



**TECHNICAL AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE
TWENTY-SECOND REGULAR SESSION**

23-29 September 2026

Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia (Hybrid)

Reports on CMM 2024-02 (MCS Measures for Pacific Bluefin Tuna)

WCPFC-TCC22-2026-11

17 August 2026

Submitted by the Secretariat

Purpose

1. The purpose of this paper is to support TCC's consideration of the following task in paragraph 4 of CMM 2024-02:

4. The Technical and Compliance Committee (TCC) and the Northern Committee (NC) shall separately review the implementation of monitoring, control and surveillance measures reported by CCMs in accordance with this CMM by 2026 and based upon the results of such review, provide recommendations to the Commission.

Background

2. The stated purpose of [CMM 2024-02](#) is to establish a regime for the monitoring and control of the conservation and management of the Pacific bluefin tuna fishery in the WCPO set out in [CMM 2024-01](#) (CMM 2024-02 paragraph 1).
3. The task assigned to TCC under paragraph 4 of CMM 2024-02, relates specifically to the reporting requirements outlined in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the same measure. These provisions are reproduced in the box below for ease of reference:

2. Each CCM that has Pacific bluefin tuna fisheries and/or farming shall report to the Executive Director by 15 June each year on the implementation of its monitoring and control measures it has taken in the previous calendar year to ensure its compliance with CMM2024-01 that include the following components:

(1) Monitoring and control measures for fisheries

- a. Registration of commercial fishing vessels that are authorized to fish for Pacific bluefin tuna (including the WCPFC RFV in accordance with CMM 2018-06 on WCPFC Record of Fishing Vessels and Authorization to Fish)*
- b. Registration of set nets that are authorized to fish for Pacific bluefin tuna (including registration scheme, number of registered set nets)*

- c. Allocation of catch limits by fishery within the CCMs, where such allocation exist
- d. Reporting requirements for catches for fisheries (targeted, incidental, and discards)
- e. Measures to monitor catch (e.g. landing receipts, landing inspection, observer program, etc.)
- f. Measures to monitor landings (including CMM 2017-02 on Minimum Standards for Port State Measures)
- g. Measures to monitor domestic transactions

(2) Monitoring and control measures for farming

- a. Registration of farms that are authorized to farm Pacific bluefin tuna (including registration scheme, number of registered farms, number of registered 'holding pens' or 'cages')
- b. Reporting requirements for caging of fish
- c. Reporting requirements for harvest of farmed fish
- d. Measures to monitor farming activities (including Rules, standards, and procedures to monitor transfer and caging activities)

3. CCMs that do not have Pacific bluefin tuna fisheries and/or farming, shall report to the WCPFC Secretariat annually any by-catches of Pacific bluefin tuna under paragraph 9 of CMM 2024-01.

NC22 and JWG-11 outcomes

4. Discussions on CCMs' reports on CMM 2024-02 were recorded in the *Chairs' Summary from the Co-Chairs of the 11th Session of the Joint IATTC and WCPFC-NC Working Group Meeting on the Management of Pacific Bluefin Tuna (JWG-11)*. This *Chairs' Summary* is Attachment 3 to the [NC22 Summary Report](#).
5. At NC22, Japan introduced "[Draft Implementation Table to Improve Monitoring of Catch Limits for Pacific Bluefin Tuna](#)" to improve monitoring of PBF catch limits, developed in response to a recommendation in the 2025 Compliance Monitoring Report. Following discussion, NC22 agreed to encourage relevant CCMs to use the template for future implementation reporting.
6. The relevant excerpts from the NC22 Summary Report and the JWG-11 Chairs' Summary Report are provided in Annexes 1 and 2 to this paper.

2026 Reports on CMM 2024-02

7. There are ten (10) 2026 Reports on CMM 2024-02 which are presented for review by TCC:
 - i. **Canada** | [JWG-11-DP02](#)
 - ii. **China** | [JWG-11-DP03](#)
 - iii. **Cook Islands** | [JWG-11-DP04](#)
 - iv. **Fiji** | [JWG-11-DP05](#)
 - v. **Japan** | [JWG-11-DP06](#)
 - vi. **Korea** | [JWG-11-DP07](#)
 - vii. **Philippines** | [JWG-11-DP08](#)
 - viii. **Chinese Taipei** | [JWG-11-DP09](#)
 - ix. **United States** | [JWG-11-DP10](#)
 - x. **Vanuatu** | [JWG-11-DP11](#)

Recommendation

8. TCC22 is invited to:
 - a. review the implementation of the monitoring, control, and surveillance measures reported by CCMs pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of CMM 2024-02; and
 - b. based on that review, provide any recommendations to the Commission on the implementation of CMM 2024-02, in accordance with paragraph 4 of the measure.



**COMMISSION FOR THE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF
HIGHLY MIGRATORY FISH STOCKS IN THE WESTERN AND CENTRAL PACIFIC OCEAN
NORTHERN COMMITTEE
TWENTY-SECOND REGULAR SESSION
Nagasaki, Japan (Hybrid)
13 – 14 July 2026
SUMMARY REPORT**

CMM for the Monitoring, Controlling and Surveillance of PBF (CMM 2024-02)

22. Without significant progress in discussion on MP and the new CMM, no modification to the CMM of MCS was proposed.
23. Japan introduced a draft implementation table to improve monitoring of PBF catch limits (WCPFC-NC22-2026-DP02), developed in response to a recommendation in the 2025 Compliance Monitoring Report that the NC improve processes for tracking carryover and transfers between small and large fish catch limits. Japan explained that the table, comprising separate small and large fish components, would record initial catch limits, overage/underage, transfers with the applicable conversion factor, and resulting compliance.
24. The USA and Chinese Taipei supported the proposal, with the USA suggesting members be encouraged to use the table voluntarily pending a management procedure and implementation measure, and Chinese Taipei recommending it be used by all CCMs, including for bycatch reporting. Fiji raised a technical question on the operation of the carryover provision, noting that while the CMM limits the annual amount of carryover, it does not appear to specify whether previously carried over quota may continue to be rolled forward across successive years if it remains unused. Fiji sought ISC advice on whether iterative carryover could have implications for realized fishing mortality or the projected stock trajectory, particularly noting that the paper presented at JWG-10 on future projections did not explicitly model the carryover provision, and asked whether this may warrant future evaluation.
25. On the understanding that Fiji's intervention was relating to the calculation of carryover under the current CMM, the Chair asked Japan to clarify the carryover point in writing for inclusion with the proposed table. No further discussion took place on the scientific aspect of Fiji's question, which remained for future consideration. The NC agreed to encourage the relevant CCMs to use the template for future implementation reporting (**Attachment 4**).

**JOINT IATTC AND WCPFC-NC WORKING GROUP MEETING ON THE
MANAGEMENT OF PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA
ELEVENTH SESSION (JWG-11)**

8 – 11 July 2026
Nagasaki, Japan (Hybrid)

**CHAIRS' SUMMARY OF THE 11TH JOINT IATTC AND WCPFC-NC WORKING GROUP MEETING ON
THE MANAGEMENT OF PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA**

IATTC-NC-JWG11-2026-00

AGENDA ITEM 3 REPORTS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA MEASURES

9. The JWG reviewed WCPFC and IATTC members' implementation reports regarding CMM 2024-01, CMM 2024-02, Resolution C-24-02, and Resolution C-24-03.
10. Mexico asked why the number of Japanese artisanal vessels conducting PBF fishing was increasing, and whether this raised concerns about Japan's commitment to limit age-0 fish mortality. Japan responded that 19,661 artisanal vessels conducted PBF fishing in 2025, an increase from 2024 but still well below the 2015 baseline of 24,086 vessels, and that it continued to manage fishing effort in line with WCPFC CMMs. It also stressed its efforts to reduce age-0 catch below 50% of 2002-2004 levels.
11. Korea asked how Japan controls catch limits for artisanal and set net fisheries between monthly reporting cycles, whether set net operators are compensated for releasing PBF, and what quantitative results exist on release success. Japan responded that prefectures issue cautions at around 70–85% of limits, that compensation exists for time spent releasing PBF but budgets are quickly exhausted, and that release estimates remain unreliable due to recapture in adjacent nets and the difficulty to count live released fish.
12. Fiji requested clarification on the application of the 17% carryover provision, specifically whether it is calculated on initial catch limits or on limits already adjusted for prior carryover, and whether carried over amounts could themselves be carried over again. Japan responded that the carryover is calculated based on initial catch limits only, excluding unused or previously carried-over amounts, and noted that it had tabled an implementing table to clarify this calculation.
13. Japan asked Korea how it manages recreational PBF catch and how many of its 159 registered set nets caught PBF. It also asked, referring to news carried by Korean media during last year's meeting in Toyama, whether an alleged 1,300 PBF reportedly caught in a single Korean set net and diverted to livestock feed were counted against its limit. Korea responded that it does not regulate recreational PBF fisheries due to their low level of catch and early development, reporting 615 PBF caught last year. Korea confirmed all 159 set nets caught PBF. As for the large catch of PBF reported last year, Korea stated that 181.6 metric tons of discarded PBF were

counted against its catch limit, fish caught in the set net were also counted against the catch limit, and because the fish were dead and unfit for human consumption they were sold as livestock feed.

14. The USA asked which fisheries produced Korea's reported age-0 catch and whether survey data reflected full fleet coverage. Korea responded that no formal coverage requirement exists and that the figure is based on purse seine port sampling and field surveys, which it is working to expand to set nets. Korea also described set net release pilot projects, including a 2023 trial on release techniques, ongoing work on live release and avoidance, and electronic monitoring, noting that one set net currently participates.
15. Japan asked Mexico about the poor migration and smaller PBF observed in the eastern Pacific in 2025 and changes thereafter, and how it manages recreational catch, noting its apparent small scale relative to the USA. Mexico responded that its recreational fishery is limited to two fish per person per day and is largely conducted and monitored by the USA. It added that the average size of purse seine catch is about 150 cm in length, reflecting a preference for larger fish, and that vessels avoided predominantly small fish schools, ceasing fishing at the end of the 2026 season after encountering mostly small fish.
16. The USA asked about the composition of Mexico's artisanal fleet and whether PBF bycatch occurs in other fisheries. Korea asked whether the fleet operates under a separate limit, what size classes it catches, and how reported catch is verified. Mexico responded that artisanal vessels are 10–12 meters in length, operate without observers, and are allocated 300 metric tons with a 15-metric-ton per vessel limit, monitored through logbooks and inspectors. Mexico added it does not know the size composition but expects smaller fish than purse seine catch, and that discards are likely negligible.
17. Korea asked Chinese Taipei how many of its 502 registered longline vessels caught PBF, whether they target or incidentally catch PBF, whether management uses an individual quota or Olympic-style system, whether its catch table includes only retained fish over 30 kg or also discards, and how discards are monitored. Chinese Taipei responded it would follow up on vessel numbers, but confirmed that fishing is seasonal and operates under an Olympic-style system together with an individual tag-based system introduced in 2025 after exceeding catch limits in 2024; it added that fish under 30 kg cannot be retained and no discard was reported last year, thus they are not included in the catch table.
18. Japan asked how Chinese Taipei manages and monitors recreational and sport catch under its TAC and CDS system, including total catch, while Korea asked whether sport-caught PBF must be tagged. Chinese Taipei responded that such catch is subject to catch limit for other fisheries with none reported last year, and is subject to landing declarations; it confirmed tagging is required for landing to monitor catch and landing time and weight.
19. Japan asked the USA to confirm its 2025 catch limit and actual catch, questioned low utilization, and noted that despite an 80% reduction in the recreational bag limit, recreational catch had increased by about 800% from the baseline in the IATTC measure in 2014 to 2,000 metric tons in 2023, asking how this would be controlled. The USA responded that 2025 catch was affected by

poor migration and small fish size and that it is exploring ways to revitalize its fishing fleets; it added that the bag limit reduction was under a superseded measure and that it remains compliant with requirements to manage recreational catch in line with commercial fisheries.

20. Korea asked the USA whether recreational catch and licensing are subject to any total regulatory limit beyond bag and trip limits, whether recreational catch is monitored against an in-season control comparable to the commercial system, and how misidentification of PBF in the American Samoa longline fishery is verified and addressed. The USA responded that it does not maintain additional total limits beyond bag and trip limits, but tracks recreational catch in near-real time on a monthly basis; it added that while American Samoa longline data previously relied on paper logbooks, delaying follow-up on discrepancies, recently implemented electronic reporting enables faster review.
21. Japan asked Australia to clarify how its 2025 catch limit relates to the CMM, including whether its reported 4 metric ton overcatch would be deducted from the following catch limit or how much underage was carried over under CMM 2024-01. Australia's response is attached **(Attachment D)**.
22. No further discussions were held on the reports submitted by other members.