The Commission for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean

FIRST BIGEYE TUNA MANAGEMENT WORKSHOP (BMW01)

Electronic Meeting
10:00 am – 2:00 pm (Pohnpei Time), 20 – 21 May 2026

CHAIRS' SUMMARY REPORT _Rev01[1]

[1] Rev01 – Amendments to Table 1 (Additional Candidate Performance Indicators).

Contents

The Commission for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean

FIRST BIGEYE TUNA MANAGEMENT WORKSHOP (BMW01)

Electronic Meeting
10:00 am – 2:00 pm (Pohnpei Time), 20 – 21 May 2026

CHAIR'S SUMMARY REPORT

Agenda Item 1 — Opening of the Meeting

1. The First Bigeye Tuna Management Workshop (BMW01) was convened virtually from 20–21 May 2026, following a decision[2] by the Commission at the Twenty-Second Regular Session of the Commission (WCPFC22) and the updated Harvest Strategy Workplan[3]. The workshop was chaired by the Scientific Committee Chair, Emily Crigler (USA).

2. The Chair opened the workshop and welcomed CCMs, observers, and the Pacific Community (SPC-OFP) – WCPFC Scientific Services Provider (SSP) and recalled that BMW01 serves as the principal forum for advancing the development of a management procedure (MP) for bigeye tuna in the western and central Pacific Ocean. She recalled the guidance provided by WCPFC22[4], and noted that the workshop would be the first of two scheduled sessions intended to provide structured technical guidance to SPC ahead of the Twenty-Second Regular Session of the Scientific Committee (SC22), with a second opportunity envisioned to occur after SC22, ultimately leading to the anticipated adoption of a bigeye MP at WCPFC23 in December 2026.

3. The objectives of BMW01 were introduced as: (i) reviewing progress on the Harvest Strategy Workplan as it relates to bigeye tuna; (ii) considering the mixed-fishery framework being applied across tropical tuna stocks; (iii) providing direction to SPC on the target reference point (TRP) options to be evaluated; (iv) providing direction on the design of the management procedure and the associated management strategy evaluation (MSE); and (v) considering operational and implementation arrangements associated with the future MP.

4. The provisional annotated agenda was adopted without amendment. The Chair invited CCMs to engage constructively, recalling that the workshop provided an opportunity to give SPC clear and timely guidance so that the analyses required to support decision-making at SC22 and WCPFC23 could be completed within the available timeframe.

Agenda Item 2 — Overview of the WCPFC Harvest Strategy Workplan

[2] See paragraph 465 of the WCPFC22 Summary Report
[3] See Attachment 24, WCPFC22 Summary Report
[4] See paragraphs 459 – 469 of the WCPFC22 Summary Report

5. The Chair presented an overview of the updated WCPFC Harvest Strategy Workplan and recalled that the workplan remains a "living document" that is reviewed and updated annually by the Commission to guide technical work and Commission decision-making for four key tuna stocks. The Chair explained that recent updates to the workplan were intended to better align the harvest strategy development schedules for three tropical tuna stocks so that management procedure outputs could be incorporated simultaneously into future tropical tuna measures. This included a one-time extension of the skipjack MP application period from three to four years to synchronize implementation schedules. The Chair also noted that similar harvest strategy work for yellowfin tuna would progress in parallel during 2026.

6. The Chair further outlined the planned meeting sequence for bigeye tuna MP development throughout 2026. BMW01 would provide initial feedback on MP design, with outcomes feeding into SC22 discussions on operating models, the estimation method, and performance of candidate MPs. A second workshop (BMW02) planned for after SC22 would then refine candidate MPs ahead of WCPFC23, where the Commission would seek to adopt both a bigeye tuna MP and a TRP. Looking ahead to 2027, the Chair explained that work would shift toward implementation, including the first operational run of the MP, adoption of a monitoring strategy, and negotiation of implementing arrangements through a new tropical tuna conservation and management measure.

7. Finally, the Chair recalled explicit guidance provided by WCPFC22 to the SSP on development of candidate bigeye tuna MPs. This included requests to develop MPs that influenced both tropical longline and purse seine fisheries (specifically FAD closure scenarios), assess 3-year management periods with 2-year data lags, and examine constraints to outputs between management periods. The Chair also highlighted the importance of sensitivity analyses addressing uncertainties in Indonesian, Philippine, and Vietnamese fisheries' catch levels, noting that these elements would underpin discussions throughout the workshop and future scientific evaluations.

Agenda Item 3 — Overview of the Mixed Fishery Framework

8. SPC introduced the mixed fishery framework underpinning the development of harvest strategies within the WCPFC. SPC explained that unlike skipjack and South Pacific albacore, whose catches are largely dominated by a single fishery, bigeye and yellowfin tuna involve significant mixed fishery interactions across purse seine, tropical longline, and domestic archipelagic fisheries. SPC outlined the current working assumption that the proposed bigeye tuna MP would primarily manage the tropical longline fishery, while overall effort in purse seine fisheries would continue to be managed through the skipjack MP. SPC also highlighted that further discussion would be needed regarding spatial boundaries, including the implications of the proposed 20°N–10°S tropical longline range and the adopted South Pacific albacore MP.

9. A CCM expressed concern with the assumption that fisheries should only be managed through a single MP and cautioned against overly rigid spatial separation of management arrangements. It also noted that existing and future MPs, including those for North Pacific albacore and Pacific bluefin tuna, would likely involve overlapping fisheries and management areas. This CCM further emphasized that current bigeye management applies across the entire Convention Area and questioned whether the proposed 20°N boundary was appropriate, particularly as it would split the Hawaii longline fishery.

10. A CCM sought clarification from SPC on how northern and southern longline catches would be treated within MSE analyses if only tropical longline fisheries were directly managed under the bigeye MP.

This CCM also asked whether decisions on the spatial range and fisheries covered by the MP would need to be finalized during the workshop or could remain open pending further analysis before SC22. SPC responded that developing multiple options would be challenging given the substantial analytical workload required prior to SC22.

11. Another CCM asked how the framework would account for purse seine fisheries, which SPC estimated accounts for approximately 45% of bigeye catch compared with 27% from tropical longline fisheries. This CCM highlighted concerns that management adjustments could place disproportionate pressure on tropical longline fisheries despite purse seine fisheries taking the larger share of bigeye catch. In response, SPC noted that alternative FAD closure periods could potentially be incorporated into the bigeye MP to influence purse seine catches of bigeye tuna, consistent with the guidance provided by WCPFC22.

12. Several CCMs supported the mixed fishery approach but expressed concern that the proposed 20°N–10°S spatial range might not align with existing arrangements under the Tropical Tuna Measure (TTM, CMM 2025-02).

13. Several CCMs similarly stressed the need for further work to understand how the bigeye MP would interact with existing flag-based catch limits, SIDS exemptions, and FAD closure arrangements.

14. A CCM welcomed the early workshop process and sought clarification on how the mixed fishery framework would address yellowfin tuna and whether revisions to stock assessment regions would affect harvest strategy discussions. This CCM also raised questions regarding regional catch distributions and future sensitivity analyses relating to archipelagic waters. SPC clarified that while yellowfin tuna would not have a dedicated MP under the current mixed fishery framework, the impacts of the skipjack, South Pacific albacore, and potential bigeye MPs on yellowfin would still be evaluated.

15. A CCM requested clarification regarding overlapping management areas between the South Pacific albacore MP and the proposed bigeye MP, particularly in relation to the purse seine FAD closure. SPC clarified that the 20°N–10°S boundaries applied only to longline fisheries and not to purse seine fisheries, which operate across the broader WCPO model area.

16. The Chair concluded the discussion by noting that these issues would be revisited in greater detail under Agenda 5.

Agenda Item 4 — Selection of the Target Reference Point

17. SPC introduced the discussion on TRPs for WCPO bigeye tuna, recalling that the Commission had previously identified three candidate TRPs based on average depletion levels from 2012–2015, corresponding to 32%, 34%, and 36% of unfished spawning biomass levels as estimated by the 2023 stock assessment.

    - 2012-2015 average spawning biomass depletion (currently estimated at 34%$SB_{F=0}$)
    - 0.94 x 2012-2015 average spawning biomass depletion (currently estimated at 32%$SB_{F=0}$)
    - 1.06 x 2012-2015 average spawning biomass depletion (currently estimated at 36%$SB_{F=0}$)

18. SPC explained that these candidate TRPs could either be treated as targets to be achieved on average or as threshold TRPs requiring a specified probability of remaining above that threshold. SPC noted that – based on the 2023 assessment results - the stock was projected to recover above these candidate TRPs under recent fishing levels. However, performance would ultimately be tested against a broader range of uncertainty through the operating models than was captured in the 2023 assessment. SPC further highlighted that the candidate TRPs were relatively close together, meaning that differences in some performance indicators under the different TRPs might be small.

18. A CCM asked how TRPs were intended to function within the MSE process, noting that management procedures and harvest control rules (HCRs) could be evaluated against multiple performance indicators and target levels. This CCM further queried why it was necessary to narrow the process to a single TRP and probability at this stage, particularly before the implications of the analyses were fully understood. SPC responded that the proposed approach would involve designing harvest control rules specifically to achieve the selected TRP either on average or at a defined probability level. SPC emphasized that narrowing the number of TRPs and probability combinations under consideration was necessary to reduce the analytical workload and reduce the volume of information presented to managers. This CCM subsequently indicated support for continuing to evaluate both target-based TRPs achieved on average (effectively 50% probability) alongside threshold-based approaches proposed by other CCMs.

19. One member, speaking on behalf of a group of members, proposed that SPC continue evaluating candidate TRPs as threshold-type reference points with a 65% probability of remaining above the threshold. Another member, speaking on behalf of another group of members, supported this proposal.

20. One CCM asked which performance indicators were likely to show meaningful differences across the three candidate TRPs and sought clarification on how declines in vulnerable biomass for tropical longline fisheries would translate into management measures such as catch limits. This CCM also proposed expanding the analysis to evaluate threshold probabilities across a broader range of 60%, 65%, and 70%.

21. SPC responded that it was too early to determine which indicators would show the greatest differences because the analyses based upon the operating model grid had not yet been completed. SPC explained that under the 2023 stock assessment results, achieving the lower depletion levels implied by the candidate TRPs could require higher fishing pressure, potentially reducing vulnerable biomass in longline fisheries. SPC agreed that evaluating 60–70% threshold probabilities was feasible, but requested that this analysis be limited to only one candidate TRP in order to manage the substantial workload associated with the bigeye MP process.

22. A CCM further suggested that the 32% unfished spawning biomass TRP be used as the basis for evaluating the 60%, 65%, and 70% threshold probabilities. Another CCM supported this suggestion, while emphasizing that a target-based TRP inherently implies a 50% probability of being above or below the target, making the choice between “target” and “threshold” essentially a choice about acceptable probability levels.

23. One CCM questioned whether introducing thresholds and probability ranges risked unnecessarily complicating the process, suggesting that a simple target-based approach might be easier for both the workshop and the Commission. However, this CCM also supported retaining a 50% probability

scenario within the analyses to allow direct comparison with the threshold-based approaches proposed by other CCMs.

24. Another CCM similarly noted that while threshold approaches could provide useful information during this early stage of development, a target-based approach would likely simplify future negotiations.

25. One CCM, speaking on behalf of a group of members, stressed the importance of limiting the analytical burden on SPC while still ensuring that the 32% TRP option was fully evaluated. They sought clarification on when additional TRP options would be evaluated if the current analysis focused on only one candidate TRP. SPC responded that the timing would depend on progress made before the planned BMW02 workshop and that prioritization of analyses might be necessary depending on the outcomes of the current discussions and available resources. SPC indicated that some additional analyses might only be available closer to the Commission meeting later in the year.

26. Following discussions, BMW01 agreed to the following (see also Table 1):

    BMW01 agreed that SPC should proceed with further evaluation of the three WCPFC21 candidate TRP levels as target TRPs:

    - **0.94 x 2012-2015 average spawning biomass depletion, as a target**
    - **0.94 x 2012-2015 average spawning biomass depletion with threshold of 60% and 70%**
    - **1.06 x 2012-2015 average spawning biomass depletion as a target**

27. In conclusion, the Chair observed that members had succeeded in narrowing the scope of the analysis to assist SPC's ongoing work ahead of SC22. The Chair thanked SPC and CCMs for what was described as a constructive and helpful discussion on one of the key policy decisions underpinning developments of the bigeye tuna MP.

Agenda Item 5 — Management Procedure Design and MSE Considerations

28. The most substantive component of the workshop was devoted to the design of the MP for bigeye tuna and the associated MSE specifications. SPC presented a structured set of decision points covering the spatial range of the MP, the shape of the harvest control rule, the choice of output controls, the management period, the treatment of fishing outside the MP control, the suite of performance indicators, the use of meta rules, and a number of supporting considerations including reference periods, robustness test, and exceptional circumstances. Discussions on each of these decision points are detailed below.

i. Spatial Range of the BET MP

29. The spatial range of the BET MP – i.e. the fisheries whose fishing levels were set by the MP - was a central focus of discussions. SPC presented several possible configurations and emphasized the need to narrow options to support analyses ahead of SC22 and WCPFC23. Initial discussions highlighted questions regarding the overlap area, interactions with the tropical tuna CMM, and consistency with the skipjack and South Pacific albacore MPs. An Observer delegation encouraged consideration of MP options encompassing as much of the bigeye stock range as possible to achieve stronger management outcomes.

30. The workshop discussed four principal spatial configurations: the original tropical longline area (20°N–10°S), a narrower 10°N–10°S option, a Tropical + Northern Longline approach, and the entire Convention Area. SPC highlighted that with elements of the Southern Longline fishery (longline fishery south of 10°S) being managed on effort, there would be potential conflicts to be worked through if the BET MP was implemented across the WCPO.

31. A CCM strongly supported the 10°N–10°S option, arguing that it best reflected the core tropical bigeye fishery and aligned with biological and operational characteristics, including spawning areas, thermocline depth, and tropical longline targeting patterns. This CCM further proposed limiting future evaluations to the 10°N–10°S option and the full Convention Area to reduce analytical complexity.

32. Some CCMs expressed reservations regarding the mixed-fishery approach and emphasized the need for compatibility with the existing TTM and zone-based management systems. Support was expressed for consideration of the WCPFC Convention Area, including the Southern longline area.

33. Some CCMs supported retaining the original 20°N–10°S tropical longline configuration. Concerns were raised that spatial boundaries constitute fundamental assumptions within the MSE framework and cautioned against narrowing the northern boundary without careful consideration as it would have implications for CCM vessels operating in the area. It was also noted that reducing the northern extent could exclude portions of the traditional tropical longline fishery.

34. A CCM supported the mixed-fishery concept as originally designed to minimize overlap and conflicting obligations between MPs, while acknowledging the need to consider northern boundary concerns and existing Southern longline arrangements.

35. The Chair noted continuing divergence among the four spatial options.

ii. Fisheries to be Managed Through the BET MP

36. SPC explained that fisheries covered by the BET MP would depend on the agreed spatial range. Under the proposed mixed-fishery approach, the BET MP would focus on the tropical longline fishery and purse seine impacts on bigeye through FAD closure duration. As a result, a candidate MP set for bigeye comprised a pair of HCRs (longline fishing, purse seine FAD closure duration).

37. Initial discussions explored interactions between fisheries and the differing management burden associated with alternative HCR pairings. SPC described “FAD-favored,” “intermediate,” and “longline-favored” approaches, noting that each could achieve similar stock outcomes while distributing management responsibility differently between longline and purse seine fisheries.

38. SPC reiterated that fisheries operating within the agreed spatial range would fall under the MP and again highlighted the potential conflicts with the Southern Longline fishery if the BET MP was implemented across the WCPO.

39. A CCM sought confirmation that purse seine FAD closures would form part of the BET MP framework, which SPC confirmed.

iii. General Shape and Operation of the HCR

40. Discussion on HCR design covered both conceptual structure and operational implications. SPC introduced a “hockey-stick” style HCR framework, consistent with the shape used for skipjack and South Pacific albacore, and explained that candidate HCRs would be developed using a “nuclear grid” approach evaluating defined combinations of tropical longline controls and purse seine FAD closure periods.

41. SPC described illustrative HCR pairings ranging from “FAD-favored” to “longline-favored” configurations, each intended to achieve agreed stock outcomes (specific target reference point) while distributing management burden differently across fisheries. One CCM requested clarification on the trade-offs among these pairings, particularly regarding stability, vulnerable biomass, and fishery distributional impacts. SPC advised that future MSE analyses would clarify these trade-offs.

42. Several CCMs discussed the severity and flexibility of purse seine controls under low stock conditions. Some CCMs requested consideration of stronger FAD closure responses, including closures longer than those currently illustrated.

43. One CCM sought clarification regarding whether closure timing (period of the year closed) could produce differing biological effects related to spawning or juvenile bigeye impacts. SPC advised that the present modelling essentially treated closure timing as equivalent.

44. On the matter of refined HCR operation, SPC proposed that longline outputs be expressed as actual bigeye catch tonnage while purse seine controls would be represented as FAD closure periods in weeks. A CCM requested clarification regarding the plateau portion of the HCR and the role of baseline catch levels within the analysis. SPC clarified that baseline periods would be used internally for tuning, but managers would ultimately receive catch tonnage outputs rather than scalar adjustments from a baseline catch level.

45. SPC also highlighted the rapidly increasing complexity of evaluations, noting that combinations of target reference points and associated probabilities, HCR preferences, spatial options, and FAD configurations could generate eighteen or more candidate scenarios. An Observer participant similarly raised concerns regarding computational complexity and the feasibility of evaluating multiple HCR pairings or transitions between pairings across management cycles. SPC advised that evaluations may therefore rely on representative and ‘extreme’ scenarios capturing a wider range of potential outcomes. Random walk approaches to model decision-making between management periods were also being considered.

iv. Duration of Management Period

46. Broad support emerged during the workshop for a three-year management period combined with a two-year data lag, consistent with approaches adopted under other WCPFC MPs. Support was expressed by a group of members and several members.

47. A CMM additionally emphasized the importance of safeguards and exceptional circumstance arrangements should major stock changes or invalid assumptions arise during a management cycle. SPC indicated that monitoring strategies and exceptional circumstances similar to those developed under the skipjack and South Pacific albacore MPs would certainly be needed.

48. The Chair observed that the three-year cycle with a two-year lag appeared to represent one of the clearest areas of convergence and suggested that this element could be treated as effectively agreed for future work.

v. Assumed Future Fishing Levels of BET in Fisheries Not Controlled by the BET MP

49. Substantive discussions took place on assumptions for fisheries outside direct MP control and their implications for MSE evaluations. A CCM requested sensitivity testing covering Northern and Southern longline, SIDS, domestic fisheries – ID, PH, VN, and other fisheries outside the MP, expressing concern that unrealistic assumptions could unintentionally shift management burdens toward tropical longline fisheries.

50. One member, speaking on behalf of a group of members,, supported sensitivity testing and emphasized that uncertainty should not result in disproportionate burdens being transferred to SIDS.

51. SPC confirmed that sensitivity analyses could be undertaken, although likely using representative scenario subsets rather than the full evaluation grid.

52. A CCM questioned assumptions for Northern and Southern longline fisheries, including differences between nominal catch and effort trends and the rationale for using effort assumptions linked to the South Pacific albacore MP. SPC explained that southern longline assumptions were intended to maintain compatibility with the South Pacific albacore MP outputs by translating expected albacore catches into associated longline effort assumptions to provide bigeye catch levels.

53. SPC further advised that fisheries outside the MP scope would still require assumptions within MSE evaluations. Existing arrangements, including the TTM and other MPs, would inform these assumptions, while domestic fisheries such as those in Indonesia would be examined through sensitivity and robustness analyses.

54. Additional discussion focused on the WCPFC–IATTC overlap area. One CCM requested clarification regarding whether overlap catches would be incorporated within MP outputs or treated separately. SPC clarified that fisheries in the overlap area would remain outside direct MP control and instead be treated as implementation considerations or external assumptions. One member, speaking on behalf of a group of members, further questioned how exceptional circumstances would be addressed if overlap catches exceeded assumptions used in evaluations. SPC acknowledged that such situations could trigger exceptional circumstance considerations, and noted that monitoring catches of bigeye tuna in the overlap area would be an important component of the monitoring strategy. SPC reiterated that the MP would generate overall longline output rather than allocation arrangements among CCMs.

vi. Candidate Performance Indicators

55. SPC introduced a suite of candidate performance indicators which received broad support from CCMs for the overall framework, with some discussion on further refinement.

56. One CCM highlighted trade-offs associated with stability, biomass, and distributional outcomes among HCR configurations, while one CCM, speaking on behalf of a group of members, emphasized the importance of scientifically robust estimation methods and cautioned against shifting

management objectives toward vulnerable biomass without explicit Commission direction, noting earlier focus on spawning stock biomass depletion targets.

57. Some CCMs questioned baseline reference periods used within the analyses. Concerns were raised regarding differing baselines between tropical longline and purse seine fisheries as well as potential distortions associated with COVID-19 years and earlier longline reduction decisions of the Commission. SPC responded that consistent application of baselines within a given HCR framework was more important than the specific year chosen because HCRs would ultimately be tuned to target reference points.

58. The Chair recalled broad support for SPC's proposed indicators but noted requests for further refinement, including separate metrics for purse seine and longline fishery impact, and potential inclusion of MSY-related indicators. One member, speaking on behalf of a group of members, requested clarification on longline effort variability metrics, and SPC confirmed that effort was currently represented in hundreds of hooks.

59. A CCM additionally stressed the need to narrow candidate MPs and provide clear instructions to support efficient SC consideration and eventual Commission decision-making.

vii. Output Controls of the BET MP

60. SPC proposed that longline outputs under the BET MP be expressed as actual bigeye catch in tonnage while purse seine outputs would be represented through FAD closure periods.

61. Discussion focused primarily on the operational expression of purse seine controls and the degree of flexibility needed.

62. One CCM preferred using days rather than weeks for FAD closures, arguing that days better reflect operational practice within the purse seine fishery.

63. A CCM similarly requested flexibility in closure ranges, particularly under deteriorating stock conditions.

64. SPC explained that modelling may initially employ coarser increments such as weeks, or multiples of weeks, to manage computational demands, while implementation could later use finer increments if desired by managers that could be interpolated from modelling results. SPC cautioned that finer increments substantially increase the number of MSE runs and associated workload.

viii. Meta Rules

65. Discussion of meta rules focused primarily on whether implementation constraints should be embedded directly within the MP or handled separately through implementation arrangements.

66. One CCM highlighted the importance of safeguards and exceptional circumstance provisions in the event of substantial stock changes or invalid assumptions during management cycles. Related concerns also emerged regarding overlap-area assumptions and the possibility of catches exceeding evaluated levels.

67. SPC noted the suggestion to postpone detailed meta-rule discussions or alternatively incorporate constraints such as ±10% limits on changes between management periods. SPC questioned whether such provisions should be hard coded into the HCR or instead addressed during implementation negotiations among CCMs. SPC observed that because allocation and implementation arrangements would ultimately involve negotiated outcomes, embedding these constraints within the MP itself may not be necessary.

Agenda Item 6 — Operational and Implementation Arrangements

68. The Chair outlined a proposed two-step framework for implementing the BET MP. The first component would be a "Management Procedure CMM," expected in 2026, which would establish the overall catch and effort limits based on agreed HCRs. This measure would include the core operational elements of the MP, including the objectives, scope, estimation method, monitoring strategy, and provisions for exceptional circumstances.

69. The second component would be an "Implementing CMM," anticipated for 2027, which would focus on operational implementation issues such as allocations, management rules, monitoring requirements, and guiding principles for applying MP outputs among CCMs and fleets. The Chair noted that implementation could potentially occur through the broader Tropical Tuna Measure framework.

70. Several CCMs emphasized the need to ensure consistency with existing management systems and avoid conflicts with other MPs, particularly the skipjack MP, South Pacific albacore MP, and existing Tropical Tuna Measure arrangements. SPC clarified that while the MP would generate overall catch or effort outputs, allocation arrangements would remain matters for future negotiation.

Agenda Item 7 — Administrative Matters

71. The Chair outlined the proposed next steps for progressing the BET MP process. The Chair explained that SC22 would review the updated bigeye tuna stock assessment, agree on the operating model, endorse the estimation method, and provide advice on the performance of candidate MPs and monitoring strategies. These scientific recommendations would then guide further refinement of candidate MPs at the second Bigeye Tuna Management Workshop (BMW02).

72. Noting the workload defined by BMW01, the SSP indicated the following work prioritization approach to ensure that SC22 had sufficient information available for technical review (see also Table 1):
    1) Evaluate the three candidate spatial ranges for one TRP level (e.g. 0.94 x 2012-2015 average spawning biomass depletion, 50% probability)
    2) Evaluate the four candidate TRP levels for one spatial range (e.g. the 20°N-10°S tropical longline, excluding the Hawaii longline fishery)
73. The Chair advised that BMW02 was planned for 1–2 October 2026 in Honolulu, Hawaii, hosted by the United States, with the objective of refining candidate BET MPs based on SC22 advice. The final objective of the overall process would be adoption of a BET MP and associated TRPs at WCPFC23 in December 2026. The presentation also highlighted an indicative 2026 workshop schedule linking BET and South Pacific albacore MP workstreams, including virtual options and implementation discussions throughout the year.

Agenda Item 8 — Other Matters

74. No other matters were discussed.

Agenda Item 9 — Review of BMW01 Agreed Points and Outcomes

75. The Chair reviewed the BMW01 outcomes and confirmed those at the workshop which are reflected in **Table 1**.

76. The Chair emphasized that SPC will deliver initial MSE results to SC22 in August 2026. BMW02 will be convened in person, hosted by the United States, in Honolulu on 1–2 October 2026, with a hybrid option. An additional virtual intersessional scientific committee meeting may be convened if required. The Commission will be invited to adopt the bigeye MP at WCPFC23 in December 2026, with an implementing measure to be developed in 2027 through a revision of CMM 2025-02.

Agenda Item 10 — Close of Meeting

77. The Chair thanked CCMs, Observers, and SPC for their constructive engagement throughout the two-day workshop and noted that the guidance provided to SPC would substantially enhance the prospects of bringing a robust BET MP forward for adoption at WCPFC23. The Chair further acknowledged and thanked the offer by the United States to host BMW02 in Honolulu in 1-2 October 2026.

78. The BMW01 adjourned at 3:03PM (PNI time) on 21 May 2026.

Table 1. Summary of BMW01 Decision Points

Decision Point	Outcome / Current Status	Further Requests / Follow-up
Spatial range of the bigeye MP	BMW01 agreed that SPC should evaluate three spatial options using one of the TRPs for each of the spatial ranges for consideration by SC22, and all of the TRPs for one of the spatial ranges for consideration by BMW02: **1. 20°N–10°S tropical longline;** **2. Convention Area-wide longline catch limit;** **3. 20°N–10°S tropical longline, excluding the Hawaii longline fishery.** BMW01 agreed that the overlap area should be distinguished from the core BET MP design and treated as an implementation adjustment rather than as a direct MP output. On that basis, the overlap area would be outside core MP control in evaluations but addressed when translating MP outputs into implementation arrangements.	SPC was requested to further consider technical and implementation implications of the spatial options, including the proportion of BET catch controlled under each option, relationship with existing MPs, and implications for implementation through the TTM.
Fisheries managed through the bigeye MP	BMW01 agreed that this decision will be dependent on the spatial range decision.	
Whether the defined bigeye TRPs are actual targets or are to be considered as thresholds & If the bigeye TRPs are to be considered as thresholds, specify the probability that spawning biomass depletion should be maintained above the thresholds	BMW01 agreed that SPC should proceed with further evaluation of two of the three WCPFC21 candidate TRP levels as target TRPs using a 50% probability formulation unless otherwise specified below: **1. 0.94 x 2012-2015 average spawning biomass depletion (currently estimated at 32%SBF=0)** **2. 0.94 x 2012-2015 average spawning biomass depletion (currently estimated at 32%SBF=0) with threshold of 60% and 70%** **3. 1.06 x 2012-2015 average spawning biomass depletion (currently estimated at 36%SBF=0)**	

General shape and operation of the HCR	BMW01 agreed that SPC should proceed with evaluating a Hillary Step-style HCR for the BET MP.	SPC was requested to evaluate a broader range of purse seine FAD closure/open period options than the current 0–3-month closure range, including options that provide greater flexibility if the stock declines. Some CCMs requested that broader possible FAD closure/open period options be reflected in further evaluations. SPC was also requested to clearly present how the longline catch scalar translates into absolute catch limits at the Hillary Step plateau and other parts of the HCR.
Duration of management period	BMW01 agreed that the BET MP should use a three-year management period with a two-year data lag.	SPC should proceed with further analyses on this basis. The three-year cycle should be used for candidate MP evaluations, with the MP run in one year and limits applying for the following three-year management period.
Assumed future fishing levels of BET in fisheries not controlled by the BET MP	BMW01 agreed that fisheries not controlled directly by the BET MP should generally be assumed to remain at fixed recent catch levels for evaluation purposes. BMW01 noted that assumptions depend on the spatial range option being evaluated. Where a fishery is outside MP control under the spatial option, SPC should use fixed catch or effort assumptions for that fishery.	SPC was requested to use recent catch and effort levels where possible, clearly explain why any reference period is selected, avoid selecting periods that disadvantage a sector or fishery, and test alternative assumptions for fisheries outside MP control. SPC was also requested to distinguish outcomes caused by the BET MP itself from outcomes driven by fisheries outside MP control, and to avoid embedding outside-MP effects within controls applied to tropical longline fisheries.
Candidate performance indicators	BMW01 agreed that SPC should use the following candidate performance indicators for BET MP evaluations: 1. Stock status in the WCPFC-CA (SB/SBF=0); 2. Proximity to the TRP, with threshold TRPs reported as probability of being above the TRP; 3. Probability that SB/SBF=0 is below the LRP;	Candidate performance indicators

	4. Expected BET catch for fisheries managed through the BET MP, reported separately for LL and PS where feasible; 5. Expected vulnerable biomass for LL fisheries managed through the BET MP, as a proxy for catch rates; 6. Catch variability for fisheries managed through the BET MP, separated for LL and PS where feasible; 7. Effort variability for fisheries managed through the BET MP, separated for LL and PS where feasible; 8. F relative to FMSY; 9. MSY; and 10. Metrics for purse seine and longline fishery impact.	SPC was requested to evaluate candidate performance indicators that characterize fishery impacts separately for purse seine and longline fisheries. SPC indicated that generating these indicators from the available model outputs would be technically challenging, and further consideration would be necessary to determine what would be feasible for presentation during SC22.
Output controls of the bigeye MP	BMW01 agreed that BET MP evaluations should proceed using longline catch limits as the longline output control and purse seine FAD closure period as the purse seine output control. BMW01 noted that the longline output should be expressed as catch, particularly if the BET MP spatial range covers the full Convention Area. BMW01 also noted that implementation may differ from the MP output; for example, although the MP output may be catch-based, some fisheries, including in PNA waters, may be implemented through effort-based arrangements such as the VDS.	Output controls of the bigeye MP
Meta-rule(s) for evaluation	BMW01 did not agree on specific meta-rules or constraints on the maximum change in fishing pressure between management periods at this stage.	Meta-rule(s) for evaluation