Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission

**Update and Workplan to Progress the Review of CMM 2017-02**

## Purpose

1. This paper provides an update on the review of *CMM 2017-02 Port State Minimum Standards* and summarises the key points of focus for potential refinements to existing rules and other Commission decisions as discussed by CCMs at PSM-WG01 in March 2025 (*Summary of Meeting*) and at PSM-WG02 in September 2025 (*Summary of Meeting*).

## Introduction

2. In 2024, the Commission agreed to establish a working group led by Fiji to undertake review of CMM 2017-02 in 2025. The review was to include the linkage between CMM 2017-02 and the MCS Data Rules, including with respect to the potential for CNM access to MCS data. (*TCC20 Outcomes, paragraph 63*)**.**

3. Paragraphs 28 – 29 of CMM 2017-02 also provide guidance on such a review:

> ***Periodic review***
> *28. The Commission shall review this measure within 2 years of its entry into force, which shall include but not be limited to an evaluation of its effectiveness, and any financial and administrative burdens associated with its implementation.*
> *29. In the review of this measure, the Commission may consider additional elements such as notification requirements, port entry, authorization or denial, use of ports, and additional inspection requirements.*

## Areas of focus identified for review

4. CCMs provided further guidance on the scope of the review during the PSM-WG1 meeting held in March 2025 which was summarised in the Chair's Summary Report as:

   a. Identification of gaps in the current CMM and where additional details would be useful, such as on port arrivals and denial of port access, and what inspections could cover.

   b. Review of data sharing arrangements with a view to strengthening data exchange requirements within the WCPFC Data Rules and considering how those data sharing arrangements will be applied.

   c. Identification of implementation challenges and the applicability of the measure.

   d. Review of requirements in existing CMMs that relate to Port State measures in order to maximize the linkages and ensure the CMMs are integrated.

   e. Consideration of the scope of existing provisions of the measure relating to capacity building for SIDS and whether these were sufficient.

f. Harmonization and standardization of data requirements with those of the PSMA and other tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (tRFMOs).

5. The PSM-WG01 noted that there was a need for analysis of CMM 2017-02 to identify potential gaps that could support CCM consideration of amendments to this measure. More detail associated with this analysis was provided in the Chair's discussion paper - TCC21-2025-19A. Additional areas were also identified as useful for PSM WG participants to consider in the review of CMM 2017-02.

### CCMs with designated ports under CMM 2017-02 and CCMs that are parties to the PSMA

6. **Table 1** below shows the WCPFC CCMs that have implemented CMM 2017-02 and those that are parties to the PSMA. 10 CCMs have notified WCPFC of designated ports under CMM 2017-02, and 24 CCMs are parties to the PSMA.

***Table 1.*** *Status of CCMs who have notified of designated ports under CMM 2017-02 and those that are parties to the PSMA.*

| | SIDS WCPFC Members and Participating Territories | Non-SIDS WCPFC Members | Cooperating Non-Members |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CCMs who have notified of designated Ports under CMM 2017-02** | France (French Polynesia, New Caledonia), Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu | Australia, Japan, New Zealand, the Philippines, United States of America | Thailand |
| **CCMs who are parties to PSMA as at 18 August 2025** | 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 |

### Special requirements of Small Island Developing States and participating territories (SIDS)

7. CMM 2017-02 took effect in February 2018 and was to be reviewed within two years. Implementation of the CMM was voluntary until such time as CCM's designated ports and/or contact points. The above table shows that since that time, most SIDS have. chosen not to designate ports under CMM 2017-02.

8. Paragraphs 22 -27 of the CMM provide examples of the types of assistance that could be required and requires CCMs to cooperate to establish appropriate mechanisms to provide technical and/or financial assistance to deliver those needs, building on, but not limited by, the key capacity or resource assistance and those mechanisms set out in paragraph 4 of CMM 2013-06.

9. The two-year review period reflected the Commission's priority to develop a mechanism for providing assistance to SIDS, which was scheduled for presentation to the Commission at WCPFC16 in 2019. This timing ensured that the measure could be reviewed within two years. Paragraph 25 also states

that the establishment of the mechanism was noted to be "critical in SIDS' decision-making processes about whether to designate their ports under this CMM."

10. As the required mechanism has not been agreed and the review of CMM 2017-02 not progressed, this would be a priority for the work of the PSM-WG.

11. As guidance develops through Commission discussions in this WG, the WG will be able to respond appropriately through proposed amendments to CMM 2017-02.

### Potential areas to consider in harmonization with tuna RFMOs

12. In relation to other tRFMOs, there are existing Memoranda of Understanding that generally enable reciprocal data exchanges that include for monitoring, surveillance and control purposes. In the case of CCSBT and IATTC, there are also Memoranda of Cooperation (CCSBT and IATTC) that provide more specific details on the type of data exchange. Once specific amendments to CMM 2017-02 are clearer, an assessment can be made as to whether any changes to these arrangements are necessary.

13. Across tRFMOs, there is a broad alignment on the core principles of port state measures, particularly the designation of ports, the requirement for inspection procedures and the general exchange of information. However, key gaps remain that hinder full harmonization. These include inconsistent obligations or minimum standards for port entry, arrivals, denial and inspection on IUU grounds, the absence of uniform real-time reporting standards and a weak cross-referencing with other MCS or relevant tRFMOs measures. Differences also exist in the binding nature of capacity building requirements and support for developing CCMs, particularly SIDS. More detail associated with this assessment was provided in TCC21-2025-19A.

## Next steps

14. **Table 2** below is an updated version of the table that was discussed during PSM-WG02 meeting. The first two columns are the original list of priority areas and initial points for discussion based on discussions from PSM-WG1. The priority areas and points for discussion are presented without ranking and are not intended to limit the scope of areas for review.

15. At PSM-WG2 the Chair invited participants to provide further views to elaborate on each of the five areas and initial list of points for discussion. A summary of the key points raised is included in the third column in **Table 2**. In the fourth column, the Chair provides suggestions on potential next steps for consideration during the 2026 review process.

## Recommendations

16. The Chair invites participants to provide further views to further refine the scope of the five areas, in particular the initial suggestions of the next potential steps set out in Column 4 of **Table 2**.

17. WCPFC22 is invited to note the update in this paper and to support the workplan proposed for the continued work of the PSM-IWG in 2026 in **Table 3.**

***Table 2:*** *Proposed scope of review for CMM 2017-02 in 2026*

| Priority areas for review | Initial list of points for further discussion | Summary of key points raised by participants during PSMWG2 | Initial suggestions of the next potential steps for further discussion in 2026 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Support for SIDS and developing States and implementation challenges** | i. Consider reviewing the adequacy of current assistance provisions.<br>ii. Consider establishing an operational funding facility.<br>iii. Consider defining clear burden-sharing mechanisms with triggers for assistance.<br>iv. Consider developing metrics to monitor delivery of capacity building and support.<br>v. Consider reviewing how flexibility of the measure affects consistent implementation.<br>vi. Consider assessing barriers faced by SIDS and developing States (legal frameworks, inspector training, MCS capacity).<br>vii. Consider examining the adequacy of current funding/technical assistance provisions.<br>viii. Consider identifying areas where clarification/simplification could improve applicability. | • Adequacy of capacity-building provisions and identification of implementation challenges for SIDS highlighted.<br>• Existing regional measures provide certain controls, which could be complemented by additional mechanisms.<br>• Financial, technical, and legal challenges may affect the effective implementation of new port controls.<br>• Resource constraints such as trained inspectors and legal frameworks need to be addressed.<br>• Operational support mechanisms, including funding, burden sharing, and structured assistance with capacity-tracking, were discussed.<br>• Transhipment controls were highlighted as an area to consider concurrently to avoid conflicting obligations related to SIDS port use. | 1.1 Develop draft recommendation text to operationalise paragraphs 22 -27 of CMM 2017-02.<br><br>1.2 Consider linkages to CMM 2013-07 and CMM 2013-06 annual reporting and the WCPFC Strategic Investment Plan. |

| Priority areas for review | Initial list of points for further discussion | Summary of key points raised by participants during PSMWG2 | Initial suggestions of the next potential steps for further discussion in 2026 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2. Port entry, arrivals and denial of access** | i. Consider establishing mandatory minimum standards for advance notification.<br>ii. Consider reviewing procedures for authorization/denial of entry, including IUU grounds.<br>iii. Consider risk-based inspection minimum standards and prioritization. | • Identified need to fill gaps on port arrivals, denial of access, and inspection scope<br>• Minimum standards on advance notification were discussed to address enforcement challenges from late or missing vessel notices.<br>• Alignment of Commission databases with GIES was identified as a potential mechanism to improve management of vessel entry and arrivals.<br>• The concept of near real-time reporting for high-risk vessels and definitions of "high-risk" cases were discussed to support targeted inspections.<br>• Interactions between mandatory denial of port entry and transhipment obligations were highlighted as requiring careful consideration.<br>• Optional port entry and arrival conditions, as well as non-binding guidelines, were also discussed where existing frameworks already provide controls. | 2.1 Consider potential refinements to the MCS data access rules and procedures to improve support to Port CCMs being able to request and access near real-time reporting for high-risk vessels.<br><br>2.2 Develop minimum and/or best practice [voluntary] standards for port entry and arrival conditions, including advance notification requirements<br><br>2.3 Consider linkages to WCPFC requirements such as:<br>a. transhipment regulation and reporting requirements,<br>b. HSBI events conducted;<br>c. Other CMM requirements to support consideration of entry applications |

| Priority areas for review | Initial list of points for further discussion | Summary of key points raised by participants during PSMWG2 | Initial suggestions of the next potential steps for further discussion in 2026 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **3. Facilitating access to WCPFC data to support Port entry procedures** | i. Consider establishing procedures that will more efficiently facilitate review and delivery of data under approved requests to support Port entry procedures, including from CNMs | • Review of data-sharing arrangements and strengthening of WCPFC Data Rules application highlighted.<br>• Challenges were identified in accessing timely and complete non-public domain data for port entry assessments, particularly for vessels not operating in certain waters despite existing Data Rules provisions (paragraphs 5 and 19).<br>• Clarification and strengthening of CMM provisions to provide clear access for port CCMs, including for Cooperating Non-Members (CNMs), was discussed.<br>• The potential establishment of an efficient communication platform between flag and port CCMs to enable faster data exchange was noted.<br>• Delays in data access were highlighted as a factor that may result in vessels entering port before verification, given the 72-hour decision timeframe. | 3.1 Consider potential refinements to the MCS data access rules and procedures to improve support to Port CCMs, including CNMs, to support requests and access to near real-time reporting<br><br>3.2 Develop draft recommendation text to task the Secretariat to progress work in 2027 to support alignment of WCPFC databases with GIES and any national or regional PSM information management systems |

| Priority areas for review | Initial list of points for further discussion | Summary of key points raised by participants during PSMWG2 | Initial suggestions of the next potential steps for further discussion in 2026 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **4. Inspection standards and scope** | i. Consider reviewing Annex A to establish binding minimum standards.<br>ii. Consider defining minimum inspection coverage (documents, gear, catch, logbooks, authorizations).<br>iii. Consider harmonization of inspection report standards with PSMA, other tRFMOs and pan-Pacific RFBs, where applicable. | • Emphasis on harmonisation and standardisation of inspection requirements with PSMA and other RFMOs.<br>• The possibility of establishing binding minimum inspection standards under a WCPFC framework was discussed, alongside potential effects on vessel port visits.<br>• Existing provisions were noted as not fully aligned with international best practices, which could reduce the effectiveness of port measures.<br>• The role of non-mandatory port measures, including designated ports, was highlighted as affecting regional implementation.<br>• Minimum inspection standards for vessel documents, fishing gear, catch, logbooks, and authorisations were discussed to promote consistency.<br>• Harmonization of inspection templates with PSMA and other tuna RFMOs was noted.<br>• Definitions of “high-risk” vessels, areas, and activities were discussed to support targeted inspections and improve regional consistency. | 4.1 Consider development of minimum and/or best practice standards for port inspections<br>4.2 Consider development of WCPFC minimum data fields for port inspections and associated reporting<br>4.3 Develop WCPFC definition of “high-risk” vessels, areas, and activities to support Port Inspection activities. (Will support consideration of 2.3 above) |

| Priority areas for review | Initial list of points for further discussion | Summary of key points raised by participants during PSMWG2 | Initial suggestions of the next potential steps for further discussion in 2026 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | • Clearer definitions of "high-risk" were identified as a way to enhance efficiency, effectiveness, and help reduce the occurrence of unreported ("ghost") vessels. | |
| **5. Reporting and data exchange** | i. Consider strengthening timely reporting of inspection-related information.<br>ii. Consider aligning inspection templates with PSMA GIES.<br>iii. Consider introducing near-real time reporting for high-risk cases.<br>iv. Consider exploring cross-tRFMO pan Pacific RFBs and CNM data sharing. | • Focus on harmonisation of data requirements with PSMA and strengthening data-exchange provisions.<br>• The importance of timely and reliable data exchange for effective port measures was highlighted for port, coastal, and flag CCMs.<br>• Development of standardised reporting templates and electronic systems linking WCPFC and PSMA databases was discussed.<br>• The FFA electronic Port State Measures Reporting tool (e-PSM) was identified as an example of a system directly connected to PSMA.<br>• Near real-time reporting for high-risk cases was noted as a potential approach, alongside consideration of technical and definitional challenges before implementation.<br>• The overall role of timely reporting in identifying IUU activities and strengthening regional compliance was emphasised. | 5.1 Develop draft recommendation text to task the Secretariat to progress work in 2027 to support alignment of WCPFC databases with GIES and any national or regional PSM information management systems (eg FFA e-PSM) |

| Priority areas for review | Initial list of points for further discussion | Summary of key points raised by participants during PSMWG2 | Initial suggestions of the next potential steps for further discussion in 2026 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **6. Integration with other CMMs/MCS tools** | i. Consider linkage between port inspections to transhipment monitoring, IUU vessel listing, HSBI and VMS. | • Review of related CMMs recommended to maximise linkages and integration of port measures within overall MCS framework.<br>• Port-related measures were discussed in the context of complementing existing CMM obligations, such as vessel markings, observer coverage, and transhipment controls.<br>• Integration across the Commission's compliance framework was identified as a way to reduce duplication and enhance coherence.<br>• Compatibility between data-sharing systems under port measures and other regional MCS tools was highlighted as important to improve efficiency and information flow. | 6.1 Develop draft recommendation text to task the Secretariat in 2027 to review related CMMs recommended to maximise linkages and integration of port measures within overall MCS framework |

***Table 3:*** *Chair's Indicative Workplan for the review of WCPFC CMM 2017-02 in 2026*

| Timeline | Planned Activities |
|---|---|
| **February-March** | First online meeting: Opportunity for participants to provide further comments on the priority areas, and initial suggestions of the next potential steps set out in Column 4 of **Table 2** |
| **April-June** | Development of initial draft recommendation texts, which may include draft amendments to CMM 2017-02, tasks to the Secretariat and first drafts of standards and procedures. |
| **June - July** | Second online meeting: to discuss initial draft recommendation texts. |
| **September (in association with TCC22)** | In-person meeting to finalise recommendations for WCPFC23. |
| **December (WCPFC23)** | Adoption of recommendations |

*Timelines are indicative and may be adjusted in coordination with CCMs and the Secretariat.