



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

23 -29 September 2026

Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia (Hybrid)

---

**Annual Report on Port Inspections and Implementation Standards for Port State Measures**

---

**WCPFC-TCC22-2026-RP07**

**2 July 2026**

**Submitted by the Secretariat**

**Purpose**

1. This paper summarises port CCM activities relating to the Conservation and Management Measure on Minimum Standards for Port State Measures ([CMM 2017-02](#)).

**Key messages for the TCC**

- a. Implementation of WCPFC port measures remains uneven across CCMs, undermining regional compliance and enforcement effectiveness. As at 31 March 2026, eleven CCMs had notified designated ports under CMM 2017-02, while 24 CCMs were parties to the FAO PSMA.
- b. Port inspection information can now increasingly support WCPFC compliance and monitoring processes. Since April 2024, automated GIES notifications and inspection reports have been received and since mid-2025, information has become more accessible, including to support Article 25(2) case creation, e.g. for cases of unauthorised transshipment activity.
- c. Improved access to port inspection information is strengthening national and regional monitoring, but data gaps remain. Access to inspection documentation is enabling better use of port inspection outcomes within WCPFC monitoring and compliance processes. However, some reports still lack sufficient accessible detail to support timely follow-up where potential infringements are identified.
- d. The current intersessional review of CMM 2017-02 is focused on strengthening practical implementation arrangements. Discussions (of the Port State Measures Working Group (PSMWG)) have highlighted the need for minimum standards that are operationally workable, support SIDS and developing CCMs, and do not discourage use of SIDS ports.
- e. There is broad CCM support for improved data access and interoperability. Priorities include better access to Commission data, improved reporting and exchange arrangements, and stronger links between WCPFC systems, FAO GIES, FFA ePSM and other MCS tools.
- f. The Secretariat's implementation and coordination role is increasing. As port inspection information becomes more available through GIES and other reporting arrangements, the Secretariat will have an increasing role in supporting CCMs to make effective use of this information within WCPFC monitoring,

reporting, and compliance processes. This will include supporting practical implementation needs identified through the CMM 2017-02 review.

- g. As intersessional work progresses in 2026, the PSMWG is expected to continue developing recommendations for consideration by TCC22 and adoption by the Commission at WCPFC23.

## Introduction

2. Port measures supplement CCM's MCS measures. Inspections of vessels entering CCM ports with fish caught in the Convention Area, whether to be landed or not, provides CCMs with a greater opportunity to validate and verify reported data and information, which can then be shared with other CCMs to strengthen efforts to combat IUU fishing activities. This information sharing supports CCMs to allocate and target inspection resources based on informed risk assessments.
3. The objective of CMM 2017-02 is to establish processes and procedures for CCMs to request that port inspections be undertaken on fishing vessels suspected of engaging in or in support of IUU fishing. The processes recognise the importance of:
  - exchanging information;
  - managing requests for inspections or inspections-related information; and
  - the need to set minimum requirements such as those relating to when port inspections are required.
4. CMM 2017-02 was adopted one year after the FAO Port State Measures Agreement ([PSMA](#)) took effect and was to be reviewed in 2019. The CMM was intended to complement but not rely on the PSMA or on CCMs being signatories. The CMM adds definition to some of the provisions of the PSMA such as the vessels to be inspected. CCMs can determine when WCPFC port minimum standard requirements will apply to them.
5. In 2024, the Commission agreed to establish an intersessional process to review CMM 2017-02, led by Fiji. The review was tasked to include consideration of the linkage between CMM 2017-02 and the WCPFC's MCS data rules, including with respect to the potential for CNMs to access MCS data.<sup>1</sup>
6. The Secretariat has been progressively improving how available data and information are used to support monitoring, reporting, and implementation of Commission decisions. This work is increasingly relevant to port CCM measures as more port inspection information becomes available through GIES and as the review of CMM 2017-02 considers future implementation, reporting, and information-sharing needs.

## Designation of ports and contacts

7. CMM 2017-02 encourages port State CCMs to designate their ports for inspection, to identify specific contacts for port related purposes, and to provide these to the Executive Director.
8. As of 31 March 2026, eleven (11) CCMs, including three (3) Pacific Island CCMs, have designated ports and six (6) CCMs have provided designated port contacts, while 24 CCMs are parties to the PSMA. Other CCMs are implementing port-related regimes, some with the intent to become signatories to the PSMA.
9. Table 1 shows the CCMs who have notified designated ports under CMM 2017-02. Specific notifications of ports have been received from Australia (all ports), Fiji (3), France (French Polynesia (1) and New Caledonia (1)), Japan (7), New Zealand (13), Papua New Guinea (6), the Philippines (2), Solomon Islands (2), Thailand

---

<sup>1</sup> See [WCPFC21 Summary Report](#), paragraphs 571 – 573

(22), Tuvalu (1) and the USA (all). Details are available on the WCPFC website at WCPFC Port State Minimum Standards.

**Table 1. Status of CCMs under CMM 2017-02 and CCMs that are parties to the PSMA.**

	<b>SSIDS WCPFC Members and Participating Territories</b>	<b>Non-SIDS WCPFC Members</b>	<b>Cooperating Non-members</b>
<b>CCMs who have notified of designated Ports under CMM 2017-02</b>	France (French Polynesia, New Caledonia), Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu	Australia, Japan, New Zealand, the Philippines, United States of America	Thailand
<b>CCMs who are parties to PSMA as of 31 March 2026</b>	Fiji, France (French Polynesia, New Caledonia), Republic of Marshall Islands, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu	Australia, Canada, China, European Union, Indonesia, Japan, Republic of Korea, New Zealand, Philippines, United States of America	Bahamas, Ecuador, Liberia, Panama, Thailand, Viet Nam

#### Port related activities by CCMs and the Secretariat

10. Since April 2024, the Secretariat has received automated notifications of 815 port inspections via GIES and one notification by email from 12 CCMs: Australia, China, Ecuador, Fiji, New Zealand, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Thailand, Tonga, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, and the United States. Table 2 provides information on those reports including the percentage that indicate potential infringements for flag CCM investigation.
11. Initial Inspection system designs in 2024 were developed to allow CCMs or the Secretariat to lodge and notify port inspection reports as well as High Seas Boarding and Inspection (HSBI) reports. As a review of CMM 2017-02 was proposed that year, work on that system was limited to HSBI reports. Once the review has progressed and implementation needs are clearer, further work on port inspection reporting arrangements could be considered, taking into account the role of GIES and any agreed outcomes from the CMM review.

**Table 2: Numbers of port inspection reports received for 2024 - 2026 (YTD). \* = Automated notifications to RFMOs began April 2024; \*\* = As of 18 May 2026**

Year	Inspection Reports via email	Inspection Reports via GIES	Total	Inspections with infringement	Percent of inspections with infringements
*2024	0	205	205	7	1%
2025	1	412	413	11	51%
**2026	0	197	197	4	24%

#### Linkage to CCM Use of the UN FAO Port State Measures Agreement

12. FAO has developed the [Global Information Exchange System](#) (GIES) to support and encourage countries to become parties to, and fully implement, the PSMA. GIES is a system that facilitates the sharing of information

among port and flag States to maximise the effectiveness of a range of international instruments including the PSMA, in preventing, deterring, and eliminating IUU fishing. RFMOs such as WCPFC are seen as playing an important role in ensuring cohesive regional port CCM measures across their region and memberships.

13. As some CCMs are already using GIES to lodge and share port-related documentation, the FAO has sought access to the WCPFC Record of Fishing Vessels (RFV) through an Application Programming Interface (API). The Secretariat is awaiting further information from FAO on their review to compare WCPFC and FAO GIES data and data standards, and we understand further approaches are to be made by the PSMA Secretariat during 2026.
14. Since 2024, GIES has provided WCPFC with notifications of port inspections lodged by countries that nominated WCPFC as a recipient of port inspection information. More recently, access to that documentation has been enabled, allowing port inspection information to be more readily considered within existing Commission processes, including where potential infringements of WCPFC CMMs are identified. The quality and accessibility of information provided through these reports remains important to support timely follow-up.

### Annual Reporting

15. From 2022 to 2025, CCMs reported on CMM 2017-02 in their Annual Report Part 2 (ARPt2). Reporting related to port CCM responsibilities for inspections, action taken in response to suspected IUU fishing activities, maintaining port contact details and requirements, and encouraging the use of SIDS CCM ports. Most of these requirements are applicable only to those CCMs who have designated ports and port contacts under CMM 2017-02.
16. This report was produced earlier than prior years to respond to a request by the Commission at WCPFC22. As a result, some 2025 data were either not available or incomplete; ARPt2 for RY2025 reporting on these obligations was due on 15 June 2026 and a review of information is currently ongoing.
17. It is anticipated that responses ARPt2 for RY2024 would show a similar pattern, indicating that an increasing number of CCMs consider the requirements of CMM 2017-02 to be applicable. Responses from those that consider the CMM requirements were not applicable indicate that this is because:
  - a. the CCM is not a party to the PSMA; or
  - b. they are still implementing the PSMA and/or they have not yet designated ports; or
  - c. they have not yet notified the WCPFC Secretariat of their designated ports and contacts; or
  - d. they have no ports.
18. In 2025, CCMs reported on how they encouraged the use of SIDS CCM ports. There were seven CCMs for which this obligation is applicable, and those CCMs have shared information on actions taken in support of this obligation. Examples provided included a CCM actively promoting the use of SIDS ports by their flagged fishing vessels while others limited activities at sea e.g. transshipments, to require port visits. Some SIDS indicated that they provide facilities for all SIDS use and encourage their own vessels to use SIDS ports when needed.
19. There are no obligations for CMM 2017-02 included in the 2026 Compliance Monitoring Report (CMR) for Reporting Year 2025. Previously, obligations with adopted audit points were assessed:
  - a. One obligation was assessed in 2025 (paragraphs 13-14 requiring an Inspection report to be provided if inspection is undertaken by Port CCM).
  - b. Five obligations in 2023 (paragraph 8 Port CCMs to ensure fisheries inspections are conducted by Government Authorised Inspectors;

- c. paragraphs 9 – 10 Minimum requirement for vessels to be inspected by Port CCMs;
- d. paragraph 17 Expected actions by Port CCMs where there is sufficient evidence of IUU fishing;
- e. paragraphs 19 and 21 Requirement to notify and maintain current Port CCM contacts with WCPFC and advise of Port State measures applying in designated ports; and
- f. paragraph 26 Requirement to encourage use of ports of SIDS to the extent practicable).

20. Prior to 2023, reporting on port CCM obligations has been included in ARPt2 but not assessed in the CMR.

### Summary of compliance cases

21. Some Article 25(2) cases have arisen from port CCM inspection reports. Figure 1 summarises the outcomes of flag CCM investigations of alleged infringements identified through port inspection activities from 2012 to 2025. Five of these cases involved port denial.

22. The cases recorded in the Compliance Case File System do not necessarily reflect all port inspection reports received during this period. Some cases have only recently been created because the Secretariat had not previously received notification of the relevant inspection report or was not otherwise aware of the report. In other cases, supporting information on the potential infringement is not yet available following identification of a GIES system error that is being resolved at the time this report was written. Some inspection reports also lack sufficient detail to support case creation, such as where a CMM is identified but the specific obligation potentially breached is not clear or supporting information is not provided.



**Figure 1: Summary of the outcomes of flag CCM Article 25(2) investigations of alleged infringements recorded from Port Inspection activities (for 2012-2025).**

## Summary points on the review of CMM 2017-02

23. The PSMWG held two meetings in 2025 and a third meeting on 15 April 2026. Key technical points from these discussions include:

- a. Continued review of CMM 2017-02 focused on strengthening port state minimum standards while recognising the operational realities and capacity constraints of SIDS.
- b. Broad support for improving access to Commission data, reporting processes, and integration of port measures with other WCPFC MCS tools, including transshipment monitoring, HSBI, IUU vessel listing processes, and VMS data.
- c. Discussion on developing near real-time access to Commission data, including possible secure web-based or portal access arrangements, to support timely port entry and inspection decisions.
- d. Recognition that routine administrative data access and urgent operational notifications for vessels requiring prioritised inspection may require separate mechanisms.
- e. Concerns raised regarding use of the term “high risk vessels”, with preference expressed for terminology focused on objective prioritisation criteria for inspections.
- f. Discussion on improving timely access to Commission data for CCMs, particularly Cooperating Non-Members (CNMs) acting as port CCMs, and possible approaches to support this.
- g. Discussion on harmonisation of inspection standards, reporting formats, and data fields with the PSMA and other tuna RFMOs.
- h. Support expressed for improved interoperability between WCPFC systems, the FAO GIES, and regional systems such as the FFA electronic Port State Measures reporting tool (ePSM).
- i. Concern expressed regarding the importance of ensuring any mandatory minimum inspection standards do not negatively impact use of SIDS ports in the absence of strengthened controls on high seas transshipment.
- j. Agreement to progress drafting work during 2026 in areas where there was broad support, including development of recommendation text and further intersessional consideration of other issues ahead of TCC22 and WCPFC23.