



DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW TROPICAL TUNA MEASURE WORKSHOP 3 (TTMW3)

Electronic Meeting

28-29 June 2023

CHAIR'S REPORT OF TTMW3

WCPFC-TTMW3-2023-Chair's Report

July 17, 2023

Agenda Item 1 — Opening of Workshop

1. The WCPFC Chair, Dr Josie Tamate, welcomed Members, Participating Territories, and Cooperating Non-Members (CCMs), Observers and the WCPFC Secretariat staff to the 3rd Tropical Tuna Measure workshop (TTMW3). The workshop was held online using the Zoom platform. An opening prayer was provided by the Niue delegation.

2. A list of confirmed participants is available as [Attachment 1](#) to this report.

1.1. Opening remarks by Chair

3. The Chair recalled that the workshop had been agreed to by WCPFC19 in a 2023 Work Plan for developing a revised tropical tuna measure (see [Attachment 2](#)), and that it followed in series from the two workshops that had been held in 2021 to discuss revisions to the tropical tuna Conservation and Management Measure (CMM) [2018-01](#). It had ultimately been decided by WCPFC18 in 2021 to “roll over” the measure for another two years with minor updates due to the difficulty of holding face-to-face international negotiations when COVID travel restrictions were in force, noting that the measure was achieving its stated objectives while the Commission continued to transition to implementation of harvest strategies.

4. WCPFC19 agreed that any new tropical tuna measure would be based on the current measure ([CMM 2021-01](#)) as far as possible, particularly in maintaining the balance between fisheries, but that there was room for strengthening certain elements of CMM 2021-01 including the development of allocation frameworks for high seas purse-seine fisheries and tropical longline bigeye fisheries. The Chair encouraged CCMs to discuss their positions with each other in the margins as much as possible, with a view to reconciling differences before coming to plenary. In this regard, she thanked the Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority and the U.S. Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council (WPRFMC) for the joint longline workshop that had been held recently to discuss issues pertaining to this measure. The Marshall Islands submitted a report of the joint longline workshop, which was posted on the meeting website as [WCPFC-TTMW3-2023-IP02](#).

5. The Chair noted that only two days were programmed for the workshop because much of the discussion would have to wait until further advice emerged from the WCPFC 19th Scientific Committee

(SC19) in August. A fourth workshop on the tropical tuna measure (TTMW4) had been agreed by WCPFC19 to be tentatively planned for early October 2023, but it might also be necessary to have an additional, fifth workshop (TTMW5) just before the WCPFC20 meeting in Rarotonga in December.

1.2. Adoption of agenda

6. The provisional agenda contained in [WCPFC-TTMW3-2023-Agenda](#) was adopted without amendment.

1.3. Workshop meeting arrangements

7. The Chair explained that the first day of the workshop had been planned to stretch over 4 hours, with a short break. If progress was good on Day 1, it might be possible to complete the agenda without needing the time that had been set aside for a second workshop day.

Agenda Item 2: Objectives of the Workshop

8. The Chair summarised the objectives of the workshop, which had also been conveyed through WCPFC Circular 2023/43 on the 26th of May 2023, and suggested that the most significant output at this stage would be the identification of any scientific advice necessary to inform the design of a revised tropical tuna measure. The objectives were outlined in workshop paper [WCPFC-TTMW03-2023-01](#) as follows:

- a. The principal objective of the workshop will be to identify the necessary scientific advice which can assist in considering relevant hard limits and allocation frameworks. This will enable any information needs to be considered at SC19 or by the Scientific Services Provider as appropriate.
- b. The identification of necessary scientific advice may include any additional analysis required to inform revisions to the tropical tuna measure. This takes into account that some of the work on a revised tropical tuna measure is contingent on advice from the Scientific Committee, in particular the management procedure for skipjack, scientific advice on stock status (in particular bigeye and yellowfin), non-entangling FADs and instrumented buoys.
- c. The workshop will review and prioritise the requests for scientific advice.
- d. The workshop will provide CCMs an opportunity to introduce their views on hard limits and allocation frameworks.
- e. An opportunity will also be provided for CCMs to provide an update on their views on revisions to the tropical tuna measure. In particular, CCMs are invited to convey the results of any bilateral discussions that have taken place with the aim of narrowing points of disagreement. Previous discussions, including those held at the Second Tropical Tuna Workshop in September 2021 (<https://meetings.wcpfc.int/meetings/ttmw2>), may provide a useful reference.

Agenda Item 3: Requests for further analysis and information by Scientific Services Provider

9. Dr Graham Pilling, on behalf of the WCPFC Scientific Services Provider, SPC, described the requests that had been made thus far by CCMs and CCM groups for further analysis and information to inform discussion of limits and their allocation among CCMs under the next tropical tuna measure. SPC's presentation is available on the workshop web page at <https://meetings.wcpfc.int/node/18843>.

10. Dr. Pilling noted that the previous tropical tuna measure was aimed at maintaining stocks on average at 2012-2015 unfished spawning stock biomass depletion levels and, in view of the agreement by CCMs that the broad balance between the tropical longline and purse-seine fisheries should remain, the

latest SPC analyses focussed on how in practice this balance might be maintained if the status of stocks required a reduction, or offered the opportunity of an increase in total catch in any of the fisheries.

11. The primary work-areas under the tropical tuna measure this year were driven by the need to agree a hard limit on total high seas purse-seine effort, in order for the Skipjack Management Procedure to be implemented, and to examine how changes in high seas purse-seine and longline key target species levels might influence the stock objectives and fishery balance in the tropical tuna measure.

12. It was envisaged that the main output of TTMW3 would be to prioritise requests to SPC from CCMs to help evaluate various potential CMM elements. Dr Pilling noted that new bigeye and yellowfin tuna stock assessments would be discussed at the Scientific Committee in August, and the resultant management advice would provide a firmer basis for evaluating the options. August would also see a run of the Skipjack Management Procedure, which would define the overall level of purse-seine effort in the WCPO. He noted that the Skipjack Management Procedure assumes a 3-month FAD closure.

13. The advice from SC19 would also provide a firmer idea of how the next tropical tuna measure objectives might be framed and would also provide a basis for completing as many of the evaluation requests as possible for presentation at the fourth tropical tuna measure workshop in September. Any outstanding requests could continue to be worked on until the Commission meeting in December, along with any new requests from the fourth workshop, if time permitted.

14. Dr. Pilling outlined the SPC's analysis of how long it might take to carry out all of the existing CMM evaluation requests from CCMs and estimated how much could be achieved in the time available, noting that it would take approximately 32 points to address all the requests, as scored by the SSP in relation to their difficulty/time requirements – the same process that had previously been used in 2021. However, only 20 points were likely to be available to SPC in the time available after SC19 and before TTMW4.

15. Dr. Pilling asked the workshop for advice on how to prioritise the requests so the most important ones could be presented in September.

16. Japan felt the presentation was informative but as they explained two years ago, the most important issue to Japan was the decline in bigeye tuna CPUE experienced by Japan fishermen. They had hoped that the tropical tuna measure would halt the decline in the bigeye stock, but Japan had seen a continuing decline in the stock, and halting this was one of their most important objectives. Referring to the second dot point of the introduction to the SPC presentation (“Examine how changes in high seas PS/key LL levels influence BET/YFT/SKJ v objectives of the TT CMM”), they asked if SPC could take into account changes that had occurred in EEZs as well as high seas. They also thought that an increase in level by 20% should be evaluated in view of the status of bigeye being an important objective. Thirdly, they felt it was important to include all recruitment scenarios. In the skipjack and yellowfin work SPC had used long term recruitment scenarios but the bigeye analysis used only short-term recruitment and they felt that this should use both long term and recent recruitment scenarios.

17. Korea thanked SPC for the hard work and analyses and wanted to clarify their requests. In views submitted earlier to the WCPFC Chair, they felt the length of the FAD closure and the bigeye catch limit should be dealt with as a package, as it had been in the past. Korea wanted to know, for example, if the FAD closure were decreased by 10% what would be the equivalent increase in the bigeye catch limit that would have the same impact. SPC suggested that existing tables from 2021¹ should be able to answer this question.

¹ [WCPFC18-2021-15](#) (Results of analyses requested by TTMW2 and TTMW1)

18. The Marshall Islands briefly described the outcomes of the 2nd WCPO Longline Management Workshop jointly organised with the WPRFMC in Honolulu on April 29-30, 2023. This was not a WCPFC meeting but an opportunity for some CCMs to discuss positions on the management of bigeye tuna in the longline fishery ahead of TTMW3.

19. Participants at the Honolulu workshop had agreed that, on the basis of current information, the bigeye stock is considered to be in good condition, and the bigeye stock status should allow for consideration at WCPFC20 in December 2023 for increases in the bigeye tuna catch limits reflected in Table 3 of CMM 2021-01. And in view of the need for balance, workshop participants had noted that it is likely that any increases in longline bigeye tuna limits would also involve proposals to equivalently increase the purse seine bigeye scalar (such as a reduction in the FAD closure duration).

20. The Honolulu longline workshop had also acknowledged low levels of observer coverage in longline fleets of some CCMs and sought to clarify what would constitute adequate MCS on the high seas and in EEZs. They considered various provisions that might improve this. The Honolulu workshop had made some recommendations on priority requests to SPC and acknowledged that the inclusion of climate change in fisheries considerations should feature in the revision to the tropical tuna CMM, and that all WCPFC CMMs would need to reflect adaptability in the face of uncertainty due to climate change impacts on fisheries.

21. On behalf of the Parties to the Nauru Agreement and Tokelau (PNA+), the Marshall Islands attached high priority to maintaining the current balance of interests between fisheries and between CCMs in relation to the conservation burden of the tropical tuna measure. They suggested that proposed changes to the management arrangements would need to be considered carefully against the management objectives of the measure and the implementation of the Management Procedure for Skipjack, because these were not independent of each other. They also requested an update to Table 9 and 10 of WCPFC18-2021-15 (*Results of analyses requested by TTMW2 and TTMW1*), based on the new yellowfin and bigeye stock assessments.

22. SPC said that they would have to make assumptions about the level of fishing in EEZs, and in part this would depend on the outcome of the Skipjack Management Procedure being discussed later. In terms of increases and decreases, if there were requests not already covered by the nuclear grid, SPC could look at these. For the bigeye recruitment scenarios from Japan, SPC would do this as a standard practice anyway. On the Korean request, it was technically feasible but would need to wait for the outcomes of SC19 regarding the new stock assessments. And responding to RMI on requests coming from the Honolulu workshop, they would comb through the report looking for requests for scientific advice but noted that some of these were already included in the USA requests. And the PNA+ request for an update to Tables 9 and 10 was feasible.

23. Although Japan said they were happy with the SPC response, they noted that some members had requested specific analyses looking at the impact of future *reductions* in FAD closures, and so Japan would also like to see some future projections based on *increases* in the FAD closure. Their preferred baseline was the 2004 period since that was the basis of the tropical tuna measure itself and the (bigeye) stock has declined since then. Japan wished to recover the stock to that level. Although their request was similar in type to the USA request, Japan wanted to be sure this particular baseline was an option in the SPC analysis.

24. SPC asked for clarification on how the impact would be measured and whether it would be the impact on adult depletion ratio or something more. They noted there was also a request from the EU to look at various combinations of pole and line and longline effort but noted that, as expressed, this would

probably triple the amount of work on SPC, and asked if EU could narrow down the number of combinations.

25. In response to SPC's question, the USA clarified that they were interested in the impact of any reduction in FAD closure period on (BET) juveniles that would have a later impact on the longline fleet.

26. Tuvalu, speaking for PNA+ saw the FAD closures as an economically costly blunt instrument. PNA+ were however willing to continue in the short term with FAD closures while advancing in-zone FAD management arrangements with a view to replacing closures with more precisely targeted FAD management measures. They requested an analysis around a candidate TRP for bigeye that would project the 2012-2015 depletion level adjusted to remove the FAD closures. They also requested an update to Table 6 to include a TRP level equivalent to the 2012-15 level of depletion without the FAD closures, and concluded by asking SPC to provide a table showing the changes in purse seine skipjack and yellowfin catches from changes in the FAD closure, to measure catches foregone.

27. After SPC had updated the table of requests for scientific advice following these clarifications from CCMs and found that the required points still added up to more than those available, they requested that CCMs might try to narrow the list still further.

28. The EU clarified one of their requests to SPC looking at different combinations of purse seine, longline and pole and line fishing levels, and suggested simplifying it by dropping the pole and line (PL) options that had been requested and just assume one PL effort level as in the past.

29. Further discussion was held on the pros and cons of amalgamating certain requests, the possible postponement of some requests and other fine-tuning, until no further movement appeared to be occurring. At the end of Day 1, after extending the workshop by two hours, the Chair ruled that the revised list of requests to SPC for analyses should be considered by CCMs overnight, and that each CCM, or group of CCMs, which had made more than one request should rank their own requests in order of priority and provide this ranking to the Secretariat by 9:30 am Pohnpei time on the second day of the workshop.

30. After further discussion and some adjustments to requests on Day 2, the workshop adopted the ranking outlined in [Attachment 3](#). Any requests that were agreed to be postponed would be addressed after TTMW4 in September and before WCPFC20, or before TTMW5 if convened ahead of WCPFC20 in the Cook Islands. SPC noted that if additional requests arose from these workshops, it was possible that another prioritisation exercise would be required to ensure the necessary analyses could be completed in time to support discussions at WCPFC20.

OUTCOME:

- CCMs made requests to the Scientific Service Provider for further analysis and information to assist in the development of hard limits and allocation frameworks and additional analysis required to inform revisions to the tropical tuna measure.
- The SSP prepared an updated table of requested analyses, which were prioritised based on feasibility and availability of SPC resources (Attachment 3).

Agenda Item 4: Consideration of options for hard limits and allocation frameworks

31. The Chair invited CCMs to consider relevant provisions of the WCPFC Convention and CMM 2021-01 which address hard limits and allocation frameworks.

32. The Chair noted that it was unlikely that this workshop would be able to make any firm recommendations on this topic, but it would be useful to advance mutual understanding through an exchange of views. The current tropical tuna CMM was supposed to be a “bridging” measure, transitioning the Commission to a full Harvest Strategy approach and a comprehensive Allocation Framework. There had been several attempts over the years to move forward on allocation and the process was unlikely to be resolved here, but it would be useful to agree on the information needed and actions that would have to be taken in order to make progress.

33. Japan felt this was an important agenda item. All would be aware that the Commission was committed to Zone Based Management (ZBM) as proposed by Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) CCMs and so this allocation process would be particularly important for coastal States of the Commission. However, without a better definition of ZBM they felt it would be difficult to make progress on allocation. They pointed out that Article 10(3) of the WCPFC Convention articulated some of the factors that needed to be taken into account in allocation decisions, including historical catch and the needs of coastal communities, while Article 5 stated that CCMs must take into account the stocks in their entirety and also to take coastal communities into account. They emphasised that we would need to consider the views of all CCMs across the region because allocation decisions require consensus, and thus the careful examination of all positions.

34. Papua New Guinea on behalf of PNA+ also noted that the first paragraph of Article 10 of the WCPFC Convention provided that the Commission’s functions as set out in that Article were to be exercised “without prejudice to the sovereign rights of coastal States”, and that this included allocation. They emphasised that the purse-seine and longline fisheries in the waters of PNA+ are managed through the purse seine and longline Vessel Day Schemes, and these were implemented by these CCMs in the exercise of their sovereign rights over fisheries in their EEZs. Any Commission allocation framework would need to be applied without prejudice to those arrangements.

35. They also noted that the UN Fish Stocks Agreement requires States that are Party to that Agreement to assist developing States, in particular small island developing States, to enable them to participate in high seas fisheries for such stocks, including facilitating access to such fisheries. PNA+ looked forward to the application of this provision.

36. Thirdly, PNA+ saw allocations, particularly high seas allocations, as a potentially important element of climate justice. They explained this concept by noting that, in a situation where Pacific Island countries and communities, through no fault of their own, face severe economic damage and a threat to their existence and cultures, access to the region’s tuna resources offered an obvious path to contributing to climate justice.

37. China understood that the WCPFC Convention required consensus decisions to be made on allocations, and agreed with Japan that we need to be very careful about how we approach this process. However, any proposals for an increase in high seas and longline fisheries should not be considered until advice from SC is received. They noted that PNA had an internal allocation process for longline and purse-seine effort in their EEZs and VDS days might often be used by foreign flag vessels chartered to PNA States, resulting in that catch or effort being attributed to the chartering coastal State. They felt that

attribution, for the purposes of regional allocation, needed to take into account some attribution to flag States for their vessels fishing in other EEZs.

38. China added that they agreed that any increase in a catch limit for longliners should be accompanied by more stringent monitoring measures. They considered that WCPFC should adopt a minimum standard for electronic monitoring (EM), preferably very quickly as part of its MCS work this year.

39. The EU noted that Article 10 outlines the functions of the Commission, including that the Commission shall set a total allowable catch or total level of fishing effort for stocks under its purview within the WCPFC Convention Area. They felt that this meant, with all due respect to the existing arrangements, that there needed to be at some point in the discussion, and without undermining what exists, some consideration of the broader convention area in any allocation discussion. This was felt to be the starting point. But all the other elements of Article 10 were also important, and it would be difficult to find a “magic formula” that would allow them all to be satisfactorily combined, or weighted in such a way that satisfied all CCMs. They felt that this would be an extremely challenging process, but that should not prevent the Commission from doing its best.

40. The EU added that there might be two elements that might be useful in moving this discussion forward. The first would be to also include in our discussions the options for the use of any allocation that the Commission might decide. What arrangements could be considered for using that allocation? The other element would be to make sure that we all understood the concepts that were being proposed by different members. In addition, the EU was not sure if all CCMs understood certain concepts in the same way. For example, they felt it would be extremely useful if the members who were pushing very hard on zone-based arrangements, and on how these arrangements could be replicated in other fisheries or in specific areas, could explain exactly how this concept would work. Another concept that the EU had only just heard about was “climate justice”. The EU had some idea of what it was about, but again, it was not clear if all CCMs understood this concept in the same way. They emphasised that it was important that a common understanding be built because otherwise it would make the discussion more difficult.

41. Tuvalu, on behalf of FFA members, emphasised that the setting of a purse seine effort limit on the high seas would be critical to the application of the newly-adopted Skipjack Management Procedure and that it would need to be consistent with the management objectives set out for skipjack and also be consistent with achieving the management objectives for bigeye tuna. FFA members recognised the importance of balancing the merits of different hard limit proposals against the criteria of impact on the sustainability of stocks, economic considerations, alignment with the Skipjack Management Procedure, as well as the positions of other CCMs in informing deliberations on this issue. FFA members had therefore requested the SPC to update tables 14 and 15 from the paper WCPFC18-2021-15 with the updated Target Reference Point from the Skipjack Management Procedure for the reference periods 2012, 2016-2018 and 2018-2021.

42. FFA members also urged further discussion to include the high seas purse-seine effort of the Philippines in the regional high seas purse-seine limit and how this could be implemented.

43. The Marshall Islands drew attention to the statement by China, and felt it was a good one that needed to be discussed further – particularly the mechanism for better verifying and monitoring longlining on the high seas. They also felt that the bias caused by the different degree of monitoring and verification of longliners versus purse seiners needed to be taken into account in this discussion. Regarding the questions by the EU about ZBM as it relates to the Convention Area, they noted that Article 10 was the basis for the limits PNA+ had placed on fishing effort through the VDS, but also relevant was the “without

prejudice” clause at the top of Article 10, as well as paragraphs 27 and 41 of the tropical tuna CMM. They pointed out that in many cases, high seas catch limits were not monitored or independently verified, and the management of longline fisheries on the high seas would need to be strengthened before we looked down the road towards allocations that include the high seas. The tropical tuna CMM would also need to recognise the sovereign rights of coastal states, including PNA+, to implement ZBM schemes. This included the longline VDS as well as the purse-seine VDS.

44. New Zealand spoke on behalf of FFA Members and reiterated their commitment to developing an allocation framework that is compatible with ZBM, that gives strong emphasis to Article 10(3) of the Convention and recognises relevant allocation criteria, and their intention to pursue a high seas FFA share. In addition to the coastal State rights under Article 10(3), they felt that the economic dependence, equal shares, development status, special circumstances, adjacency, and catch/effort history are the key criteria for the development of an allocation framework. Further, they sought a dynamic allocation framework that would take into account climate change impacts and avoided a disproportionate burden on SIDS and Territories. They also agreed that independent verification is crucial for the monitoring of, and compliance with, any allocation framework.

45. Marshall Islands spoke on behalf of PNA+ CCMs in support of the FFA member position. PNA+ continued to consider the setting of hard limits and agreement on allocation frameworks as an important priority. At the same time, this was a very difficult area in which to make progress and would take time. This could conflict in terms of priority with the need to make progress on core harvest strategy work, noting that there are limits to how much can be achieved with harvest strategies without more effective limits and allocation frameworks than those in place now. PNA+ took as the starting point the various provisions discussed in the last agenda item, including the Convention provisions and paragraphs 27 and 41 of the tropical tuna CMM as well as Article 25(3) of the UN Fish Stocks Agreement. From those provisions, a key element for PNA+ was the importance of the interests of developing coastal States, especially SIDS. This would need to be explicitly recognised in any allocation framework.

46. Related to that, any allocation framework would also need to allow for changes in the composition of fleets as SIDS fleets expand and replace historical distant water fleets, and not be fixed. A critical element for PNA+ was the need for effective monitoring and independent verification of any new sets of limits. It was clarified that PNA+ apply effort limits, not catch limits in their waters because effort limits can be effectively monitored and independently verified through e-reporting, VMS, and observers. On the other hand, it was often the case that catch limits were not fully monitored and not independently verified. They felt that this was no basis for effective management.

OUTCOME:

- **CCMs noted the importance of the development of hard limits and allocation frameworks and their commitment to progressing this work, taking into account other important Commission work including on harvest strategies.**
- **CCMs acknowledged that the Convention and the UN Fish Stocks Agreement provide the direction to the Commission for decisions on allocation. Under the terms of the Convention, any decision on allocation requires consensus. It was acknowledged that allocation is a difficult area and agreement will take time. Care therefore needs to be taken in proceeding with allocation to ensure consensus can be achieved.**

- **CCMs had a good discussion of views and acknowledged that further progress will await the outcome of SC19 and the additional analysis to be provided by the Scientific Services Provider.**
- **CCMs were encouraged to continue their individual and bilateral discussions to make progress on the development of a revised tropical tuna measure.**

Agenda Item 5: Next Tropical Tuna Workshop

5.1. Proposed dates for the next Workshop

47. The Chair invited the WCPFC Secretariat to outline potential options for dates to convene TTMW4. The Secretariat noted that if CCMs were committed to meeting in person for TTMW4, then September 29-30 in Pohnpei would provide for some reduction in costs to the extent that CCM officials attending TCC19, which concludes on September 26 in Pohnpei, would also attend TTMW4 and travel costs to support developing State participation would be minimal. Similarly, hosting the workshop in Pohnpei would allow the Secretariat to provide the full complement of support services to the workshop. An alternative option to meeting on September 29-30 in Pohnpei would be to meet some time during the week of October 2-6, in Pohnpei for the same reasons outlined in support of September 29-30. If CCMs were interested in holding the workshop outside of Pohnpei, then a host would be required, and the normal hosting requirements would be expected. The Secretariat further noted that the US had provided funding to the Secretariat to support an extra day of TCC19, which would not now be used for that purpose, and that those funds could be applied to support an in person TTMW4. Additional funding would be sourced from the WCPFC's Working Capital Fund, which WCPFC19 had agreed could be utilized in 2023 for any intersessional meetings or workshops that may be needed. For each of the in-person meeting options presented, the Secretariat confirmed that these could also be held in hybrid format to enable online participation by those unable to travel.

48. CCMs agreed to wait to decide whether a 5th TTM workshop should be planned immediately before WCPFC20 in Rarotonga.

OUTCOME:

- **The Workshop noted the importance of an in-person workshop to allow consultations and to make progress on the tropical tuna measure. The next Workshop will be held September 29-30 (Fri-Sat) to be held in Pohnpei and hybrid format.**

5.2. Initial discussion of the objectives of the 4th Workshop (TTMW4)

49. On behalf of PNA+, PNG supported the view that the single biggest priority for the TTMW4 would be the adoption of hard limits for high seas purse seine effort in order to enable the full application of the Skipjack Management Procedure. It seemed clear that there would be a lot of work needed to close the gaps in terms of an agreement on a hard limit this year, but they thought it important that there should also be at least a preliminary exchange of views on the allocation of this limit.

50. As an additional comment on the progress of this work, PNG noted that WCPFC should not plan to allow the work of reviewing the tropical tuna measure to spill over into 2024, because 2024 needed to be committed to progressing Harvest Strategy work.

51. Korea hoped that the next tropical tuna measure workshop would be able to start discussing specific text to amend the existing tropical tuna measure. Korea was very much looking forward to having discussions on specific text proposed by CCMs rather than having discussions based on systems, views or positions with which members are already familiar.

52. Korea recognised that the additional scientific advice requested would not be available long before the next workshop, but they hoped that CCMs would make their best endeavours to propose specific text for elements that were not dependent on scientific advice. For example, Korea was intending to propose some text on the FAD closure rule and expected a more focussed, substantive discussion at the next workshop.

OUTCOME:

- **The main objective for TTMW4 will be to review results of SSP analyses from TTMW3, which will take account of SC19 recommendations, and inform discussions on review and revision of relevant TTM provisions. The objectives of TTMW4 will be finalised in consultation with CCMs.**

5.3. Process for development of agenda for the next Workshop

53. The Chair invited the WCPFC Secretariat to outline the process for developing the agenda for the next Workshop.

54. The Secretariat responded that the process would likely be similar to what was used for this workshop, where the Chair would circulate a proposed agenda to CCMs for their feedback, with agreement to be confirmed electronically. But this was possibly a process that would need to wait until after SC19 before a proposed agenda could be developed.

OUTCOME:

- **The same process that was used to develop TTMW3 provisional agenda will be used for TTMW4. The Chair will propose an agenda for TTMW4 and invite CCM feedback.**

Agenda Item 6: Other Matters

55. No other matters were raised.

Agenda Item 7: Workshop Outcomes

56. The Chair briefly summarised the main workshop outcomes and noted that a comprehensive Chair's Report would be made available to workshop participants in due course. A written version of the Outcomes would be made available.

Agenda Item 8: Close of workshop

57. The Chair thanked participants for their work, and the Secretariat and SPC for their efficient support. She looked forward to meeting many of the participants in person the following week at the Northern Committee meeting in Fukuoka and encouraged CCMs to continue to discuss tropical tuna issues with each other, and to explore possible compromises in order to improve the chances of moving forward at the next workshop.

ATTACHMENT 1 - LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CHAIR

Josie M Tamate

Ministry of Natural Resources, Government of Niue

Director-General

josie.tamate@mail.gov.nu

AUSTRALIA

Kate Martin

Australian Fisheries Management Authority
Tropical Tuna Manager

kate.martin@afma.gov.au

Max Bayly

Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Assistant Director

max.bayly@aff.gov.au

Selina Stoute

Australian Fisheries Management Authority
Senior Manager

selina.stoute@afma.gov.au

CANADA

Robynn Laplante

Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Advisor

Robynn-Bella.Smith-Laplante@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

CHINA

Li Yan

China Overseas Fisheries Association

Deputy Director of High Seas Fisheries

liyancnfj@outlook.com

Liu Xiaobing

Shanghai Ocean University

Visiting Professor

xiaobing.liu@hotmail.com

Xiaojie Dai

Shanghai Ocean University

Professor

xjdai@shou.edu.cn

Zhao Gang

China Overseas Fisheries Association

Secretary General

zhaogang@cofa.net.cn

COOK ISLANDS

Barbara Hanchard

c/o Marshall Islands Marine Resources
Authority

Consultant

barbara@hanchard.net

Pamela Maru

Ministry of Marine Resources

Secretary

P.Maru@mmr.gov.ck

EUROPEAN UNION

Stamatis Varsamos

European Commission, Directorate General
for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Unit B2:
RFMOs

Head of the European Union Delegation

Stamatios.VARSAMOS@ec.europa.eu

Francisco Javier Abascal Crespo

Spanish Institute of Oceanography

Fisheries Scientist

francisco.abascal@ieo.csic.es

Ignacio de Leiva

European Union

Fisheries Attache

Ignacio.de-leiva@eeas.europa.eu

FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

Jamel James

FSM National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority

Assistant Fisheries Biologist

Justino Helgen

FSM National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority

Senior Fisheries Compliance Officer

justino.helgen@norma.fm

Mathew Chigiyal

National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority (NORMA)
Deputy Director
mathew.chigiyal@norma.fm

Youky Susaia Jr

FSM National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority
Assistant Director, Fisheries Compliance
Division
youky.susaia@norma.fm

INDONESIA**Putuh Suadela**

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Deputy Director of Fish Resources
Management in IEEZ and High Seas,
Directorate General of Capture Fisheries
putuhsuadela@gmail.com

Mumpuni Cyntia Pratiwi

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

JAPAN**Masahide Kannou**

Fisheries Agency of Japan
Staff, International Affairs Division
masahide_kanno210@maff.go.jp

Akihito Fukuyama

Japan Far Seas Purse Seine Fishing Association
Managing Director
fukuyama@kaimaki.or.jp

Fuyuki Hayashi

Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative Association
Assistant Director
fhayashi@japantuna.or.jp

Reiko Ohashi

Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative Association
Assistant Director
ohashi@japantuna.or.jp

Tetsuya Kunito

Federation of North Pacific District Purse Seine
Fisheries Cooperative Associations of Japan
Section Manager
tetsuya_kunito920@kitamaki.jp

Tomohiro Itou

Fisheries Agency of Japan
staff
tomohiro_ito400@maff.go.jp

KIRIBATI**Uati Tirikai**

Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
Development
Senior Compliance Officer, Licensing
Compliance Division
uatit@mfmrd.gov.ki

NAURU**Howard Tsai**

Ocean Pride Company, Ltd. and Ocean Ranger
Company, Ltd.
Operations Manager
a7220363@yahoo.com.tw

Julian Itsimaera

NFMRA
Observer Coordinator
julian.itsimaera2016@gmail.com

NEW ZEALAND**Heather Ward**

Ministry for Primary Industries
Principal Advisor

Arthur Hore

Ministry for Primary Industries
Manager, Offshore Fisheries
arthur.hore@mpi.govt.nz

Hilary Ayrton

Ministry for Primary Industries
Senior Fisheries Analyst

NIUE**Poi Okesene**

Government of Niue
Director, Department of Agriculture, Forestry
and Fisheries; Ministry of Natural Resources
poi.okesene@mail.gov.nu

Launoa Gataua

Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

MCS Officer

Launoa.Gataua@mail.gov.nu

Quentin Hanich

Australian National Centre for Ocean Resources and Security (ANCORS) - Uni of Wollongong

Advisor

hanich@uow.edu.au

PALAU**Kathleen Sisor**

Bureau of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Environment

Acting Chief / Fisheries Policy Advisor

utau.sisor@gmail.com

Keith Mesebeluu

Palau Oceanic Fisheries, Bureau of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Environment

Fisheries Policy Specialist/Acting Chief

keithmesebeluu@gmail.com

Zilah Dirremeang Oiterong

Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Environment

Licensing and Revenue Officer

dirremeang@gmail.com

PAPUA NEW GUINEA**Benthly Sabub**

Papua New Guinea National Fisheries Authority

Fisheries Management Officer, Tuna Fishery

bensabub@gmail.com

Simon Kaumi

National Fisheries Authority

Executive Officer to the Managing Director

skaumi@fisheries.gov.pg

PHILIPPINES**Alma C. Dickson**

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources

Development Management Officer IV

alma_dickson@yahoo.com

Asis G. Perez

SACOPA

Legal Adviser

perezasis@yahoo.com

Benjamin Felipe Jr. Serina Tabios

Department of Agriculture

Office for Special Concerns, Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources

benjotabios@gmail.com

Francisco Torres Jr

National Fisheries Research and Development Institute (NFRDI)

Senior Science Research Specialist

francisco_torresjr@yahoo.com

Isidro Tanangonan

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources

Aquaculturist II

itanangonan@bfar.da.gov.ph

Jennifer Viron

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources

Senior Fishing Regulations Officer

Lilian C. Garcia

National Fisheries Research and Development Institute

Executive Director

Maria Joy Mabanglo

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources

VMS Staff

mj.mabanglo@gmail.com

Marlo Demo-os

DA-Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources

Aquaculturist II

mbdemoos@bfar.da.gov.ph

Peter Erick Cadapan

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources

Supervising Aquaculturist

pcadapan@bfar.da.gov.ph

Rafael V. Ramiscal

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR)

Chief, Capture Fisheries Division

rv_ram55@yahoo.com

Rosanna Bernadette B. Contreras

Socksargen Federation of Fishing and Allied Industries, Inc.
Executive Director
fishing.federation@gmail.com

Severino Escobar Jr

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Chief, Capture Fisheries Licensing Section-
Fisheries Regulatory and Licensing Division
jojo_escobar@yahoo.com

Suzette B. Barcoma

National Fisheries Research and Development Institute (NFRDI)
Science Research Specialist II
suzette_barcoma@yahoo.com

REPUBLIC OF KOREA**Bongjun Choi**

Korea Overseas Fisheries Association (KOFA)
Manager
bj@kosfa.org

Eui Sup Shin

Sajo Industries Company, Ltd.
Assistant Manager
eui@sajo.co.kr

Hee Won Park

National Institute of Fisheries Science (NIFS)
Scientist
heewon81@gmail.com

Ilkang Na

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

Jung-re Riley Kim

Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
Head of Fisheries Negotiation Unit
riley1126@korea.kr

Kyung Yung Lee

Sajo Industries Co., Ltd.
General Manager
dada1000@sajo.co.kr

Minsung Lee

Sajo Industries Company, Ltd.
Manager
ted@sajo.co.kr

Sang Bum Lee

Dongwon Industries
General Manager
gabbalee@dongwon.com

Sangjin Baek

Korea Overseas Fisheries Association
Assistant Manager
sjbaek@kosfa.org

Ung Gyu Han

Sajo Industries Co., Ltd.
Senior Staff
Dan@sajo.co.kr

REPUBLIC OF MARSHALL ISLANDS**Beau Bigler**

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

Berry Muller

Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
Deputy Director - Oceanic and Industrial
Affairs Division
bmuller@mimra.com

Glen Joseph

Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
Executive Director
gjoseph@mimra.com

SOLOMON ISLANDS**Amanda Hamilton**

Tri Marine International Pty, Ltd.
Senior Manager - Fleet Operations &
Sustainability
ahamilton@trimarinegroup.com

Angelina Tan

Tri Marine International Pty, Ltd
Manager - Fisheries Policy & Sustainability
angelinatan@trimarinegroup.com

Harold Vilia

Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
Chief Fisheries Officer (Observer Programme)
hvilia@fisheries.gov.sb

CHINESE TAIPEI

Jerhyn Chu

Taiwan Tuna Purse Seiners Association
(TTPSA)

General Secretary

jerhyn@ttpsa.org.tw

Lin Han Yu

Taiwan Tuna Association

Director

tony@tuna.org.tw

Ryan Xu

FCF Company, Ltd.

Assistant

ryanxu@fcf.com.tw

Scott Tai-Yun Wen

Overseas Fisheries Development Council

Secretary

wty@ofdc.org.tw

Shui-Kai Chang

National Sun Yat-sen University

Professor

skchang@faculty.nsysu.edu.tw

Wang Chih Min

Tung Kang Fisheries Association

Director

Wei-tang Hsu

Fong Kuo Fishery Co. Ltd.

Manager

twthsu@fongkuo.com.tw

Wenying Wang

Fisheries Agency, Council of Agriculture,
Executive Yuan

Section Chief, International Fisheries Affair
Section, Deep Sea Fisheries Division

wenyingw456@gmail.com

Yee-Chun Chiang

Fisheries Agency, Council of Agriculture,
Executive Yuan

Assistant Trainer, International Fisheries Affair
Section, Deep Sea Fisheries Division

yeechun@msl.f.gov.tw

TUVALU

Michael Batty

Tuvalu Fisheries Department

Adviser

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Kelly Kryc

National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration

Deputy Assistant Secretary for International
Fisheries

kelly.kryc@noaa.gov

Alex Kahl

NOAA Fisheries - Pacific Islands Regional
Office

International Fisheries Division

alex.kahl@noaa.gov

Alexa Cole

NOAA Office of International Affairs &
Seafood Inspection

Director

Alexa.Cole@noaa.gov

Callan Yanoff

Department of State

Foreign Affairs Officer

yanoffcj@state.gov

Christa Svensson

PFMC

Alternate-Commissioner

cvsvensson@trimarinegroup.com

Dr. Christine Bertz

U.S. Department of State

Foreign Affairs Officer

bertzca@state.gov

Eric Kingma

Hawaii Longline Association

Executive Director

Eric.K.Kingma@gmail.com

Gerald B. Leape

Pew Charitable Trusts

International Government Relations

gleape@pewtrusts.org

Jaimey

NOAA

Deputy NOAA Administrator

Jason Philibotte
NOAA Fisheries
International Fisheries, Division Chief
jason.philibotte@noaa.gov

Katrina Poremba
NMFS
Fisher Policy Analyst
katrina.poremba@noaa.gov

Mark Fitchett
Western Pacific Regional Fisheries
Management Council (WPRFMC)
Pelagic Ecosystem Fisheries Scientist
mark.fitchett@wpcouncil.org

Michael Goto
United States Delegation
Commissioner

Raymond Clarke
Bumblebee SeaFoods
VP
ray.clarke@bumblebee.com

Rebecca Wintering
U.S. Department of State
Office of Marine Conservation
WinteringRJ@state.gov

Sean Martin
Hawaii Longline Association
President
SEAN@POP-HAWAII.COM

Terry Boone
NOAA Fisheries Office of Law Enforcement,
Pacific Islands Division (NOAA OLE/PID)
VMS Manager

William Gibbons-Fly
American Tunaboat Association
Executive Director
wgibbons-fly@atatuna.com

AMERICAN SAMOA

Gun Kang
Starkist
Fish Coordination Manager
gun.kang@starkist.com

FRENCH POLYNESIA

Marie Soehnlen
Marine Resources Department
Fisheries officer
marie.soehnlen@administration.gov.pf

Thibaut Thellier
French Polynesia Fishery Department
Offshore Fishery Officer
thibaut.thellier@drm.gov.pf

THAILAND

Nattawut Aiemubolwan
Department of fisheries Thailand
Fisheries Biologist, Practitioner Level
nattawut.mnk62@gmail.com

Orawan Prasertsook
Department of fisheries Thailand
Fisheries Biologist, Practitioner Level
fukowindy.sp@gmail.com

Thitirat Rattanawiwan
Department of fisheries Thailand
Fisheries Biologist, Practitioner Level
milky_gm@hotmail.com

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL CENTRE FOR OCEAN RESOURCES AND SECURITY (ANCORS)

Bianca Haas
Australian National Centre for Ocean
Resources and Security
Research Fellow
bhaas@uow.edu.au

Kamal Azmi
Australian National Centre for Ocean
Resources and Security (ANCORS)
Australian National Centre for Ocean
Resources and Security (ANCORS)
kamala@uow.edu.au

CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL (CI)

Jyanti Singh
Conservation International (Fiji)
Oceanic Fisheries Coordinator
jsingh@conservation.org

**INTERNATIONAL SEAFOOD
SUSTAINABILITY FOUNDATION (ISSF)**

Claire van der Geest

ISSF

Advisor

claire.vandergeest@gmail.com

MARINE STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL

Bill Holden

Marine Stewardship Council

Senior Tuna Fisheries Outreach Manager

bill.holden@msc.org

Sayuri Ichikawa

Marine Stewardship Council

WCPO Tuna Project Fisheries Manager

Sayuri.Ichikawa@msc.org

PACIFIC COMMUNITY (SPC)

Finlay Scott

Pacific Community

Fisheries Scientist

finlays@spc.int

Graham Pilling

Pacific Community (SPC)

Deputy Director FAME (OFP)

grahamp@spc.int

John Hampton

Pacific Community

Chief Scientist

johnh@spc.int

Lauriane Escalle

Pacific Community

Fisheries Scientist

laurianee@spc.int

Moses Nainoka Mataika

SPC

Pacific Islands Fisheries Professional

mosesm@spc.int

Paul Hamer

Pacific Community

Principal Scientist

paulh@spc.int

Peter Williams

Secretariat of the Pacific Community

Principal Fisheries Scientist (Data Mgmt.)

peterw@spc.int

Robert Scott

Pacific Community

Senior Fisheries Scientist

robertsc@spc.int

Sam McKechnie

Pacific Community

Fisheries Scientist

samm@spc.int

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

'Ana F. Taholo

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency

Compliance Policy Advisor

ana.taholo@ffa.int

Adele Dutilloy

FFA

Fisheries Management Advisor

adele.dutilloy@ffa.int

Joyce Samuelu-Ah Leong

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)

Fisheries Management Adviser

joyce.samuelu-ahleong@ffa.int

Lianos Triantafillos

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)

Fisheries Management Advisor

lianos.triantafillos@ffa.int

Marina Abas

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)

Fisheries Management Advisor

marina.abas@ffa.int

Michael Honeth

FFA

Fisheries Management Adviser

michael.honeth@ffa.int

**PARTIES TO THE NAURU AGREEMENT
(PNA)**

Brian Kumasi

Office of the Parties to the Nauru Agreement

Policy Manager

Brian@pnatuna.com

Les Clark
PNA
Adviser
les@pnatuna.com

PEW CHARITABLE TRUST

Glen Holmes
The Pew Charitable Trusts
Officer
gholmes@pewtrusts.org

Laura Eeles
The Pew Charitable Trusts
Senior Associate
leeles@pewtrusts.org

THE OCEAN FOUNDATION

Dave Gershman
The Ocean Foundation
Officer, International Fisheries Conservation
dgershman@oceanfdn.org

WCPFC SECRETARIAT

Albert Carlot
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
VMS Manager
albert.carlot@wcpfc.int

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

Elaine G. Garvilles
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Assistant Science Manager
Elaine.Garvilles@wcpfc.int

Emma N. Mori
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Project Management Assistant
emma.mori@wcpfc.int

Jeannie M. Nanpei
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
RFV Officer
jeannie.nanpei@wcpfc.int

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

Karl Staisch
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
ROP Coordinator
karl.staisch@wcpfc.int

Lara Manarangi-Trott
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Compliance Manager
Lara.Manarangi-Trott@wcpfc.int

Lucille Martinez
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Administrative Officer
lucille.martinez@wcpfc.int

Penelope Ridings
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Legal Advisor
pennyridings@yahoo.com

Rhea Moss-Christian
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Executive Director
rhea.moss-christian@wcpfc.int

Samuel T. Rikin
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
IT Officer
samuel.rikin@wcpfc.int

SungKwon Soh
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Science Manager
sungkwon.soh@wcpfc.int

SureAnn Poll

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
ROP Data Entry
sureann.poll@wcpfc.int

Tim Adams

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Meeting Rapporteur
tim.adams@gonedau.com

Tim Jones

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
IT Manager
tim.jones@wcpfc.int

Virginia Ezekias

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
VMS Officer
virginia.ezekias@wcpfc.int

ATTACHMENT 2 - Process to Negotiate a Revised Tropical Tuna Measure in 2023

Background

CMM2021-01 (Tropical Tuna Measure, TTM) remains in effect until February 15, 2024, and outlines timeframes for the Commission's agreement on (1) purse seine hard effort or catch limits in the high seas of the Convention Area and an allocation framework (para 27) and (2) longline hard limits for bigeye and an allocation framework (para 41) amongst all Members and Participating Territories by 2023.

The Measure requires that an allocation framework take into account Articles 8, 10(3), and 30 of the Convention.

WCPFC 19 agreed that the process to revise the TTM will be based on 2021-01 without a complete overhaul, and at least two workshops will be needed to make progress towards the adoption of a revised TTM in 2023.

Work Plan

The process will be led by the Chair of the Commission, with the assistance of the Vice Chair of the Commission. The Secretariat and the Scientific Services Provider will assist the Chair, Vice Chair and CCMs throughout the process.

- End of February, 2023 : The Chair will produce a document highlighting the areas of the TTM that need revisions (reference to scientific information, limits, allocation, etc).
- End of March, 2023 : CCMs will provide feedback on the areas of the TTM that need revisions, and provide their views on relevant limits and allocation frameworks. CCMs will hold a virtual pre-workshop to have an initial exchange of views.
- End of April, 2023 : The Chair will circulate the compilation of the feedback from CCMs, providing a side-by-side comparison of different views on relevant limits and allocation frameworks. The objectives and agenda for the first workshop will be circulated by the Chair and agreed intersessionally by the end of May 2023.
- End of June, 2023 : The first workshop will be held virtually. This workshop will focus on narrowing down options hard limits and their allocation and identify any additional information needs and issues to be considered at SC19.
- August 2023 : SC19 will consider any issues related to the limits.
- Beginning of October 2023 : The second workshop will be held (virtually / in person) to address remaining issues. This workshop will also determine the necessity of another workshop, and a contingency plan that could be adopted if no agreement can be reached at WCPFC 20 on the revision of the TTM.

(This is Attachment H of the Summary Report of the Nineteenth Regular Session of the Commission (28 November to 3 December 2022), and transcribed here for convenience).

ATTACHMENT 3 - OUTCOME OF RANKING PROCESS OF THE REQUESTS FROM TTMW3 TO SSP

The table below contains the requests to the Scientific Services Provider that were revised on-screen at the TTMW3 meeting on 28 June. An additional column has been included on “rankings” which reflects the rankings received as at 9.30am Pohnpei time on 29 June 2023.

Each CCM or groups of CCMs was requested to fill in the ranking for each of their *own* requests (ie not the requests of other CCMs or groups of CCMs). Rankings were requested in order of priority with 1 being the highest priority.

Summary table of SSP requests from TTMW3

Request to SPC	CCM/Observer	Points	Priority Rank (1 being the highest)	Notes
Produce the usual depletion/risk matrices (nuclear grid) for BET and YFT based on LL and PS scalars using the 2023 assessment grids.	US	-		Will underpin a lot of the other requests. SSP views as key. Note status quo and MP levels
Trade off between FAD closure period (EEZ/HS), and LL catch. Cf EEZ vs HS FAD closure, FAD closure and LL catch (table 9 of WCPFC-TTMW2-2021-01_rev4/ Tables 11-13 in WCPFC18-2021-15)	EU/Korea	2	1	
	<i>Chinese Taipei</i>		1	
Identify the biomass depletion levels associated with various candidate TRPs (i.e., 2012-2015 depletion, 2004 depletion, depletion associated with a risk level, 2001-2004 average levels), and the LL/PS scalars that achieve those biomass depletion levels.	US/JP	2	1	

Request to SPC	CCM/Observer	Points	Priority Rank (1 being the highest)	Notes
Analysis of catch, effort, and catch-per-unit-effort (in weight per day) by zone and high seas, for longline fisheries and fleets	TLL workshop	2	1	Note from US on ranking: this request covers two requests from the US
Examine the conditions necessary to achieve a BET TRP at 2012-15 depletion levels, where the FAD closure has been removed	PNA	1	1	
Examine the implications of the FAD closure on foregone catches of SKJ and YFT	PNA	2	1	
Update Tables 9 and 10 of WCPFC18-2021-15 based upon the new assessment	PNA	2	1	
Provide an updated analysis on the potential level of high seas purse seine effort based on the SKJ TRP (SKJ MP output).	FFA Members	2	1	
Update of Tables 14 and 15 of WCPFC19-2021-15, with the updated TRP from the interim skipjack MP for the reference periods 2012, 2016-2018 and 2018-2021	FFA members	2	1	
Table with future purse seine scalars under current conditions, without footnote 1 exemptions, without paragraph 15 exemptions (previous paragraph 17), without HS effort by CCMs in table 2, without HS effort by CCMs not in table 2	EU	2	2	

Request to SPC	CCM/Observer	Points	Priority Rank (1 being the highest)	Notes
Provide information to support inclusion of the catch by the Philippines in the high seas limit and how this could be implemented.	FFA members	1	2	Expansive query. Could estimate the catch consistent with the allocated limit as in Attachment2?
Include stock projections for different scenarios of reduced FAD closure (10% 20%, 30% reduction, status quo) in their analyses to be presented to SC19.	Korea	2		Not available for SC given new BET assessment to be agreed. TTMW4 feasible
Include stock projections for different scenarios of increased FAD closure (10%, 20%, 30% increase) in their analyses.	JP		2	
What is the impact to juvenile BET and YFT from decreasing the FAD closure period in terms of SB/SB _{F=0} ?	US		2	Overlap with JP/KR request above
	Chinese Taipei		2	
Prior to TTMW4		20		
Develop methods to convert between purse seine effort and longline catch. What does a day of fishing and sets of fishing equate to in terms of catch - both on the high seas and inside EEZs. (note also para 136 of TTMW3-2023-IP02)	US	2	3 Post-TTMW4	Can compute PS effort v LL catch/CPUE from available aggregate level data.

Request to SPC	CCM/Observer	Points	Priority Rank (1 being the highest)	Notes
Update Table 6 and 7 of WCPFC18-2021-15 with a TRP at 2012-15 levels, without a FAD closure	PNA/JP	1	3 (JP) 4 (PNA) Post-TTMW4	
Update of data summaries as in SC18-MI-IP-08 – LL catch and PS/PL effort by area (AW, EEZ, HSP, other HS) and HS v flag	EU	1	Post-TTMW4	Update with latest information as needed
Updated figures 9 and 10 of SC18-MI-IP08 with PS effort in waters under national jurisdiction (EEZs and AWs), in the HS by CCMs in table 2 of CMM, in the HS by the Philippines, in the HS by Pacific Island fleets fishing in high seas adjacent to their home waters during the HS closures, in the HS by CCMs not listed in Table 2 (not including the effort already included in the previous item).	EU	1	Post-TTMW4	Time required reduced based upon EU clarification
Requests for post TTMW4 and prior to WCPFC20		5		

Total points available prior to TTMW4 = **20**

Total points do not include the development of the ‘nuclear grid’ – one key large item – which will underpin the work on many other requests, and hence is viewed by the SSP as high priority and necessary for delivery.