



THIRD MEETING OF THE PORT STATE MEASURES WORKING GROUP (PSMWG03)

Electronic Meeting

15 April 2026

CHAIR'S SUMMARY REPORT

5 May 2026

AGENDA ITEM 1: WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

1. The Chair opened the Third Meeting of the Port State Measures Working Group (PSMWG03) and extended a welcome to all participants. The Chair acknowledged the contributions made by CCMs and the Secretariat in the period since WCPFC22 which had been held in the Philippines in December 2025, including the submission of papers, comments, and amendments that had been provided in the lead-up to this meeting.
2. The Chair expressed appreciation to the WCPFC Secretariat for the logistical and technical support provided in preparing the meeting documents, posting papers to the meeting portal, processing registrations, and facilitating the conduct of the online session.
3. The Chair noted the document to be discussed reflected the consolidated Table of Issues developed through the intersessional process, incorporating the views of CCMs as submitted during and following WCPFC22. The Chair drew particular attention to the receipt of a working document from one CCM and a comparative analysis paper from an observer organisation prior to the meeting, as well as comments submitted by another CCM in the days immediately preceding the session.

AGENDA ITEM 2: AGENDA

4. The draft agenda was presented for consideration. The agenda was adopted without amendment (**Annex 1**). The Chair provided a brief overview of the structure of the discussion, noting that the primary substantive work would be undertaken through a review of the priority areas in Table 2 of working paper [PSMWG03-2026-01](#).

AGENDA ITEM 3: INITIAL REMARKS

5. The Chair invited initial remarks from CCMs (List of participants **Annex 2**). PNA delivered a joint statement reiterating strong support for the continuation of the review of CMM 2017-02 and expressing appreciation to the Chair and Secretariat for the responsiveness shown in incorporating the group's views within the Table of Issues. The statement affirmed the view that the review of WCPFC port state minimum standards should reflect the unique context and membership of the Commission and the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) region, rather than being oriented principally towards alignment with the FAO Port State Measures Agreement (PSMA). The view was expressed that

the review should focus on practical improvements that address the specific conditions and operational realities of the WCPO, including for small island developing states (SIDS) considering there was limited scope for extending CMM 2017-02 in areas such as denial of port entry and inspection standards, in the absence of the Commission adequately encouraging the use of SIDS ports and to control high seas transshipment. In this context, placing additional requirements on SIDS port activities, without parallel arrangements being applied to vessels transshipping at sea, would create further disincentives for the use of SIDS ports and undermine the interests of coastal states. Priority areas where progress was desirable and achievable were facilitating access to Commission data for port state CCMs; improvements to reporting and data exchange; and effective use of other monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) tools.

7. An additional CCM statement emphasised the importance of port measures as a compliance tool and highlighted the opportunity to develop common positions with the PSMA, UNFSA and other RFMO practices. It was observed that port state measures complement but are distinct from high seas boarding and inspection (HSBI) arrangements, however, the two together constitute a coherent compliance system. Support was expressed for the ongoing work of the Working Group.

AGENDA ITEM 4: WCPFC22 OUTCOMES

8. The Chair recalled the WCPFC22 tasking to this Working Group to continue its review of CMM 2017-02 to strengthen port state minimum standards for the WCPO region. The existing Terms of Reference and workplan were reaffirmed and the working paper for discussion built on priorities from PSMWG02 and outlined next steps for 2026.

AGENDA ITEM 5: OPEN DISCUSSION ON PSMWG03-2026-01

9. CCMs had substantive discussion on the Table of Issues in the Working Paper which was organised around six priority areas. The Chair guided CCMs through each priority area in turn, introducing the key points for discussion from previous meetings and the proposed next steps for 2026.

Priority Area 1: Support for SIDS and Developing States, and Implementation Challenges

10. The Working Group considered the adequacy of existing assistance and capacity-building provisions under CMM 2017-02, and the implementation challenges faced by SIDS and developing states. It was noted that the current measure contains provisions in paragraphs 22 through 27 relating to special requirements and assistance, but questions remain as to whether these provisions have been operationalised in a manner commensurate with the scale of the challenges faced. Consideration was needed on matters including the adequacy of existing funding mechanisms, the potential establishment of operational support facilities, the definition of clear burden-sharing arrangements, and the development of metrics to monitor the delivery of capacity-building support.
11. The Working Group noted the close relationship between this priority area and recent Commission decisions concerning annual reporting relating to CMM 2013-06 and CMM 2013-07 and the context of the WCPFC Strategic Investment Plan. These mechanisms seek to capture and track areas of assistance

required and provided. The Secretariat noted that, while these processes provide some structure for capturing assistance needs, a clear linkage between these frameworks and the full operationalisation of the assistance provisions in CMM 2017-02 had yet to be established, and that additional direction from CCMs would assist in guiding future drafting.

12. The Chair summarised progress and proposed next steps under Priority Area 1: (1.1) develop draft recommendation text to operationalise paragraphs 22 through 27 of CMM 2017-02, and (1.2) develop text that considers the linkages with CMM 2013-07 and CMM 2013-06.

Priority Area 2: Port Entry, Arrivals and Denial of Access

13. The Working Group discussed the question of establishing minimum standards for advance notification of port entry, reviewing procedures for authorization and denial of entry, and risk-based inspection prioritization. The Chair drew attention to the gap between the current voluntary nature of many CMM 2017-02 provisions and the expectations embedded in the PSMA, noting that the review offers the opportunity to address this disparity while remaining sensitive to the capacities of SIDS port states and matters raised by PNA.
14. Regarding sub-area 2.1, which proposed development of near-real-time data sharing or notification mechanisms when vessels enter ports, a range of views was expressed. Several CCMs expressed strong support for developing near-real-time access to Commission data to enable port CCMs to make timely and evidence-based decisions regarding vessel entry and inspection. It was observed that the ability to request data already exists within the Commission's systems, but that this process is neither systematic nor sufficiently timely to constitute near-real-time access. It was suggested that the practical solution may involve the development of an accessible online portal or platform, allowing port CCMs continuous access to relevant vessel information rather than only relying on ad hoc data requests.
15. Several CCMs expressed similar views regarding the relationship between near-real-time notifications and routine data sharing. The view was put forward that these represent two distinct functions: routine access to data for inspection planning purposes, which could be conducted on a regular administrative basis; and urgent, near-real-time communications where a vessel is identified as presenting a high risk or suspected of serious non-compliance, which would require a more immediate and targeted response mechanism. It was suggested that these two functions should be considered separately in any drafting of a revised CMM.
16. Concern was also expressed regarding the use of the term "high risk vessels" as a defined category. It was observed that in many risk-based management systems, vessels may be automatically classified as high risk simply because they have not previously been inspected, rather than because of any actual record of non-compliance or IUU fishing activity. The view was expressed that such a classification, if recorded in public databases or shared platforms, could generate a false impression detrimental to the interests of vessels that are simply uninspected. Several CCMs endorsed the suggestion that "prioritisation of vessels to be inspected" would be more appropriate language than "high risk vessels,"

and reference was made to paragraphs 9 and 10 of CMM 2025-07 on HSBI as a potential model for articulating prioritisation criteria in an objective and operationally useful manner.

17. Questions were raised about whether the provisions on near-real-time data access should extend equally to cooperating non-members (CNMs) acting as port CCMs. This was to be discussed further under Priority Area 3 however it was noted that, while a data request process exists, this does not practically satisfy the near-real-time requirements for data although pathways exist for the Commission to make a specific decision or CMM amendment enabling such access e.g. secure web-based access to specified data views. The Working Group agreed that this matter should be addressed as part of the Priority Area 3 discussions with CCMs indicating the specific need to improve the access and flow of data between flag and port CCMs.
18. One CCM also raised the desirability of ensuring that denial of port entry should be reflected as a possible outcome alongside inspection in sub-area 2.3, and that the scope of near-real-time notification obligations could extend beyond designated "high risk" vessels to encompass all vessels that have fished within the Convention area or on the high seas within the Convention area.

Priority Area 3: Terms of Access to Commission Data

20. The Working Group discussed the conditions under which port CCMs (including CNMs) can access Commission data to support port state functions. The Secretariat confirmed that the current MCS data rules and procedures explicitly reference "Member" access, and that CNMs that are parties to the PSMA have experienced difficulty in accessing additional data to support their assessment of vessel risk and potential inspections.
21. A different interpretation of the existing data rules was suggested based on paragraph 19 of the 2007 Commission data rules which already provides for port state CCMs, including CNMs acting as port states, to have the same access to Commission data as other CCMs. Reference was made to paragraph 2 of the 2009 MCS data rules, which addresses high seas VMS data and other non-public domain data, and which was interpreted as incorporating the paragraph 19 access entitlement for port state purposes. The CCM indicated its intention to submit a written note to the Secretariat setting out this interpretation, with a view to the Secretariat undertaking further legal and technical analysis.
22. The Secretariat acknowledged the point and expressed willingness to review the matter, while noting that the issue is technically complex and involves working through a number of subsequent paragraphs in the data rules that refer specifically to "members." The Secretariat indicated that both the interpretation of the existing rules and the potential for alternative near-real-time access mechanisms would be considered. The broader view was expressed that, if CCMs wish to resolve this matter definitively and visibly, they may wish to consider incorporating explicit data access provisions within the revised CMM itself, rather than relying solely on Commission decisions.
23. It was also proposed that the scope of this priority area should not be limited to data access for port entry procedures but should encompass access to all WCPFC data needed by port CCMs in the exercise of their port state functions more generally. There was no objection raised to this suggestion.

24. Further consideration was given to the role of the Global Information Exchange System (GIES) administered by FAO, and the question of whether WCPFC-specific data fields could be incorporated into that system. One CCM proposed that the Secretariat's work in this area should include identification of any refinements to GIES that would better facilitate WCPFC members' needs for example, ensuring that data fields relevant to vessels that have fished in the Convention area are available for completion by CCMs participating noting this would be discussed in the forthcoming FAO GIES related Technical Working Group on Information Exchange.
25. The Secretariat explained that some WCPFC-authorized vessel inspection reporting is already received through GIES, but that the development of additional specific data fields had been deprioritized pending clearer direction from CCMs on the outcome of the CMM review. The Secretariat confirmed it was aware of the approaches taken by other RFMOs in this space and had been engaged in ongoing discussions with FAO.
26. The Chair summarised progress and proposed next steps under and the need to (3.1) explore potential refinements to MCS data access rules and procedures to improve support for port CCMs, including CNMs, and near-real-time access, and (3.2) prepare draft recommendation text addressing data access for port CCMs.

Priority Area 4: Inspection Standards and Scope

27. The Working Group discussed the development of minimum standards for port inspections, including the data fields to be captured, the scope of document, gear, catch, logbook, and authorisation checks, and the harmonisation of inspection reporting with the PSMA and other RFMOs.
28. Strong support was expressed for the importance of harmonisation with other tuna RFMOs and the PSMA, particularly given that vessels operating in the WCPFC Convention Area may also operate in other RFMO areas and may call at ports in multiple jurisdictions. It was observed that inconsistencies in inspection standards and data fields across RFMOs can create operational complexity for port inspectors and reduce the effectiveness of the overall MCS framework.
29. The concern regarding the terminology of "high risk vessels" was iterated in this context. It was observed that the use of this term in publicly accessible databases or inspection records could generate misleading impressions regarding vessels that have simply not yet been subject to HSBI or port inspection, without any record of actual non-compliance. Further support was expressed for replacing this term with language that accurately describes a prioritisation process based on objective criteria, consistent with the approach reflected in CMM 2025-07 on HSBI.
30. A position was advanced by a CCM on behalf of PNA that mandatory minimum inspection standards cannot be supported at this stage. The concern was expressed that tightening port inspection requirements without parallel arrangements to strengthen the control of transshipment to carriers at sea would create further disincentives for longline vessels to use SIDS ports, since such vessels would face lower compliance burdens by offloading to carrier vessels at sea rather than entering port. The view was expressed that this asymmetry is inconsistent with the obligations of the Commission under the Convention. However, they were open to discussing improvements to the Annexes of CMM 2017-02 and to the development of best practice standards that were not mandatory requirements.

31. One CCM offered a model for balancing PSMA alignment and RFMO-specific requirements, citing CCAMLR's approach of maintaining a separate template for PSMA-aligned data fields alongside a distinct template for RFMO-specific CMM compliance fields. The suggestion was made that the WCPFC could adopt a similar approach, ensuring both consistency with the PSMA for parties to that Agreement and the capture of WCPFC-specific CMM compliance data. The Secretariat confirmed awareness of this RFMO approach, noted ongoing discussions with FAO in relation to GIES, and agreed to explore the data field options in consultation with the CCM that had raised the CCAMLR example, with a view to reporting back to the Working Group.
32. The Chair summarised progress and proposed next steps under Priority Area 4, including: (4.1) the development of minimum best practice standards for port inspectors; (4.2) consideration of WCPFC-minimum data fields for port inspection and associated reporting; and (4.3) consideration of a WCPFC-appropriate definition or framework for prioritization of vessels for inspection, with careful attention to terminology.

Priority Area 5: Reporting and Data Exchange

33. The Working Group considered the harmonisation of data requirements and the strengthening of information exchange platforms relevant to port CCM operations. Recognition was given to existing platforms, including the PSMA GIES and the electronic Port State Measures reporting tool (ePSM) developed by FFA members. The interconnection between this priority area and the discussions under Priority Areas 2 and 3, particularly the question of near-real-time data exchange, was acknowledged.
34. The proposed next step under Priority Area 5 - the development of draft recommendation text to the Secretariat to progress alignment of WCPFC databases with GIES and any national or regional PSM information management systems for 2027 – was presented for consideration. The Secretariat indicated it had received clear guidance from CCMs on the direction for this work during the meeting and could consider data needs as proposed. No objections to the proposed next step were raised.

Priority Area 6: Integration of Other CMM MCS Tools

35. The Working Group considered how port measures under CMM 2017-02 should be integrated with, and linked to, other Commission MCS instruments, including transshipment monitoring arrangements, IUU vessel listings, HSBI under CMM 2025-07, and vessel monitoring system (VMS) data. The interdependency between these instruments was acknowledged, with the view expressed that port inspections, at-sea inspection, and flag CCM oversight should operate as mutually reinforcing components of a coherent and integrated MCS framework.
36. The proposed recommendation under Priority Area 6 to develop draft text maximising the linkages and integration of port state measures within the overall MCS framework was put to the Working Group. No objections were raised.

Observer Organisation Presentation

37. PEW presented a comparative analysis paper examining the port state measures of multiple tuna RFMOs against the standards of the FAO PSMA, applying a methodology consistent with previous

analyses conducted by other organizations for the purposes of RFMO performance assessment. The analysis covered measures adopted by several RFMOs, including ICCAT, IOTC, and SPRFMO, and assessed their alignment with PSMA provisions on matters such as pre-entry notification, information requirements for vessels seeking entry, authorization and denial procedures, national coordination, and real-time information exchange.

38. Key findings indicated that many aspects of the WCPFC measure remain voluntary or are conditional on a member designating a port, and that gaps exist in the areas of pre-arrival notification, specific information requirements for vessels seeking port entry, and national coordination and real-time information exchange. The Chair proposed that the paper be shared on the meeting portal for the consideration and reference of CCMs, and the Secretariat confirmed that this would be arranged. (Refer to [PSMWG03-2026-OP01](#))

AGENDA ITEM 6: NEXT STEPS AND REVIEW OF WORKPLAN

39. The Chair presented the indicative workplan for the period from April 2026 through to the Annual Session of the Commission, and invited comments from CCMs. The Secretariat confirmed its readiness to provide support to the Chair in preparing a summary report of the meeting outcomes for circulation to participants and indicated that this could be completed within the following week, subject to the Chair's own schedule.
40. The Working Group endorsed the following indicative workplan:
41. During the period from approximately April to May 2026, the summary report of this meeting would be finalized and circulated to participants for review and comment, incorporating the outcomes and agreed next steps from the discussions under each priority area.
42. During the period from May to July 2026, work would commence on the development of initial draft recommendation text on those priority areas identified as most readily approachable or yielding readily achievable outcomes. This drafting work would draw on the guidance provided by CCMs through this meeting and the broader intersessional process.
43. An online intersessional meeting is proposed for August 2026 to review the initial draft text developed during the May to July drafting period and to provide CCMs with the opportunity to comment and refine the proposed recommendations.
44. An in-person meeting of the Working Group is proposed during the Annual Meeting of the Technical and Compliance Committee (TCC), at which CCMs would continue face-to-face discussions on the draft text and work towards the development of concrete recommendations for the Commission.
45. At the Annual Session of the Commission in late 2026, the Working Group's recommendations would be presented for consideration and action by the Commission.
46. No objections to this workplan were raised. The Chair noted that comments submitted after the meeting by CCMs who were unable to participate in real time, or who wished to provide supplementary input, would be welcomed and could be incorporated into the meeting summary as appropriate.

AGENDA ITEM 7: SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES AND CLOSE OF MEETING

47. The Chair summarized the key outcomes of the meeting. The Working Group had conducted a structured review of all six priority areas in document PSMWG03-2026-01, and had reached the following principal outcomes: agreement to progress draft recommendation text on Priority Areas 1 and 6; substantive engagement on Priority Areas 2, 3, 4, and 5 with proposed next steps identified and agreed; recognition of divergent views on the question of mandatory versus best practice standards for port entry and inspection, with SIDS-specific concerns clearly articulated; agreement on the need to improve data access for port state CCMs, including CNMs, with further analysis to be undertaken by the Secretariat in light of both interpretation of existing data rules and the development of near-real-time access mechanisms; endorsement of a CCAMLR-inspired approach to data field harmonisation as a potential model for Priority Area 4; and agreement on the approach to the comparative analysis paper provided by the observer organisation.
48. The Chair expressed appreciation to all participants for their engagement and acknowledged the competing priorities and demands on the membership's time throughout the year. Recognition was extended to the support provided by development partners throughout the process. The Chair noted the region's aspiration to be recognized as a leader in addressing IUU fishing issues and affirmed the Working Group's collective commitment to progressing this important review towards outcomes that reflect the uniqueness of the WCPO while strengthening the robustness and effectiveness of port state measures in the region.
49. The Secretariat confirmed that the comparative analysis paper submitted by the observer organisation would be posted to the meeting page for members' reference, consistent with the Chair's proposal.
50. The Chair officially closed the Third Meeting of the Port State Measures Working Group. The meeting had lasted approximately two hours and eleven minutes.



Third Port State Minimum Standards working Group (PSMWG03)

15 April 2026

Online

Draft Agenda

PSMWG03-2026-Agenda

15 April 2026

Online Meeting on the review of CMM 2017- 02 Port States Measure		
Agenda 1	Welcome and opening remarks	Fiji
Agenda 2	Agenda	Fiji
Agenda 3	Initial remarks	Members
Agenda 4	WCPFC22 outcomes	Fiji
Agenda 5	Open discussion on PSMWG03-2026-01	Fiji
Agenda 6	Next steps and review of workplan	Fiji
Agenda 7	Summary of outcomes and close meeting	Fiji



Third Port State Minimum Standards working Group (PSMWG03)

15 April 2026

Online

List of Participants

CHAIR

Meli Raicebe

Ministry of Fisheries
Acting Principal Fisheries Officer - Offshore
Fisheries Management Division
raicebe.meli@gmail.com

AUSTRALIA

Madeleine Miller

AFMA
Senior Policy Officer
madeleine.miller@afma.gov.au

CANADA

Felicia Cull

Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Senior Policy Advisor
felicia.cull@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

CHINA

Yanxuedan Zhang

SHANGHAI OCEAN UNIVERSITY
Associate Professor
yxdzhang@shou.edu.cn

FIJI

Arishma Archana Ram

Ministry of Fisheries
Fisheries Technical Officer - surveillance
arishma.ram.07@gmail.com

Vivina Seruvono Baukari

Ministry of Fisheries
Fisheries Officer
vbaukari78@gmail.com

FRANCE

Marie Feucher

Maritimes affairs office in French Polynesia
Head of office
marie.feucher@mer.gouv.fr

François Amaudric du Chaffaut

Maritime Affaires State Direction in French Polynesia
Deputy Head
francois.amaudric-du-chaffaut@mer.gouv.fr

INDONESIA

Alza Rendian

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of the Republic of Indonesia
Multilateral Cooperation Analyst
alzarendian@gmail.com

Jatu F. Nugrohorukmi

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of the Republic of Indonesia
Policy Analyst
jatu.fn@kpk.go.id

Mumpuni Cyntia Pratiwi

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of the
Republic of Indonesia
Capture Fisheries Production Management
Officer
mumpuni.cpratiwi@gmail.com

Yuliadi Kadarmo

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of the
Republic of Indonesia
Policy Analyst, Bureau of Public Relations and
Foreign Cooperation, MMAF
adhie.multilateral@gmail.com

JAPAN**Nobushige Shimizu**

Fisheries Agency of Japan
Staff
nobushige_shimizu640@maff.go.jp

Takahiro Fukushima

Fisheries Agency of Japan
Section Chief
takahiro_fukushim820@maff.go.jp

Takeshi Miwa

Fisheries Agency of Japan
Counsellor
takeshi_miwa090@maff.go.jp

Yayoi Otani

Fisheries Agency of Japan
Section Chief
yayoi_otani420@maff.go.jp

NEW ZEALAND**Greta Davison**

New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries
Senior Policy Analyst
greta.davison@mpi.govt.nz

Jordan Owczarek

Ministry for Primary Industries
Compliance Adviser, International Fisheries
jordan.Owczarek@mpi.govt.nz

REPUBLIC OF KOREA**Ilkang Na**

Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
Multilateral Fisheries Negotiator
ikna@korea.kr

Jae-geol Yang

Korea Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Center
Policy Analyst

REPUBLIC OF MARSHALL ISLANDS**Beau Bigler**

Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
Chief Fisheries Officer
bbigler@mimra.com

Francisco Blaha

MIMRA
Ofsshore Fisheries Advisor
fblaha@mimra.com

Nibaan Edwin

MIMRA
Boarding officer
nedwin@mimra.com

SOLOMON ISLANDS**Samson Maeniuta**

Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
Chief Fisheries Officer - Compliance
smaeniuta@fisheries.gov.sb

CHINESE TAIPEI**Wen-Chi Chang**

Fisheries Agency
Associate Technical Specialist
wenchi0902@ms1.fa.gov.tw

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**Katrina Poremba**

NMFS
Fisher Policy Analyst
katrina.poremba@noaa.gov

Martina Sagapolu

NOAA Office of Law Enforcement, Pacific Islands
Division
Assistant Director, Office of Law Enforcement
martina.sagapolu@noaa.gov

Merna Saad

Department of State
Foreign Affairs Advisor
saadmn@fan.gov

Murray Bauer

US DOC / NOAA National Marine Fisheries
Service Office of Law Enforcement
Deputy Special Agent in Charge (a)
MURRAY.BAUER@NOAA.GOV

**INTERNATIONAL SEAFOOD SUSTAINABILITY
FOUNDATION (ISSF)****Kerrie Robertson**

Adira Consulting
Consultant
krobertson@iss-foundation.org

**PACIFIC ISLANDS FORUM FISHERIES AGENCY
(FFA)****Jason Raubani**

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
MCS Policy Advisor
jason.raubani@ffa.int

PARTIES TO THE NAURU AGREEMENT (PNA)**Lara Manarangi-Trott**

PNA Office
Consultant

Les Clark

PNA
Adviser
les@pnatuna.com

PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS**Dave Gershman**

The Pew Charitable Trusts

Senior Officer, International Fisheries
Conservation
dgershman@pewtrusts.org

Glen Holmes

The Pew Charitable Trusts
Senior Officer
gholmes@pewtrusts.org

WCPFC SECRETARIAT**Deatra Iehsi-Solomon**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
HR Officer
deatra.iehisi-solomon@wcpfc.int

Eidre Sharp

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Deputy Compliance Manager
Eidre.Sharp@wcpfc.int

Hilary Ayrton

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Fisheries Management and Compliance Adviser
hilary.ayrton@wcpfc.int

Joseph Jack

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Reporting Analyst Officer
Joseph.Jack@wcpfc.int

Matthew McGregor

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Compliance Manager
matthew.mcgregor@wcpfc.int

Natsuko Akinaga

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Administrative Officer
natsuko.akinaga@wcpfc.int

Penelope Ridings

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)

Legal Advisor

pennyridings@yahoo.com

Tim Jones

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)

IT Manager

tim.jones@wcpfc.int

Van David

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)

Vessel Management Officer

van.david@wcpfc.int