



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

23-29 September 2026

Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia (Hybrid)

Reference Paper Related to Harvest Strategy Development for TCC22

WCPFC-TCC22-2026-20

31 August 2026

Submitted by the Secretariat

Purpose

1. The purpose of this paper is to support TCC22's consideration of harvest strategy matters relevant to the work of TCC. The paper presents relevant outcomes from WCPFC22, SC22, NC22, and intersessional harvest strategy processes.
2. TCC22 is invited to:
 - a. review and provide input into the *Skipjack Monitoring Strategy*;
 - b. review and provide guidance on the development of the *South Pacific albacore Monitoring Strategy*; and
 - c. review relevant outcomes from WCPFC22, SC22, NC22, and intersessional harvest strategy processes, and provide technical and compliance-related advice relevant to the development and implementation of harvest strategies.

Skipjack tuna

3. TCC21 welcomed the presentation on Harvest Strategy development and requested the SSP to continue monitoring the trends between effort and catch in the purse seine fishery, including effort creep, and to report these trends to TCC22 in 2026.
4. TCC21 reviewed information prepared by the SSP presenting information about the performance and outputs of the Skipjack MP, compared to the 2024 levels for three fishery components: Purse seine (including Archipelagic Waters) effort, Pole and line effort, Domestic Archipelagic Waters catch (refer [TCC21-2025-IP04 rev1](#) Table 16). TCC21 noted that the information indicated that in 2024 the catch or effort in the fisheries subject to the Skipjack MP were below the levels specified by the MP for 2024-2026. Based on the discussion and information available, including Table 16 of [TCC21-2025-IP04 rev1](#), TCC21 made updates to the *Skipjack Monitoring Strategy*.
5. At WCPFC22, the Commission agreed to a one-time extension of the current skipjack Management Procedure application period from 3 to 4 years so the Management Procedure would be run in 2027, not 2026, with consequential changes every subsequent three-year period. The Commission agreed to amend the Table in paragraph 8, paragraph 11, and paragraph 12 of CMM 2022-01 to reflect this decision and adopted CMM 2025-03, which supersedes CMM 2022-01 ([WCPFC22 Outcomes Attachment 20](#)).
6. The [TCC Workplan 2025-2027](#) indicates that TCC22 will review and provide input into the *Skipjack Monitoring Strategy* on an annual basis. The *Skipjack Monitoring Strategy*, including the template for recording TCC22 inputs, is reproduced below.
7. Relevant SC22 outcomes are reproduced below:

SC22	22nd Regular Session of the Scientific Committee Skipjack tuna monitoring strategy - SC22 Paper: WCPFC-SC22-2026-MI-WP09 SC22 reviewed information available to SC22 on SKJ. SC22 agreed that there is no information preventing the implementation of the SKJ MP. SC22 requested that pending development of a mixed fishery monitoring strategy, stock status of BET and YFT should be reported in relation to the interim management objective to maintain those stocks at or above the average spawning biomass depletion for the period 2012-2015. SC22 requested SSP evaluate exceptional circumstances for each MP when evaluating monitoring strategy and provide update to SC. SC22 recommended SSP convert the monitoring table into an action log with owners, due dates, evident, and clear triggers. Effort data analysis Noting that TCC21 requested the SSP to continue monitoring the trends between effort and catch in the purse seine fishery, including effort creep, and to report those trends to TCC22, SC22 agreed to forward WCPFC-SC22-2026-MI-IP01 and WCPFC-SC22-2026-MI-IP05 to TCC22. (ref: SC22 Outcomes, paragraph 107-109 and 119)
------	---

Skipjack tuna monitoring strategy

Table 1: Monitoring strategy for the skipjack Management Procedure (CMM 2022-01).

1. Review of MP performance		
a. Comparison of predicted MP performance against latest stock assessment outcomes		
SC	TCC	Commission
Regularly review/check the performance and outputs of the MP, including the indicators set out in Annex III of CMM 2022-01 and provide advice to the Commission on: a) The performance of the MP in managing skipjack tuna to achieve defined objectives including the TRP. This includes the robustness of the MP to changes in the fishery and any exceptional circumstances consistent with Annex IV of CMM 2022-01. b) The application of the MP outputs to CMM 2023-01. SC19: With the first implementation of the MP in 2024, the stock assessment in 2025 will be the first in which the impact of the MP on stock status will be experienced. Only one year of MP implementation will be included in that assessment and it will therefore provide only a preliminary measure of performance. The MSE predicted outcomes of the adopted MP and the 2022 stock assessment show good correspondence with assessed status for the most recent years but some departure for the historical period.	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: a. Catch and effort levels for all fisheries subject to the MP relative to maximum levels specified under the most recent output of the MP. b. 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. TCC20: Additional information on relevant catch and effort for the fisheries subject to the MPs will be needed by TCC. TCC21: reviewed information prepared by the Scientific Services Provider presenting performance and outputs of the MP, compared to the 2024 levels for three fishery components: Purse seine (incl AW) effort, pole and line effort, domestic catch (ref TCC21-2025-IP04_rev1 Table 16). TCC21 noted that the	WCPFC20: Noted the successful running of the MP as outlined in SC19-MI-WP-01 WCPFC22: The Commission agreed to a one-time extension of the current skipjack Management Procedure application period from 3 to 4 years so the Management Procedure would be run in 2027, not 2026, with consequential changes every subsequent three-year period. The Commission agreed to amend the Table in paragraph 8, paragraph 11, and paragraph 12 of CMM 2022-01 to reflect this decision and adopted CMM 2025-03.

SC20: No new information SC21: The 2025 stock assessment (SC21-SA-WP-02) includes only 1 year of data (2024) under MP implementation and therefore provides a preliminary measure of MP performance. The 2025 stock assessment indicates the recent stock depletion is close to the recalibrated TRP and is within the range expected through the MSE testing of the interim skipjack MP. SC22: Updated projections indicate relative stability of stock depletion in the future when recent (2025) conditions are assumed.	information indicated that in 2024 the catch or effort in the fisheries subject to the MP were below the levels specified by the MP for 2024-2026. Additional information on the trends between effort and catch in the purse seine fishery, including effort creep will be needed by TCC	The Commission endorsed the consolidated updates to the skipjack monitoring strategy
b. Data availability to run the MP		
SC	TCC	Commission
Check availability, quantity and quality of data necessary to run the MP (e.g. the estimation method) SC19: Sufficient data were available to run the MP. However, declining effort in the pole and line fishery in some regions (e.g. tropical region) and consequent reduction of informative CPUE data represents a risk to the future performance of the MP. A re-evaluation of the estimation method may need to be undertaken prior to the next implementation of the MP. High priority SC20: The effect of changes made to the historical data is not known.	Check availability, quantity and quality of data necessary to run the MP (e.g. the estimation method) TCC20: No new information	WCPFC20: Noted that a re-evaluation of the estimation method may need to be undertaken prior to the next implementation of the MP.

c. Other sources of data to monitor performance		
SC	TCC	Commission
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.) SC19: No new information noted at SC19. SC20: No other sources of data have been identified.	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.) TCC20: No new information	
d. Performance of the estimation method (EM)		
SC	TCC	Commission
Confirm the EM is performing well and not subject to estimation failure. SC19: Overall the EM performed well and provided estimates of stock status within the prediction range of the MSE.	No input anticipated.	
2. Review of the MP design		
a. Management objectives		
SC	TCC	Commission
No input anticipated.	No input anticipated.	Review the TT-CMM, taking account of the outputs of the SKJ MP. Check that overall objectives of the MP remain appropriate. Revise catch and effort limits for 2024-06 as necessary. WCPFC20: CCM requests for further work to better align the skipjack MP with the TT-CMM.

b. Scope of the management procedure		
SC	TCC	Commission
Confirm the fisheries controlled by the MP, and the method of control, remains appropriate SC19: No new information at the time of SC19. SC20: No change.	Confirm the fisheries controlled by the MP, and the method of control, remains appropriate TCC20 No new information	Confirm the fisheries controlled by the MP, and the method of control, remains appropriate
c. Exceptional circumstances		
SC	TCC	Commission
Provide technical advice to identify the occurrence of exceptional circumstances (see CMM 2022-01 Annex IV) and review, modify or replace the MP as appropriate. SC19: None identified. SC20: None identified.	Provide technical advice to identify exceptional circumstances (see CMM 2022-01 Annex IV) and recommend remedial action where necessary. TCC20: No new information	Identify the occurrence of exceptional circumstances (see CMM 2022-01 Annex IV) and review, modify or replace the MP as appropriate.
3. Review of MSE		
a. Operating model grid		
SC	TCC	Commission
Ensure the most important sources of uncertainty are included in the OM grid. SC19: OM grid to be extended to include climate change scenarios (robustness set). In particular the effects of warm pool expansion in the WCPO. This requires further analysis of SEAPODYM outputs and may occur over an extended time frame. Medium priority Further investigation of the OM grid is suggested to investigate the lack of overlap in estimates of stock status for the historical period. These issues will be considered for inclusion when the current MP is reviewed. Low priority	No input anticipated.	

SC20: Impacts of changes to FAD closure period from 2024 should be investigated and where necessary the OM grid modified to better represent fishery dynamics.		
b. Calculation of performance indicators		
SC	TCC	Commission
Check that performance indicators adequately represent management objectives SC19: No new information at the time of SC19.	No input anticipated.	
c. Modelling assumptions		
SC	TCC	Commission
Consider the technical details of the simulation and testing framework SC19: While no major issues are identified, any re-evaluation of the skipjack EM (identified under 1.2) may require a re-evaluation of the modelling framework	No input anticipated.	
d. Data availability to support the MSE framework		
SC	TCC	Commission
Identify any improvements in data collection to either enhance the OM framework or reduce uncertainty included in the OM grid.	No input anticipated.	

Table 2: Schedule for the implementation and review of the skipjack MP (from CMM 2025-03)

Year	Science Services Provider	Scientific Committee	Commission
2023	Run the MP (using data to 2022). Support the SC and Commission consideration of the MP	Provide advice to the Commission on the MP outputs for the period 2024-2026	Review the Tropical Tuna CMM, taking into account the output of the MP. Revise catch and effort related limits for 2024-2026
2024		Data to monitor performance of the MP not available in first year of implementation.	Apply Tropical Tuna CMM
2025	Perform full stock assessment (with data up to and including 2024).	Review performance of the MP including potential exceptional circumstances and advise Commission.	Apply Tropical Tuna CMM. Review the performance and use of the MP.
2026		Monitor the performance of the MP using available data to 2025.	Apply Tropical Tuna CMM.
2027	Run the MP (using data to 2025). Support SC and Commission consideration of the MP.	Monitor the performance of the MP using available data to 2026. Provide advice to Commission on the MP outputs for the next management period (2027-2029).	Review the Tropical Tuna CMM, taking into account the output of the MP. Revise catch and effort related provisions for 2028-2030
2028	Perform full stock assessment (with data up to and including 2027).	Review performance of the MP including potential exceptional circumstances and advise Commission.	Apply Tropical Tuna CMM. Review the performance and use of the MP.
2029		Monitor the performance of the MP using available data to 2028.	Apply Tropical Tuna CMM.
2030	Run the MP (using data to 2029) Support SC and Commission consideration of the MP.	Monitor the performance of the MP using available data to 2029. Provide advice to Comm. on the MP outputs for the next management period (2027-2029).	Review the Tropical Tuna CMM, taking into account the output of the MP. Revise catch and effort related provisions for 2031-2033

South Pacific albacore tuna

8. At WCPFC22, the Commission adopted [CMM 2025-01](#) on a Management Procedure for South Pacific Albacore Tuna. The Commission agreed to progress an Implementing Measure through the SPA-IWG activities in 2026, taking into account the proposal from FFA members contained in [WCPFC22-2025-02b](#) and noting the need for flexibility in developing implementing arrangements for South Pacific albacore management. The Commission also adopted the Terms of Reference for a South Pacific albacore allocation workshop (SPAA01) ([WCPFC 22 Outcomes, Attachment 18](#)).
9. The First Joint IATTC-WCPFC Working Group on South Pacific Albacore Tuna (SPAJWG01) was held virtually on 18–19 March 2026. The Joint Working Group considered the WCPFC South Pacific albacore Management Procedure, overlap area arrangements and the development of compatible management measures between the two RFMOs.
10. The First South Pacific Albacore Allocation Workshop (SPAA01) was held in Wellington, New Zealand, on 25–26 June 2026. SPAA01 considered allocation and implementation arrangements for the South Pacific albacore Management Procedure, including MCS matters. The Workshop recommended that the MCS provisions in [US DP01](#) and [FFA IP02](#) be referred to the TCC Chair for consideration at TCC22. SPAA02 is scheduled to be held virtually on 22 October 2026 to continue consideration of the allocation framework and implementing measure.
11. SC22 subsequently considered the first operational run of the South Pacific albacore Management Procedure and the South Pacific albacore Monitoring Strategy. SC22 agreed that there was no information preventing implementation of the Management Procedure and that no modification to the South Pacific albacore Monitoring Strategy table was necessary at this time.
12. The [TCC Workplan 2025–2027](#) provides for TCC22 to consider the South Pacific albacore Monitoring Strategy and provide advice relevant to the implementing CMM to be adopted by WCPFC23.
13. The *South Pacific albacore Monitoring Strategy* identifies matters relevant to TCC consideration, including catch and effort relative to the output of the Management Procedure; allocation through the implementing measure; the quality of information and data gaps relevant to monitoring implementation; and implementation arrangements. The Monitoring Strategy, including the suggested tables of responsibilities for SC, TCC and the Commission, is reproduced below for TCC22 consideration.
14. Relevant SC22 outcomes, SPAA01 recommendations, and SPAJWG01 recommendations and taskings are reproduced below.

SC22, SPAA01, & SPAJWG01	22nd Regular Session of the Scientific Committee South Pacific albacore management procedure – run SC22 reviewed the results of the first SPALB MP run provided by SSP. SC22 noted that the EM of the SPALB MP has successfully run. In accordance with CMM 2025-01, SC22 advised the Commission that the output of the adopted SPALB MP was 56,096 mt, applicable to longline and troll fisheries operating south of 10°S in the WCPFC-CA, excluding the EEZs of Tokelau and Tuvalu. SC22 also noted that some operational data were not available in the IATTC area for the MP run. SC22 encouraged those members who have not made data available to do so as soon as practical and requested that the SSP evaluate the impact of the missing data and to report back to SC once these data become available. South Pacific albacore monitoring strategy SC22 reviewed information available to SC22 relevant to the SPALB monitoring strategy. SC22 agreed that there is no information preventing the implementation of the SPALB MP and that no modification is necessary to the South Pacific albacore monitoring strategy table at this time. <i>(ref: SC22 Outcomes, paragraph 102-104)</i> First South Pacific Albacore Allocation Workshop (SPAA01) Chairs Summary Recommendations on Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) provisions to support implementation of the Management Procedure The Workshop recognised that effective implementation of the South Pacific albacore Management Procedure will require robust monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) arrangements. Participants expressed differing views on whether MCS provisions, such as transshipment, electronic monitoring, observers and charter management should be included within the South Pacific albacore implementing CMM or progressed through existing Commission processes, particularly the Technical and Compliance Committee (TCC). The Workshop further noted broad support for progressing transshipment but not to delay the allocation framework and implementing measure. The Workshop recommend that the MCS provisions in US DP01 and FFA IP02 be recommended to the TCC Chair for consideration at TCC22. Detailed discussion of these matters, including transferability and flexibility, chartering and attribution, phased implementation, management of externalities and MCS arrangements, is provided in the SPAA01 Chairs Summary Report, Agenda item 4. <i>(ref: SPAA01 Chairs Summary Report)</i> The First Meeting of the Joint IATTC-WCPFC Working Group on South Pacific Albacore Tuna (SPAJWG01) Recommendations and taskings relevant to the South Pacific albacore Management Procedure and compatible management measures
--------------------------	---

	The Joint Working Group recommended that issues related to the overlap area be prioritised for further work, including in the context of the development and implementation of compatible management measures. The Joint Working Group tasked the Co-Chairs and Secretariats to further develop intersessional work on the overlap area and related notification issues, including consideration of how these issues may be reflected in future advice to the Commissions. The Joint Working Group tasked the Co-Chairs, with support from the Secretariats, to further develop the compatible measures discussion paper as a guiding document to support intersessional work and future consideration by the Joint Working Group and both Commissions. The Joint Working Group agreed to progress work on shared data standards, timelines, and analytical approaches, including in support of future stock assessment work and broader scientific collaboration. Detailed discussion of these matters is provided in the SPAJWG01 Co-Chairs' Summary Report, under Agenda Items 4.2 (Overview of current SPA management approaches adopted by both Commissions), 4.3 (Introduction to the Harvest Strategy adopted by WCPFC, including arrangements for the overlap area), 4.4 (Consideration of the implementation of compatible measures) and 6 (SPAJWG provisional workplan and meeting schedule). <i>(ref: SPAJWG01 Co-Chairs Summary Report, Recommendations c, d, e and I)</i>
--	--

South Pacific Albacore Monitoring Strategy

1. Review of MP Performance		
Scientific Committee	Technical and Compliance Committee	Commission
a. Evaluation of predicted performance indicators		
Regularly review/check the performance and outputs of the MP, including the indicators set out in Table 6 of CMM 2025-01 and provide advice to the Commission on: a) The performance of the MP in managing South Pacific albacore to achieve defined objectives including relative to the TRP. b) The robustness of the MP to changes in the fishery and any exceptional circumstances consistent with Annex IV of CMM 2025-01, c) The application of the MP outputs to CMM 2025-01.	Regularly review/check the performance and outputs of the MP, including the indicators set out in Table 6 of CMM 2025-01 and provide advice to the Commission on: a) Catch and effort levels for all fisheries subject to the MP relative to maximum levels specified under the most recent output of the MP. b) Allocation of catch and effort through the implementing measure. c) 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.	No input anticipated.
b. Data availability to run the MP		
Check availability, quantity and quality of data necessary to run the MP (e.g. the estimation method).	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.	No input anticipated.
c. Additional data to inform MP performance		
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.).	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.).	No input anticipated.
d. Performance of the estimation method		
Confirm the EM is performing well and not subject to estimation failure.	No input anticipated.	No input anticipated.

Table 1: Table of responsibilities (review of MP performance)

2. Review of MP Design		
Scientific Committee	Technical and Compliance Committee	Commission
a. Management objectives		
No input anticipated.	No input anticipated.	Review CMM 2025-01, taking account of the outputs of the SPA MP. Check that overall objectives of the MP remain appropriate. Revise catch and effort limits as necessary.
b. Scope of the MP		
Confirm the fisheries controlled by the MP, and the method of control, remains appropriate.	Confirm the fisheries controlled by the MP, and the method of control, remains appropriate.	Confirm the fisheries controlled by the MP, and the method of control, remains appropriate.
c. Exceptional circumstances		
Provide technical advice to identify the occurrence of exceptional circumstances (see CMM 2025-01 Annex IV (WCPFC 2025)) and review, modify or replace the MP as appropriate.	Provide technical advice to identify the occurrence of exceptional circumstances (see CMM 2025-01 Annex IV (WCPFC 2025)) and review, modify or replace the MP as appropriate.	Identify the occurrence of exceptional circumstances (see CMM 2025-01 Annex IV (WCPFC 2025)) and review, modify, or replace the MP as appropriate.

Table 2: Table of responsibilities (review of MP design)

3. Review of MSE		
Scientific Committee	Technical and Compliance Committee	Commission
a. Operating model grid		
Ensure the most important sources of uncertainty are included in the OM grid.	No input anticipated.	No input anticipated.
b. Calculation of performance indicators		
Check that performance indicators adequately represent management objectives.	No input anticipated.	No input anticipated.
c. Modelling assumptions		
Consider the technical details of the simulation and testing framework. Review the catches in regions outside MP control relative to the levels assumed during MP testing.	Review the catches in regions outside MP control relative to the levels assumed during MP testing.	No input anticipated.
d. Data availability to support MSE framework		
Identify any improvements in data collection to either enhance the OM framework or reduce uncertainty included in the OM grid.	No input anticipated.	No input anticipated.

Table 3: Table of responsibilities (review of MSE)

Year	Scientific Services Provider	Scientific Committee	Commission
2026	Run the MP (using data to 2024) for application to the period 2027-2029.	Provide advice to the Commission on the MP outputs for the period 2027-2029.	Apply the output of the MP to the SPA Management Arrangements CMM for 2027-2029.
2027	Perform full stock assessment ($y_{last} = 2025$).	Monitor and review the performance of the MP, including potential exceptional circumstances, and advise Commission.	Apply the SPA Management Arrangements CMM. Consider SC advice on the performance of the MP.
2028	Monitor performance of the MP.	Monitor performance of the MP.	Apply the SPA Management Arrangements CMM.
2029	Run the MP (using data to 2027) for application to the period 2030-2032.	Monitor the performance of the MP. Provide advice to Commission on the MP outputs for the next management period (2030-2032).	Apply the output of the MP to the SPA Management Arrangements CMM for 2030-2032.
2030	Perform full stock assessment ($y_{last} = 2028$).	Monitor and review the performance of the MP, including potential exceptional circumstances, and advise Commission.	Apply the SPA Management Arrangements CMM. Consider SC advice on the performance of the MP.
2031	Monitor performance of the MP.	Monitor performance of the MP.	Apply the SPA Management Arrangements CMM.
2032	Run the MP (using data to 2030) for application to the period 2033-2035.	Monitor the performance of the MP. Provide advice to Commission on the MP outputs for the next management period (2033-2035)	Apply the output of the MP to the SPA Management Arrangements CMM for 2033-2035.
etc. in a repeating 3-year cycle			

Bigeye tuna

15. At WCPFC22, the Commission agreed that three candidate target reference points (TRP) for bigeye tuna identified at WCPFC21 and based on the 2012–2015 depletion level, shall remain under evaluation as targets, and requested the SSP to continue assessing all three TRP options and provide comparative performance results for the Commission’s consideration at WCPFC23.
16. The Commission requested the SSP to include the probability of the stock remaining above MSY as an additional performance indicator and encouraged continued development of climate-related robustness tests.
17. The Commission requested the SSP to develop additional candidate Management Procedures (MPs) that include controls for both the tropical longline and tropical purse seine fisheries. Additionally, the Commission provided the following guidance to the SSP in developing candidate MPs for bigeye tuna:
 - a) Use of a three-year management period with a two-year data lag.
 - b) Evaluate a range of HCRs controlling the tropical longline and tropical purse seine fleets, at different levels of FAD closure length (from 0 to 3 months) and tropical longline catch and/or effort, that form the basis of a continuum of MPs all tuned to achieve the same TRP.
 - c) Evaluate the plausibility of developing additional HCRs through interpolating the outputs of the evaluated HCRs.
 - d) Evaluation of HCRs with and without constraints to the outputs between management periods.
 - e) Evaluation of the candidate TRPs identified by the Commission at WCPFC21.
 - f) Evaluate fixed assumptions on catch outside of the MP control.
18. When the Commission considers the MSE results, consideration should be given to how to translate and apply MP outputs to the range of existing management measures in place, including the longline catch limits, PNA+ Longline Vessel Day Scheme, and FAD management measures.
19. The Commission agreed that CCMs will cooperate to develop a management procedure for bigeye tuna during 2026, with a view to adopting a management procedure at WCPFC23.
20. The Commission requested the SSP to conduct sensitivity analyses addressing uncertainties in Indonesian, Philippine, and Vietnamese archipelagic fisheries, including scenarios representing recent levels, recent averages, historical peak catches, and new national management measures.
21. The Commission requested the SSP to evaluate MP performance under fixed assumptions for catches outside the MP’s direct control.
22. The Commission acknowledged the guidance from PNA+ on the bigeye MP ([WCPFC Outcomes Attachment 22](#)).
23. The Commission noted the importance of and need for a series of dedicated bigeye tuna management workshops (BMWs) and agreed to hold a series of BMWs in 2026 focused on the design of the BET management procedure. BMW01 was held virtually on 20–21 May 2026. BMW02 is scheduled for 1–2 October 2026 in Honolulu, Hawaii, with a hybrid option.
24. The TCC Workplan indicates that the TCC will provide technical and compliance-related advice to support the development of harvest strategies, including harvest control rules.

25. Relevant BMW01 agreed decision points and SC22 outcomes are reproduced below:

BMW01 & SC22	BMW01 Agreed Decision Points 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 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; 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. 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.
--	--

	A detailed summary of discussions, including the views expressed by CCMs on the candidate TRPs, spatial range, HCR design, fisheries and fishing levels outside the MP, output controls, meta-rules, and operational and implementation arrangements, is provided in the BMW01 Chair's Summary Report (Agenda Items 4–6). <i>(ref: BMW01 Chair's Summary Report, Table 1: Summary of BMW01 Decision Points)</i> 22nd Regular Session of the Scientific Committee Stock assessment SC22 agreed that the lack of consensus on the 2026 stock assessment should not impede progress on the bigeye management procedure, noting that Commission consideration of a management procedure depends on the estimation method rather than directly on acceptance of the most recent stock assessment. SC22 noted that, within the harvest strategy framework, management advice should be generated through adopted management procedures, while stock assessments should primarily support the monitoring, evaluation, and potential review of those procedures. SC22 recommended ensuring that catch and/or effort levels remain consistent with the evaluations of the bigeye management procedure and recommended the Commission adopt a bigeye management procedure, noting that the evaluations have yet to be finalized. <i>(ref: SC22 Outcomes, paragraphs 32,33 and 36)</i> Bigeye operating models SC22 noted that SC21 supported the use of the initial OM set for BET MSE, which is based on the 2023 assessment, while requesting further revisions. SC22 further acknowledged with gratitude to SSP that the revised BET OM presented to SC22 was substantially updated to address wider uncertainties responding to the SC21 requests. However, SC22 noted that the 2026 BET stock assessment which was also available to SC22 showed differences from the revised OM set even after additional work by SSP to expand the distribution of OM. Most notably, the new stock assessment suggested, while the overall trajectory and status relative to the 2012-2015 target is similar to those in the OMs, a more depleted stock status than currently captured within the OM set, with a greater risk of the stock being below the LRP. Although SC22 was not able to achieve a consensus on the acceptance of the 2026 stock assessment SC22 considered that the performance of MPs needs to be MSE tested using an OM grid that spans the range of plausible low-depletion scenarios informed by the 2026 assessment analyses. This is particularly important given that the probability of breaching LRP is one of the performance metrics used to evaluate candidate MPs in the BET MSE. Based on these observations, SC22 therefore, while supporting the overall BET MSE framework to proceed, requested the SSP to further explore options to expand the uncertainty range of the OM grid, in particular to cover the lower depletion range as suggested by the 2026 BET stock assessment. SC22 requested the SSP to revise the OM grid accordingly and where feasible use this revision for work to be provided to the BMW02 (and definitely prior to WCPFC23). SC22 advised BMW02 to provide feedback on the revised OM for final approval by SC. Mindful of the WCPFC Harvest Strategy Workplan, SC22 advised convening of a two-day special SC session (in hybrid format) for further review and formal approval of the BET OM grid by the SC,
--	---

taking place adjacent to the WCPFC23 in Port Vila, Vanuatu, subject to intersessional confirmation. Bigeye estimation method SC22 acknowledged that the EM submitted to SC22 had been revised in response to the SC21 requests and that its performance was improved as intended. SC22 supported the use of the revised EM for the BET MSE in principle, while noting that its performance needs to be re-evaluated once the OM grid is revised as suggested above. Bigeye management procedure – design and implementation considerations SC22 acknowledged that the SSP intended to develop a range of candidate MPs based on the instruction from BMW01. The critical aspect of the approach is the use of a “nuclear grid” which provides possible combinations of longline catch and FADs closure periods that achieve a certain level of long-term biomass depletion, i.e., the TRP. Although SSP provided “longline favored” and “purse-seine favored” MPs within the range of combinations defined by WCPFC22, it is possible to select any other combination using the grid to achieve the same target. SC22 noted that the specific shape of each HCR was not discussed at BMW01. SC22 thanked the SSP and generally welcomed the development of the BET management procedure framework, while making many suggestions. Some CCMs, in particular, noted that the fisheries application in the candidate MPs is not in line with their understanding of the decision at BMW01, and therefore the evaluations were incomplete. In their understanding, the catch limit as well as FADs closure period in the Convention-area-wide application option should be managed consistently with the Tropical Tuna CMM, taking into account the exemptions in place in CMM 2025-02. SC22 requested the SSP to update MPs, in particular the “nuclear grid” and HCR designs, based on the revised OMs as the first priority. In addition, while noting that providing specific advice on MP design is not SC’s role, SC22 advised SSP to evaluate requests by CCMs and to endeavor to address them to the extent practicable to be presented at BMW02 to facilitate the discussion on BET MSE, thereby facilitating consideration of all proposed options before a decision is taken by the Commission. Bigeye management procedure – evaluations SC22 welcomed the presentation of the BET MSE results and made a number of suggestions for improvements. SC22 noted the large volume of results even with the current MP list. It was noted that the results need to be updated once the OM reference set is revised. SC22 requested that SSP further develop the MSE presentation taking into account the comments from SC22 and present it at BMW02. SC22 noted the importance of keeping the number of candidate MPs manageable, both to minimize the workload for the SSP and to facilitate effective decision-making by the Commission, and advised BMW02 consider reducing the number of the candidate MPs. As one approach to reducing the number of candidate MPs, SC22 advised the SSP to consider excluding one of the candidate MPs that perform similarly across indicators, while clearly documenting and reporting properly the rationale for their exclusion to BMW02 or the Commission. Bigeye tuna management workshop SC22 requested that BMW02 consider the results of the revised BET OM evaluation and provide feedback to the SC and the Commission. SC22 also advised BMW02 review the results of BET as well as YFT MSE and provide feedback to the SC and the Commission.

	SC22 agreed that the lack of consensus on the 2026 stock assessment should not impede progress on the bigeye management procedure, noting that Commission consideration of a management procedure depends on the estimation method rather than directly on acceptance of the most recent stock assessment. SC22 noted that, within the harvest strategy framework, management advice should be generated through adopted management procedures, while stock assessments should primarily support the monitoring, evaluation, and potential review of those procedures. SC22 recommended ensuring that catch and/or effort levels remain consistent with the evaluations of the bigeye management procedure and recommended the Commission adopt a bigeye management procedure, noting that the evaluations have yet to be finalized. <i>(ref: SC22 Outcomes, paragraph 87-98)</i>
--	---

Yellowfin tuna and the mixed fishery approach

26. At WCPFC22, the Commission acknowledged the sequenced approach to the development of Target Reference Points (TRPs) for bigeye and yellowfin tunas, and the range of factors to consider when developing an effective monitoring strategy for yellowfin that are related to the bigeye management procedure. When evaluating the outcomes for yellowfin tuna within the mixed fishery approach, the Commission supported the sensitivity scenarios outlined by the SSP in [WCPFC22-2025-26 Rev01](#), and to use the same performance indicators as developed for bigeye tuna, which include maximum sustainable yield (MSY) metrics.
27. Relevant SC22 outcomes on yellowfin tuna and the development of the mixed-fishery monitoring strategy are reproduced below:

SC22	22nd Regular Session of the Scientific Committee Yellowfin operating models SC22 noted that the YFT OM grid, which is based on the 2023 stock assessment, was revised in response to the request of SC21 and now covers a wider range of uncertainty in depletion levels. It was also noted that, while the 2026 YFT stock assessment was not reviewed at SC22, the uncertainty range of the 2026 YFT stock assessment was generally within the range of the updated OM grid. Many areas of further work were suggested. However, SC22 agreed to adopt the YFT OM grid as presented, while additional uncertainties could be identified through the monitoring strategy where necessary, and further evaluation should continue as part of sensitivity or robustness testing, also taking into account the discussion on the 2026 BET stock assessment. Yellowfin outcome evaluations SC22 noted that there is no specific MP for YFT and that, under the mixed fishery approach, YFT will be managed implicitly through the MPs of SKJ, BET, and SPA. However, it is still required to test outcomes for YFT to ensure the stock remains sustainable and management objectives for YFT are achieved. The YFT MSE is simulated using the YFT OM and output from SKJ, BET, and SPALB MPs. It was noted that the PS effort level is assumed constant because the impact of PS on the YFT stock is almost the same between FADs set and free-school set and overall effort is defined through the SKJ MP and currently assumed to be constant in YFT MSE testings. SC22 noted that the BET MP output will change both the tropical LL effort level and the ratio of PS effort allocated between associated and free-school sets which can impact the YFT stock level. It was also noted that no current BET candidate MP will achieve the interim target of YFT (SB/SBF=0, 2012-2015), as was reported to the Commission previously. SC22 supported the YFT MSE framework as presented by the SSP and advised them presenting the results to BMW02. As the choice of BET MP affects the YFT stock level and vice versa, SC22 advised BMW02 to take the YFT MSE results into consideration when discussing BET MSE. <i>(ref: SC22 Outcomes, paragraphs 99-101)</i> Mixed fishery monitoring strategy SC22 reviewed the framework of the mixed fishery monitoring strategy provided by the SSP. Noting that the mixed fishery monitoring strategy (BET and YFT) is to be developed and adopted in 2027, SC22 recommended to the Commission that the monitoring strategy process be a standing agenda item on Commission and subsidiary body meeting agendas. SC22 also supported the proposal to consolidate the regular papers provided to meetings into a format
------	---

	designed to specifically inform monitoring strategies once all the MPs are adopted, as well as to consider an online approach dedicated to delivering the monitoring strategy. (ref: SC22 Outcomes, paragraph 110)
--	--

Pacific bluefin tuna

28. NC21 agreed to progress work in 2026 on the Pacific bluefin tuna long-term harvest strategy, Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS), and MCS measures, with the long-term harvest strategy intended for implementation in 2027. WCPFC22 subsequently adopted the [NC21 Summary Report](#).
29. Work on the development of a long-term management procedure for Pacific bluefin tuna continued through the third intersessional meeting of the Joint IATTC–WCPFC–NC Working Group on the Management of Pacific Bluefin Tuna (JWG103), held in March 2026. JWG103 agreed to use the “Newport Beach Management Procedure” as the basis for further consideration at JWG11.
30. At the 11th Session of the Joint IATTC–WCPFC–NC Working Group on the Management of Pacific Bluefin Tuna (JWG11), held on 8–11 July 2026, the JWG continued consideration of the proposed Management Procedure (MP) and associated implementation arrangements. The JWG made progress on a number of elements but did not reach consensus on the MP. The JWG agreed to further intersessional work.
31. At the resumed 11th Session of the Joint IATTC–WCPFC–NC Working Group on the Management of Pacific Bluefin Tuna (JWG11(2)), held virtually on 18 August 2026, the JWG recommended adoption of the PBF Interim Management Procedure. The JWG also recommended that the draft WCPFC CMM be forwarded to NC22 to resolve outstanding allocation issues and finalise the CMM, consistent with the Interim Management Procedure. The recommended Interim Management Procedure does not identify a specific role for TCC.
32. During SC22, the Committee considered updated information from the ISC on the Pacific bluefin tuna MSE and progress in developing the long-term harvest strategy. SC22 agreed to revisit the Management Procedure at the special SC meeting adjacent to WCPFC23, subject to intersessional confirmation.
33. TCC’s review of the implementation of MCS measures reported by CCMs under [CMM 2024-02](#) is addressed separately in [WCPFC-TCC22-2026-11](#), *Reports on CMM 2024-02 (MCS Measures for Pacific Bluefin Tuna)*.
34. Relevant NC22, JWG11(2) and SC22 outcomes are reproduced below:

NC22	22nd Regular Session of the Northern Committee Co-Chair Madeira outlined the intensive discussions on the long-term harvest strategy, including the complex issues relating to West: East fishery impact, conservation of small fish, sportfishing, conversion factors and other outstanding issues. He noted that the JWG made progress but ultimately was unable to reach consensus on the long-term harvest strategy or any recommendations on current management measures. He confirmed that the JWG intends to continue to prioritize discussions to advance the Management Procedure (MP). Finally, Co-Chair Madeira summarized next steps, including that the Co-Chairs will consult with JWG members and identify opportunities for further discussion to advance the long-term harvest strategy. (ref: NC22 Summary Report, paragraph 14)
-------------	--

	11th Joint IATTC and WCPFC-NC Working Group Meeting on the Management of Pacific Bluefin Tuna – Second Session Co-Chair Madeira presented the rest of the interim MP and there were no comments or concerns by any Members. The JWG recommended adoption of the PBF Interim Management Procedure (Attachment D). The JWG recommended that the WCPFC CMM text (Attachment E) be forwarded to the Northern Committee to resolve the outstanding allocation issues and finalize the CMM, consistent with the interim MP. Detailed discussion of these matters is provided in the JWG11(2) Chairs' Summary, under Agenda Items 3.2 (Recommendations on the Long-Term Harvest Strategy) and 4 (Review of Conservation and Management Measures for Pacific Bluefin Tuna). <i>(ref: JWG11(2) Chairs' Summary, paragraphs 17 and 27)</i> 22nd Regular Session of the Scientific Committee Pacific bluefin tuna - Long-term harvest strategy ISC provided updated information on PBF MSE including TAC1 calculation of newly requested HCRs by JWG in March 2026 and re-introduced the method to calculate conversion factors among different management categories. It was noted that the full PBF MSE results were presented at SC21, while the newly proposed HCRs were not yet fully simulated due to time constraints. However, ISC noted that, as they fall in between the HCRs already tested, their performance can be generally inferred and the risk to the PBF stock would not be problematic. Once an MP is adopted, it will be fully simulation tested by ISC. SC22 welcomed the progress made by the ISC PBFWG and the Informal Joint Working Group on Pacific bluefin tuna between WCPFC-NC and IATTC (PBFJWG) on the development of a long-term harvest strategy for Pacific bluefin tuna and encouraged the continued application of science-based decision-making in the development of the harvest control rule, consistent with the WCPFC harvest strategy approach. SC22 considered that in principle any management procedure to be adopted by the Commission should be fully simulation tested through MSE and reviewed by the SC before its adoption. SC22 noted that, despite the considerable progress made by the Joint Working Group, no agreement was reached before SC22 on a Management Procedure recommendation, and no proposal from NC22 was tabled to SC22 for recommendation to the Commission. SC22 further noted that the ISC explained that the performance of PBF MSE is mainly dictated by its target level and that the newly proposed HCR falls in between the candidate HCRs, both of which do not pose substantial risk to the stock. However, it was noted that the newly proposed HCRs were not tested through MSE. SC22 noted that some CCMs proposed to revisit this and any progress made intersessionally at the special SC taking place adjacent to WCPFC23 (subject to intersessional confirmation). Given that there is no consensus, SC22 agreed to revisit this item in the special SC. <i>(ref: SC22 Outcomes, paragraphs 112-114)</i>
--	--

North Pacific Albacore

35. At TCC21, [CMM 2019-03](#) paragraph 2 was assessed as “CMM Review”. TCC21 noted that the obligation contained a limit for vessels “fishing for” North Pacific albacore, which posed challenges in being able to verify the information provided by CCMs. TCC21 also noted that the Northern Committee had adopted a harvest strategy for North Pacific albacore in 2023, but had not adopted an implementing measure to give effect to the management procedure. TCC21 recommended that the Commission and the Northern Committee address the North Pacific albacore CMM so that the quantitative limit could be assessed in future.
36. At WCPFC22, the Commission tasked NC22 to initiate the review of [CMM 2019-03](#) for North Pacific Albacore in 2026, to ensure that compliance with the measure can be assessed and to accurately reflect the management procedure that was adopted for this stock in 2023.
37. Relevant NC22 discussion and outcomes are reproduced below:

NC22	22nd Regular Session of the Northern Committee Review of the CMM for North Pacific Albacore (CMM 2019-03) Canada submitted a consultative draft proposal to amend CMM 2019-03 (WCPFC-NC22-2026-DP03), intended to update and streamline the measure, clearly link it to Harvest Strategy 2023-01, introduce CCM level obligations to act in accordance with the Harvest Strategy, and better define CCM level fishery limits to allow assessment of compliance. Japan presented a proposal (WCPFC-NC22-2026-DP01) outlining a new CMM to implement Harvest Strategy 2023-01. Under the proposal, the existing effort control rule would continue to apply while the stock remains above the SSB threshold, but if the stock falls below the threshold, the ISC would calculate catch limits based on the Harvest Strategy, to be applied triennially per CCM alongside the existing effort control, with carryover/deduction for under- and overharvest, a possible exclusion for smaller fisheries, and annual compliance plans submitted to the Secretariat for NC review. The Chair proposed an intersessional working group co-chaired by Japan and Canada to continue this work. NC noted that as WCPFC and IATTC typically consider revisions to shared measures around the same time, it would be helpful to report on NC discussions regarding potential revisions to the North Pacific albacore CMM so that these could also be raised at the IATTC. Detailed discussion of these matters is provided in the NC22 Summary Report, under Agenda Items 2.2.2 (Application of Harvest Strategy for the North Pacific Albacore Fishery) and 2.2.3 (Review of the CMM for North Pacific Albacore (CMM 2019-03)). (ref: NC22 Summary Report paragraphs 32, 37, 40 and 58.)
------	---

Southwest Pacific Swordfish

38. At WCPFC22, the Commission adopted the *Indicative Workplan for Developing a Southwest Pacific Swordfish Harvest Strategy* as a Commission workplan to guide further development of a management procedure for Southwest Pacific Swordfish ([WCPFC22 Outcomes Attachment 23](#)).
39. Relevant SC22 outcomes are reproduced below:

SC22	22nd Regular Session of the Scientific Committee Southwest Pacific swordfish management procedure SC22 thanked Australia for leading the discussion on the Southwest Pacific swordfish MSE. Given the number of questions and comments provided by CCMs, SC22 encouraged interested members to further discuss intersessionally based on the proposal from Australia, which includes the formation of an informal steering committee. Some of the priorities identified by SC22 in the development of the harvest strategy for SWP swordfish included the balance between bycatch and target fisheries, the consideration of discard survival under catch-limit scenarios in bycatch fisheries, the importance of including stock and regional structure as one important uncertainty, and the need to separate scientific and management discussions. (ref: SC22 Outcomes, paragraphs 115-116)
------	--

Western and Central North Pacific Ocean swordfish

40. At NC21, the Northern Committee tasked the ISC Billfish Working Group (BILLWG) to begin technical work on a Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) for Western and Central North Pacific Ocean swordfish and to develop a detailed MSE workplan for consideration by NC22.
41. At NC22, the Northern Committee considered candidate inputs proposed by the USA for the MSE, including management objectives and performance indicators, candidate reference points and harvest control rules, a three-year management period, and TAC-based output controls.
42. Relevant NC22 outcomes on the development of the WCNPO swordfish management framework are reproduced below:

NC22	22nd Regular Session of the Northern Committee Development of a management framework The USA submitted candidate inputs to inform the MSE for North Pacific swordfish (WCPFC-NC22-2026-DP04). The NC agreed that an intersessional email process could be used to finalize candidate inputs to the MSE (Attachment 7). The Secretariat would circulate the working paper for Members and observers to provide feedback on and the USA would prepare a revised paper for consideration. The Chair also asked the USA to organize the virtual meeting and work with other Members to amend the USA proposal if necessary. The ISC noted that its billfish technical meeting would occur in August 2026 and that without direction on key inputs, no MSE results would be available for NC23, and sought confirmation at least of the geographic scope in NC22. The USA clarified that the scope should be consistent with the area evaluated under the 2023 stock assessment. The NC confirmed this scope, endorsed the ISC proceeding on this basis, and endorsed the ISC's proposal to shift the next stock assessment from 2028 to 2029. The NC agreed that candidate inputs to the North Pacific swordfish MSE would be completed by WCPFC23 and sent it back to the ISC. NC22 also recommended continued and strengthened cooperation with IATTC, including collaboration on North Pacific swordfish through the MSE process. Detailed discussion of the development of the WCNPO swordfish management framework is provided in the NC22 Summary Report, under Agenda Item 2.3.2. <i>(ref: NC22 Summary Report, paragraphs 43, 47, 48, 58 and Attachment 7)</i>
------	--

Harvest Strategy Workplan

43. At WCPFC22, the Commission endorsed an updated [Harvest Strategy Workplan](#).
44. TCC22 may wish to review the Harvest Strategy Workplan and consider whether any updates or revisions should be recommended to WCPFC23.
45. The relevant SC22 outcome is reproduced below:

SC22	22nd Regular Session of the Scientific Committee Progress of the WCPFC Harvest Strategy Work Plan SC22 reviewed the WCPFC Harvest Strategy Work Plan and considered no revision is required at SC22. <i>(ref: SC22 Outcomes, paragraph 111)</i>
------	---