adequacy of current funding/technical assistance provisions. viii. Consider identifying areas where clarification/simplification could improve applicability.
2. Port entry, arrivals and denial of access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consider establishing mandatory minimum standards for advance notification. ii. Consider reviewing procedures for authorization/denial of entry, including IUU grounds. iii. Consider risk-based inspection minimum standards and prioritization.
3. Facilitating access to WCPFC data to support Port entry procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consider establishing procedures that will more efficiently facilitate review and delivery of data under approved requests to support Port entry procedures, including from CNMs
4. Inspection standards and scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consider reviewing Annex A to establish binding minimum standards. ii. Consider defining minimum inspection coverage (documents, gear, catch, logbooks, authorizations). iii. Consider harmonization of inspection report standards with PSMA, other tRFMOs and pan-Pacific RFBs, where applicable.
5. Reporting and data exchange	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consider strengthening timely reporting of inspection-related information. ii. Consider aligning inspection templates with PSMA GIES. iii. Consider introducing near-real time reporting for high-risk cases. iv. Consider exploring cross-tRFMO pan Pacific RFBs and CNM data sharing.
6. Integration with other CMMs/MCS tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consider linkage between port inspections to transshipment monitoring, IUU vessel listing, HSBI and VMS.

Table 3: Gap analysis comparing PSM-WG01 key focus outcomes with obligations in CMM 2017-02

PSM-WG01 Outcome	CMM 2017-02	Potential Gap
Capacity building for SIDS and Implementation challenges and applicability	<p>Paras. 22-24 – assistance listed: legal frameworks, training, MCS technology, dispute resolution costs. Para. 27 – recognition of the need to consider disproportionate burden.</p> <p>Paras. 22-27 – recognizes SIDS’ needs. Annex C provides inspector training guidelines. Para. 25 – recognition to develop funding mechanism.</p>	No operational mechanism to deliver assistance
Port arrivals, denial of access, inspection scope	<p>Paras. 2, 17 – sovereign right to deny entry. Paras. 6, 7 – ports can be designated. Paras. 9, 10 – guidelines on inspection scope in Annex A.</p>	No mandatory advance notification requirements (timeframe and data fields). No standardized denial/notification procedures. Inspection scope in Annex A is non-binding. No risk-based inspection threshold.
Data sharing arrangements	<p>Para. 13 – inspection reports must go to requesting CCM, flag CCM and WCPFC ED within 15 days. Annex B provides inspection report template. Para. 20 – general information exchange is encouraged.</p>	No real-time requirement. Lacks an in-depth integration with WCPFC Data Rules. No data exchange protocols with PSMA or other tRFMOs and CNMs.
Integration with other CMMs	<p>References to IUU list, VMS, transshipment documents. Paras. 16, 20 – Encourages coordination with other tRFMOs.</p>	No explicit linkages to WCPFC transshipment, IUU or high seas boarding and inspection measures.
Harmonization with PSMA and tRFMOs	<p>Preamble – acknowledges PSMA and tRFMO measures. Annex A to C broadly aligned with PSMA standards.</p>	No formal alignment of data fields with PSMA Global Information Exchange System (GIES). The inspection reports are not similar to the PSMA format. No cross-tRFMO sharing mechanism.

Table 4: Comparative analysis of port CCM measure provisions across tuna RFMOs, highlighting similarities and gaps.

Priority	WCPFC	ICCAT	IOTC	IATTC	CCSBT	Similarities and gaps
Capacity building for SIDS and implementation challenges	<p>Assistance for SIDS; recognition of disproportionate burden</p> <p>Recognizes SIDS' needs; inspector training guidelines; funding mechanism commitment</p>	<p>Explicitly recognize disproportionate burdens and provide training/funding assistance.</p> <p>Port Inspection Expert Group & assistance process exists</p>	<p>Provision for requirements of developing States is included.</p> <p>Capacity building & support mechanisms, including funding</p>	<p>Provisions for assessment of needs of developing CPCs and providing capacity assistance included.</p> <p>Needs assessments & capacity assistance process required</p>	<p>Provision for requirements of developing States is included.</p> <p>Bilateral inspector-exchange programs encouraged; some assistance references</p>	<p>Some RFMOs recognize SIDS/developing State needs. However, these are not uniformly addressed; CCSBT and IOTC have limited formal provisions.</p> <p>All recognize implementation challenges. However, the level of detail and support varies; funding mechanisms are not consistently formalized as well.</p>
Port arrivals, denial of access, inspection scope	<p>Provision to deny entry; designated ports; inspection guidelines.</p>	<p>Designated ports; must decide to authorize/ deny; deny entry if sufficient IUU proof.</p>	<p>Must deny entry on sufficient proof; inspections (no priorities)</p>	<p>Encourages designated ports; must deny entry (communication not specified); inspections with priorities.</p>	<p>Designated ports; must decide to authorize/ deny; inspections with priorities.</p>	<p>All have provisions for designated ports and inspections. Only some require mandatory denial of entry where proof of IUU activity; communication procedures and inspection priorities vary.</p>

Priority	WCPFC	ICCAT	IOTC	IATTC	CCSBT	Similarities and gaps
Data sharing arrangements	Inspection reports to request CCM, flag CCM, WCPFC ED within 15 days; template exists; no real-time reporting standards.	Reporting only when infringement; no real-time reporting standard.	Electronic transmittal of all inspection reports.	Standard templates being developed; electronic submission encouraged.	Reports include PSMA fields, no RFMO-wide real-time reporting standard.	All require some level of reporting. However, the standard for real-time reporting is not harmonized; timelines and data fields vary across tRFMOs.
Integration with other CMMs	References to IUU list, VMS, transshipment, coordination encouraged.	Integration to ICCAT MCS tools implied, not systematic.	ePSM systems strong but cross-linking limited	Templates/processes being built; explicit cross-references limited	Relies on other RFMOs' reports; coordination noted but not systematic	All recognize links to wider MCS tools. However, the integration is largely informal; the systematic cross-referencing across CMMs and RFMOs is weak.
Harmonization with PSMA and tRFMOs	Preamble acknowledges PSMA; Annexes broadly aligned	Broad alignment; inspector-function minimums incomplete	Closest to PSMA on reporting/electronic standards; AREP fields aligned	Aligns many PSMA elements; standard forms to be finalized	Inspection report minimums align; inspector training mostly encouraged, not binding	There is a broad alignment with PSMA across RFMOs. However, there are differences in inspection standards, reporting forms and binding nature of training requirements.