



## Meeting 2 of PSM-WG (Hybrid)

27 September 2025

### Chair's Summary Report

---

---

#### Agenda Item 1. Welcome and Initial Remarks

1. The second Meeting of the Port State Measures Working Group (PSM-IWG2) was held in the margins of TCC21. The Chair of the Port State Measures Working Group, Meli Raicebe (Fiji), opened the meeting at 1.15 pm and welcomed participants and expressed his appreciation to the participants attending.
2. The Chair highlighted that this meeting would build on discussions at PSM-IWG1 held in March 2025 and followed WCPFC21's decision to conduct a systematic review of the Conservation and Management Measure CMM 2017-02, which establishes the minimum standards for Port State measures within WCPFC.
3. He also acknowledged the contributions of members that had assisted in the preparation of the discussion paper and stressed that the work aimed to assess the effectiveness of the CMM and its alignment with regional practices and other Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs). The Chair also highlighted the importance of this work given the majority of WCPFC members are now parties to the FAO Port State Measures Agreement (PSMA), noting this also allows lessons to be drawn from that experience.
4. The WG adopted the agenda without amendment (Attachment 1).

#### Agenda Item 2. Outcomes of PSM-WG1

5. The Chair reminded participants of the purpose of the review and the outcomes of the PSM-WG1 that provided CCM views on the focuses for the review.
  - a. Harmonization and standardization of data requirements with those of the PSMA.
  - b. Review of requirements in existing CMMs that relate to port State measures in order to maximize the linkages and ensure the CMMs are integrated.
  - c. Consideration of the scope of existing provisions of the measure relating to capacity building for SIDS and whether these were sufficient.
  - d. Identification of gaps in the current CMM and where additional detail would be useful, such as on port arrivals and denial of port access, and what inspections could cover.
  - e. 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.
  - f. Identification of implementation challenges and the applicability of the measure.

6. The Chair summarise these as the need to identify areas where the CMM diverges from or lacks consistency with the PSMA and with the measures adopted by other tuna RFMOs. Members were invited to assess gaps in coverage, inconsistencies in data-sharing provisions, and challenges that hinder implementation. Consideration also needs to be given to whether the measure is adequately integrated with other existing WCPFC CMMs, such as those on vessel markings, logsheet requirements, and transshipment. The working group was asked to recommend ways to harmonise these overlapping frameworks while ensuring that the unique needs of the region, especially SIDS, remain central.
7. The review sought to identify areas where the CMM diverges from or lacks consistency with the PSMA and with the measures adopted by other Tuna RFMOs. Members were invited to assess gaps in coverage, inconsistencies in data-sharing provisions, and challenges that hinder implementation. Consideration was also given to whether the measure is adequately integrated with other existing WCPFC CMMs, such as those on vessel markings, logsheet requirements, and transshipment. The working group was asked to recommend ways to harmonise these overlapping frameworks while ensuring that the unique needs of the region, especially SIDS, remain central.
8. The Chair noted CCM feedback to date shows different views on the challenges and applicability of the measure depending on whether it is from a flag CCM or a port CCM, resulting in a mixture of views on what should be covered in the review.
9. The Chair opened the discussion for any general points. The following points were raised:
  - Appreciation for the Chair’s report that reflected CCMs’ input but also noting limitations on participating at PSM-WG1 given other meetings.
  - Some CCMs emphasised the need for WCPFC port CCM minimum standards to be guided by the WCPO context rather than alignment with the PSMA to ensure they were practical for the region and its uniqueness.
  - There was a need to ensure changes to tighten port CCM measures did not prematurely cut across other areas of Commission work in relation to the control of at-sea transshipments and encouraging the use of SIDS ports. There was also a need to recognise where existing FFA/PNA arrangements already deliver effective control of foreign fleets; duplication or new mandatory standards may undermine them.
  - A regional focus on data sharing and access to data could strengthen port CCM management with any measures consistently applying to all members.
  - There was an openness expressed by some CCMs to discuss and consider specific proposals such as the designated ports and improved data exchange.

### Agenda Item 3. Discussion of analysis drawing on CCMs initial scope of review for more specific direction

10. The Chair introduced the discussion paper ([WCPFC-TCC21-2025 19A](#)) and sought CCM comment on each section to give more detailed guidance on each of the focus areas in light of evolving international frameworks and CCMs experiences in regional implementation of port measures. He noted the paper identified those CCMs that were parties to the PSMA and also

provided a high-level analysis was provided to support consideration of CMM 2017-02 in relation to frameworks in other tuna RFMOs and the FAO Port State Measures Agreement (Annex 1).

*Support for SIDS and developing states*

11. Key points from discussions included:

- a. It is important to consider existing measures in the regions that already provide control and are being implemented by SIDS, recognising the potential financial, technical and legal challenges that implementing any additional controls would create for SIDS is a central consideration, limiting the effective application of port measures.
- b. Mechanisms need to be put in place to address resource needs already affecting any implementation of national port measures - shortages of trained inspectors and other resources, and adequate legal frameworks.
- c. Support mechanisms that can provide operational funding, clear burden sharing and structured assistance are needed with the ability to track the capacity building and support.
- d. A need to consider transshipment controls at the same time to ensure any stricter port measures did not cut across obligations on CCMs to encourage SIDS port use.

*Port entry, arrivals and denial of access*

12. Key points from discussions included:

- a. Consideration of port entry procedures including advance notifications and denial of port entry with some members supported minimum standards on advance notification, to assist with current enforcement challenges when vessels fail to provide timely notice.
- b. Some CCMs supported aligning relevant Commission databases with GIES and the opportunity to discuss this approach to streamline data sharing to assist with challenges in managing vessel entry and arrivals.
- c. Some CCMs require near-real-time reporting from vessels they designate as high risk.
- d. There was a suggestion that consideration could be given to defining high risk cases that could provide information to support vessel inspections.
- e. Concerns were raised that mandatory denial provisions could conflict with unresolved obligations on transshipment at sea, and that further measures would be premature until progress is made in this area.
- f. Some members were open to considering the inclusion of port entry arrival conditions but not as mandatory provisions where there were already existing frameworks e.g. through FFA and PNA that provided strong controls. Several CCMs considered the focus should be on guidelines rather than binding obligations at this stage.

*Facilitating Access to WCPFC Data*

13. Key points from discussions included:

- a. CCMs discussed challenges in accessing data to support port entry assessments. Several CCMs, particularly FFA members, noted difficulties obtaining timely and complete non-public domain data, especially for vessels that had not operated in FFA waters despite paragraphs 5 and 19 of the Commission’s Data rules that allowed port CCMs access to data on vessels unloading in their ports. Some members proposed clarifying and strengthening CMM provisions to ensure port CCMs have clear access to relevant Commission data, including for Cooperating Non-Members.
- b. Participants highlighted the potential value of establishing an efficient communication platform between flag and port CCMs to enable faster data exchange, noting that current delays often mean a vessel must be allowed entry and then manual check made when the vessels arrive in port given a 72 hour turnaround time for decisions on port entry/denial.

*Inspection Standards and Scope*

14. Key points from discussions included:

- a. CCMs discussed challenges in accessing data to support port entry assessments. The Working Group discussed the possibility of establishing binding minimum inspection standards under a WCPFC framework, noting the need to consider how to balance any disincentives to vessels coming into ports.
- b. Current provisions were viewed by some members as incomplete and not fully aligned with international best practices and undermining the effectiveness of port measures implementation. If the port measures for WCPFC were not mandatory including the need for designated ports then this undermined the effectiveness port measures in the region.
- c. Proposals included defining minimum standards for inspections to ensure some consistency of inspection standards for vessel documents, fishing gear, catch, logbooks, and authorisations.
- d. Participants suggested harmonising inspection templates with those used under the PSMA and by other tuna RFMOs.
- e. Several members highlighted the need to define “high-risk” vessels, areas, and activities to better and provide some consistency of target inspections carried out across the regions port CCMs. There was some general agreement that clearer definitions of “high risk” could improve both the efficiency and effectiveness of the application of port measures and could assist in reducing the number of ‘ghost’ vessels over time.

*Reporting and data exchange*

15. Key points from discussions included:

- a. Members agreed that improving data exchange is central to the effectiveness of port measures for CCMs whether port, coastal or flag CCMs with information about vessels being and their prior activity being critical.
- b. Broad support was expressed for developing standardised reporting templates and electronic systems that could link WCPFC and PSMA databases.

- c. The FFA's electronic Port State Measures Reporting tool (e-PSM) was highlighted as a leading example, being one of only two globally connected directly to the PSMA system.
- d. Some participants considered there may be an option such as introducing near real-time reporting for high-risk cases, while others noted the need to resolve technical and definitional challenges before implementation and to fully consider the suite of approaches that could provide a useful addition to regional port measures.
- e. There was broad recognition that timely and reliable reporting is essential for identifying IUU activities and strengthening compliance across the region.

*Integration with other WCPFC CMMs/MCS tools*

16. Key points from discussions included:

- a. Members emphasized that port-related measures should complement, not operate separately from, existing CMM obligations, including those on vessel markings, observer coverage, and transshipment controls.
- b. Integration was viewed as important to reduce duplication and enhance coherence across the Commission's overall compliance framework.
- c. Participants highlighted the need for compatibility between data-sharing systems under the port CCM measures and other regional MCS tools to improve efficiency and information flow.

17. A summary of these points would be circulated to CCMs to facilitate further discussion with CCMs having more time to consider providing additional guidance on the focus for amendments to CMM 2017-02 to support preparation of the paper for WCPFC22.

**Agenda Item 5. Open Discussion on the Next Steps**

- 18. Given the limited time for review and discussion, members were encouraged to provide additional written inputs electronically before the next stage of discussions and to support the revision of the paper based on feedback at the PSM-IWG2.
- 19. The review process will continue intersessionally into the following year, with the aim of presenting proposed amendments for adoption by the Commission once consensus has been reached.
- 20. The Secretariat was tasked with compiling all feedback from the discussions into an updated version of the working paper. This revised document will incorporate both the substantive comments received and the technical proposals raised during the meeting and would be presented to the Commission with draft recommendations for progressing the review.
- 21. The Chair closed the meeting at 2.00 pm Pohnpei time.



**Western and  
Central Pacific  
Fisheries  
Commission**

**TECHNICAL AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE**

**Twenty-First Regular Session**

**24 September to 30 September 2025**

**Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia (Hybrid)**

---

**Adopted Agenda**

---

AGENDA

<b>PSMWG2: review of CMM 2017- 02 Port States Measure</b>		
<b>Agenda 1</b>	Welcome and initial remarks	Fiji
<b>Agenda 2</b>	Outcomes of PSM-WG1	Members
<b>Agenda 3</b>	Discussion of analysis drawing on CCMs initial scope of review for more specific direction	Members
<b>Agenda 4</b>	Open discussion on next steps	Members
<b>Agenda 5</b>	Summary and conclusion of meeting	Fiji

## Excerpt from Circular 2025/06

**Schedule for the review of WCPFC CMM 2017-02 for 2025  
Conservation and Management Measure on Port State Minimum Standards**

<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Detailed Activity</b>
<b>14th week of March</b>	First online meeting: Opportunity for CCMs to provide further comments on the current CMM and feedback on the draft work plan.
<b>Last week of March</b>	Circulation of summary of discussion and the identification of key areas of the review.
<b>Early April - late June</b>	Development of initial draft amendment text on CMM 2017-02
<b>23 - 30 September</b>	In-person meeting to discuss development as outcomes of WCPFC21.
<b>October</b>	Proposed online meeting to discuss post TCC development and progress of work plan and status of work.
<b>December</b>	Summary of progress to be presented to WCPFC22 and an opportunity for face-to-face meeting to progress the review and update the Work Plan as required.