**THE INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION**

**103rd MEETING**

**Panama City, Panama**
**01-05 September 2025**

# DOCUMENT IATTC-103 INF-E

**JOINT IATTC AND WCPFC-NC WORKING GROUP MEETING ON THE MANAGEMENT OF PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA**
**TENTH SESSION (JWG-10)**

Toyama, Japan (Hybrid)
9 – 12 July 2025

# CHAIRS' SUMMARY OF THE 10TH JOINT IATTC AND WCPFC-NC WORKING GROUP MEETING ON THE MANAGEMENT OF PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA

**IATTC-NC-JWG10-2025/00**

## AGENDA ITEM 1 OPENING OF THE MEETING

1. The 10th Session of the Joint IATTC and WCPFC-NC Working Group Meeting on the Management of Pacific Bluefin Tuna (JWG-10) was held on 9 – 12 July 2025. The meeting was opened by co-chairs Mr. Josh Madeira (USA, IATTC) and Mr. Masanori Miyahara (Japan, Northern Committee Chair).

2. Japan welcomed JWG members, observers, and participants, expressing gratitude to attendees and special thanks to the co-chairs. Japan noted that this year features challenging measures including long-term management and universal Monitoring Control and Surveillance (MCS) measures, emphasizing that while these items are difficult and complicated, they are confident the JWG can make good progress.

3. A list of participants to the JWG-10 is included in **Annex A**.

## AGENDA ITEM 2 ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND MEETING PROCEDURES

4. Co-Chair Madeira outlined the meeting procedures and presented the provisional agenda for adoption.

5. The provisional agenda was adopted (**Annex B**).

6. Mr. Samuel Coyle of Japan was appointed as rapporteur for the meeting.

## AGENDA ITEM 3 REPORTS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA MEASURES

7. The JWG reviewed WCPFC and IATTC members' implementation reports regarding CMM 2024-01, CMM 2024-02, Resolution C-24-02, and Resolution C-24-03. Co-Chair Miyahara explained that the discussion would be conducted in two rounds: first, a discussion on the implementation of CMMs by each party, and second, a review of the reports on MCS measures.

8. Japan asked Korea about current year fishing activities, specifically about a reported large purse seine catch of 7,000 fish in July that could potentially cause overshooting of catch limits. Korea responded that there was a significant PBF catch in late June or early July, and they were still compiling the exact catch amount. Korea explained that their initial report showed purse seine catches did not exceed 600 metric tons and they have reserved catch limits of more than 300 metric tons for unexpected situations.

9. In response to questions from Japan, Korea subsequently provided additional information from their relevant division, noting that they do not have recreational fisheries specifically targeting PBF but that recreational fisheries catch small PBF from time to time due to high abundance in their waters. Korea reported that recreational fisheries caught 358 individual PBF (0.83 metric tons) in 2023 and 526 individual PBF (1.21 metric tons) in 2024, with catches consisting only of small fish due to gear configuration. Regarding set nets, Korea reported having 155 total set net licenses (82 in Gangwon Province and 73 in North Gyeongsang Province) that do not target PBF. Japan clarified that their 1,688 set net sites are authorized to catch PBF, with many targeting PBF while others do not, and noted that Korea's recreational catches should be counted against their catch limits as a mandatory requirement. Korea explained that they count recreational fishery catches against their 2024 catch limits; they will continue to count against future catch limits.

10. The USA asked Mexico about the number of pens holding PBF and whether Mexico also has pens for yellowfin tuna. While they do not have the exact number, Mexico responded that Mexican farming companies have limited capacity based on each company's concession, and there are no pens for yellowfin tuna. Japan asked Mexico about sports fishery data collection methods, noting that Mexico estimated sports fishery catch to be 4 metric tons in 2024, and whether fishermen are required to provide catch reports. Mexico responded that sports fishermen must fill out documents and there are port inspectors who check vessel arrivals and communicate with fishermen.

11. Japan asked Chinese Taipei about the management of recreational sports fishermen, noting that their catches should be counted under WCPFC measures. Chinese Taipei responded that they have laws requiring recreational fishermen to obtain tags before landing PBF, and without tags, they are not allowed to land.

12. In response to a question from Japan about how the USA manages the catch from their sport fisheries, the USA responded that its recreational fisheries are robustly managed in a manner consistent with its commercial fisheries through trip limits, bag limits, 100% logbook and near-real time reporting requirements. Although the management of this fishery did not change between 2023 and 2024, US recreational catches for PBF declined, and the number of fish caught to date in 2025 is also much lower than the same period in 2024. Japan noted concerns about the gap between commercial and recreational fishing trends, with commercial catches reducing by almost 40% while recreational catches increased sharply to a record high of almost 2,000 metric tons in 2023, and asked how the USA plans to manage sports fisheries under the new management procedure. Co-Chair Miyahara noted that this question was relevant to discussions to occur in Agenda Item 5.

13. Japan asked New Zealand about managing the sports fishery catch of PBF under WCPFC conservation measures. New Zealand responded that they manage PBF recreational harvest by a combined bag limit of 20 finfish per day, which differs from their southern bluefin tuna management approach. Chinese Taipei requested information about New Zealand's international trade partners, to which New Zealand replied that in 2024, they exported PBF primarily to Japan and smaller amounts to the USA, Australia, Canada, and Switzerland.

14. In response to a question from Japan about monitoring the number and average size of PBF caged in farming pens, particularly when originally caught by purse seiners, Korea responded that they check the amount of caging and harvest of PBF based on paper documents. Korea noted that government officials and scientists visit the farms to monitor activities, although coverage is not 100%. Korea explained that

farming activities for PBF are in their initial experimental stage, so going forward, they will consider making necessary enhancements to their existing MCS system.

15. Japan asked Mexico to provide MCS information in written form for both WCPFC and IATTC implementation reports. Regarding farming activities, Japan noted that Mexico's purse seiners have 100% observer coverage, but observers cannot identify the number of fish to be caged or the average size of PBF to be caged, which is why video cameras are necessary. Japan asked whether Mexico's operators use video cameras to confirm the actual size of fish. Mexico responded that they have stereoscopic cameras when transfer is done and that observers and inspectors have the possibility to get information about the amount of fish transferred.

16. In response to questions from Japan about violations by sports fishermen, the USA reported that they have never discovered any laundering of PBF and noted that while recreational fishermen are prohibited from selling PBF on the market, a minimal number of violations have been identified and are addressed. Japan noted that the USA sport fisheries caught almost 2,000 metric tons in 2023, which could have a big impact, and stated that monitoring and enforcement measures are important. Japan explained that in their case, they frequently identify violations during peak season that are subject to penalties, with around 10 cases identified in their recreational fisheries almost every year, and expressed surprise that USA sports fishermen caught 2,000 metric tons, but no violations were found.

17. Co-Chair Miyahara noted the need for a standardized MCS reporting format and tasked Japan with creating a unified format for MCS reporting based on current CMM and IATTC resolutions. Japan agreed to make efforts to create a format for reporting that would be used for next year's reporting. Co-Chair Miyahara asked Japan to create a draft skeleton of MCS measures for consideration at the JWG 11 meeting next year. Japan noted that creating a draft skeleton of MCS measures is a challenging task and requested assistance from other delegations during the intersessional period, stating that cooperation is necessary to complete this work. Japan created a draft reporting template and explained that it allows members to place their MCS activities according to existing obligations, and expressed hope that it would be helpful for unified reporting. The template in Annex C was considered but could not be agreed upon. This template will be sent to each commission for further consideration **(Annex C)**.

18. No further discussions were held on the reports submitted by other members.

## AGENDA ITEM 4 SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION ON PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA

### 4.1 Catch limit scenario projections

19. Dr. Shuya Nakatsuka, the Chair of the ISC Pacific Bluefin Tuna Working Group (PBFWG), presented updated projection results using the 2024 benchmark stock assessment. The PBFWG reviewed the projection results, notably scenario 3 that reflects the current management measures (CMM 2024-01 and C-24-02) and scenario 4 that maximizes the use of the conversion factor of small-fish quota to large-fish quota. The PBFWG noted that the projection of new measures is only slightly more pessimistic compared to the scenario 15 presented in 2024, while the projection of maximum application of the conversion factor produced much more optimistic results.

20. The USA noted that in last year's negotiations, it was important that any quota increases would still allow for long-term increases to the biomass over time. They also noted the significant positive

conservation benefits of transferring small fish to large fish, even after applying the conversion factor. The USA asked about the confidence intervals related to scenario 3, noting that it is possible that the stock could fall below the second rebuilding target over time, and inquired whether recruitment or other factors may influence this possible outcome.

21. The PBFWG explained that the dotted lines represented the fifth and 95th percentiles, and the main reason for the variance in projections is the assumption of recruitment variance, which creates the width of the area. The PBFWG noted a small dip around 2030 reflecting slightly lower recruitment, but it will be higher in the long term, with the width in the trajectory reflecting recruitment value assumptions.

22. Pew Charitable Trusts noted that Table 2 shows future projection scenarios and the probability of overfishing according to various reference points. They expressed concern that under the new CMM, there is a risk of overfishing depending on the level of the target and looked forward to more discussions on the long-term harvest strategy to prevent an overfishing situation in the future.

**4.2 Research on migratory patterns**

23. The PBFWG explained that they had not received any additional requests from the Northern Committee as referred to in last year's report, and there had not been a formal request to ISC on this matter. The PBFWG noted that stock structure and distribution are key information for understanding stock and fundamental for stock assessment, and are of great interest for many scientists, much broader than ISC itself. The PBFWG stated that there are many studies regarding migratory patterns, but they were not quite sure what was being requested, and if the JWG or the NC wants specific information on migratory patterns, they would need specific instructions.

24. The USA appreciated the information presented by ISC and noted that there are many studies describing migration patterns and documenting historical harvests. They stated they did not want to divert PBFWG too far from their existing schedule, specifically the peer review next year, and suggested a path forward might be to identify references that document migration patterns and list those references to satisfy the request. They suggested the JWG could recommend to the NC that this could be a path forward. The JWG recommended that the NC task the ISC to compile existing references that document migration patterns and present them to WCPFC22.

**4.3 Review of conversion factors**

25. The PBFWG presented analysis regarding conversion factors for swapping catch quotas between Pacific bluefin tuna fishery sectors while maintaining overall fishing intensity. The analysis calculated conversion factors among WCPO small to WCPO large and WCPO large to EPO, and can be used to convert between all fishery sectors.

26. The PBFWG noted that the results could vary if conditions such as selectivity of fleets or natural mortality are different from those assumed, and that transfers of TAC between the EPO and WCPO based on a prescribed fishery impact ratio would be more consistent with how the impact between EPO and WCPO was calculated for the Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE).

**4.4 Reports from WCPFC-SC and IATTC-SAC**

27. The JWG acknowledged that the 21st meeting of the WCPFC Scientific Committee (August 13–21, 2025, Tonga) would occur after JWG-10, hence no SC outcomes were available for this meeting.

28. The IATTC representative reported that the 16th SAC meeting took place in June. The SAC endorsed the recommendations from the IATTC scientific staff, who made four recommendations: (1) reference points should be adopted, taking into consideration those in SAC-14; (2) choose one of the harvest control rules and test using MSE, considering performance relative to possible reference points for PBF and other performance metrics; (3) recruitment should be monitored, and the harvest strategy should include provisions for exceptional circumstances; and (4) future work should focus on improving harvest control rules to ensure they are robust.

## AGENDA ITEM 5 LONG-TERM HARVEST STRATEGY

### 5.1 Development of the long-term harvest strategy

29. Co-Chair Madeira acknowledged the significant progress made to date and thanked the ISC for their work to complete the MSE analysis and final report. He noted that the JWG had received the final MSE results just two weeks prior to the meeting and that all results had been posted for review.

30. Co-Chair Madeira emphasized that the current long-term harvest strategy for PBF was outdated and should be updated in both commissions as a matter of priority. He noted that the JWG was expected to recommend a comprehensive long-term harvest strategy in 2025 and that it was anticipated to be implemented in 2026. Further, he noted that the IATTC resolution C-24-03 was a two-year measure that would need to be negotiated in 2026.

31. Co-Chair Madeira outlined the key elements that must be included in the long-term harvest strategy agreement, as required by WCPFC CMM 2022-03 and relevant IATTC resolutions, including management objectives, acceptable levels of risk, reference points, monitoring strategy, harvest control rules, and the MSE framework itself for future testing of different harvest control rules.

### 5.2 Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE)

32. Dr. Desiree Tommasi, representing the PBFWG, provided a summary of the final results of the MSE. She explained that the MSE examined the performance of candidate management procedures for PBF relative to the set of objectives agreed upon by the JWG using a closed-loop computer simulation that accounted for uncertainty in observations, assessment models, and implementation.

33. Dr. Tommasi described the management procedures as model-based harvest strategies that estimate stock status from an estimation model, specify a harvest control rule (HCR) to be applied, and establish TAC by fleet segment: TAC Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO), TAC WCPO small fish, and TAC WCPO large fish.

34. Dr. Tommasi explained that performance was evaluated based on four categories: safety, status, stability, and yield. For safety performance, the objective was to maintain less than 20% probability of the stock falling below the limit reference point (LRP), with all HCRs showing less than 10% probability of breaching the IATTC's interim LRP. All HCRs except for HCRs 6 and 14 were also able to maintain a low

probability (<20%) of breaching the second interim rebuilding target of 20%SSBF=0. For status performance, the objective was to maintain fishing mortality at or below the target level with at least 50% probability, with all HCRs achieving at least 50% probability of maintaining fishing mortality at or below their target levels.

35. Dr. Tommasi noted that stability performance aimed to limit changes in overall catch limits between management periods to no more than 25% unless the stock was below the LRP, while yield performance focused on maintaining an equitable balance in proportional fishery impact between the WCPO and EPO, maximizing yield over medium and long terms. She emphasized that HCRs with the highest probability of spawning stock biomass (SSB) being at or above the second rebuilding target had the lowest yield metrics and vice versa, demonstrating clear tradeoffs between safety and yield objectives.

36. Following the presentation, China sought clarification on the MSE projection timeframe, noting that the projection period seemed short compared to the PBF lifespan of 15-20 years, suggesting a 30–40-year timeframe might be more appropriate. Dr. Nakatsuka responded that the projection was based on the generation time of 8-9 years rather than maximum age, covering more than two generations.

**5.3 Recommendations on the long-term harvest strategy**

37. Co-Chair Madeira requested members to share their priorities regarding the MSE results and management objectives, emphasizing the need for discussion on tradeoffs between safety, status, stability, and yield objectives that had been previously agreed upon by the JWG.

38. The JWG reaffirmed that the four management objective categories—safety, status, stability, and yield—were all equally important and had been agreed upon through extensive discussions 2-3 years earlier. Members emphasized that economic factors and equitable fishery impacts were important considerations, with priority given to ensuring the PBF stock never becomes heavily depleted again and biomass is maintained above the second rebuilding target. Several members noted that attention should focus on the performance of HCRs rather than revisiting management objectives.

39. Japan expressed preference for HCR 5, noting that according to the MSE simulation, relationships between yield and performance were demonstrated. Japan noted that all HCRs except 6 and 14 showed a < 20% probability of SSB falling below 20%SSBF=0, indicating that safety criteria were met for most HCRs. Japan emphasized that some HCRs, like 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, and 11, showed the possibility of significant TAC reduction when the stock falls, indicating low stability in terms of fishery management and harvest.

40. The USA expressed support for HCRs 9 to 16, as these scenarios support the 70:30 West-East allocation, which is an important aspect for the USA, given that EPO historically had a much larger impact. The USA emphasized the importance for their stakeholders to gain a more equitable portion of the harvest and favored scenarios with defined targets and limit reference points, which eliminated HCRs 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, and 15 from consideration.

41. New Zealand noted that modifications to the 2024 benchmark may have resulted in optimism and emphasized that the sustainability of stock was paramount, not wanting to lose the recovery, especially considering climate change. New Zealand stated their preference for two HCRs that most closely aligned with their domestic harvest strategy standards: HCRs 3 and 11. New Zealand noted that their harvest strategy standard specifies a default soft limit which is analogous to the WCPFC LRP of 20%SSBF=0.

42. Korea explained that they have not established a definitive position on the selection of HCRs, noting they did not want to rush to make important decisions without adequate time to digest the information that had been made available only two to three weeks prior. Korea noted that, regarding concerns about the absence of LRP in some HCR scenarios, the important point was to keep the stock safe regardless of terminology, emphasizing attention to the yield and safety relationship.

43. Chinese Taipei supported Japan's position, agreeing that all HCRs except 6 and 14 could ensure the stock would remain at a safe level. Chinese Taipei expressed support for HCR 5, because it is easier to communicate with the stakeholders since part of its concept has already been implemented and it has proven effective in achieving the rebuilding targets.

44. In relation to HCR 5, Korea reiterated its previous statement made during the intersessional JWG meeting that was held in Monterey that reverting back to the level of CMM 2021-02 in the event of the SSB falling below the LRP of 20%SSBF0 would not necessarily mean that the catch limit allocation to each country would be the same as what is in that CMM.

45. Japan further stated that HCR 5 was the most suitable option it could accept among the 16 options. Japan noted that its stakeholders have endured significant sacrifices in implementing strict CMMs, including a 50% decrease in small fish catch limits. Japan stressed that more ambitious HCRs would not be workable for their stakeholders, particularly given the extensive fisheries operations in their exclusive economic zone, territorial waters, and internal waters.

46. Japan also stated that it does not agree to drop HCRs 6 and 14, since they provide sufficient safety with the probability of stock falling below 20%SSBF=0 at around 23%, which maintains the stock above the IATTC LRP of 7.7%SSBF=0 with very high probability.

47. The USA expressed disagreement with Japan's position, emphasizing that the JWG should not jeopardize the hard-won rebuilding success by accepting any HCR that could allow the stock to fall below 20%SSBF=0. The USA argued that establishing a 20%SSBF=0 LRP would be the minimum acceptable threshold, noting that if the stock fell below this level, fishing effort should be reduced to minimal levels. The USA also clarified that it would prefer an F-target of 40% to prioritize safety.

48. Following bilateral discussions, Japan reported that while some progress had been made, significant gaps in opinions remained between the delegations. The USA reiterated its position that establishing a 20%SSBF=0 LRP would be essential for preventing backward movement.

49. The JWG noted general views to continue discussions on an appropriate range of F-targets, with a preliminary focus on consideration of a 25% to 30% range for future HCR selection, noting the need to consider together with other elements of HCR as a package.

50. Japan questioned the implication of changing the management cycle to two years from three years in the long-term harvest strategy. ISC replied that the shorter management cycle leads to responsive management, in general, including earlier response to recruitment drops. ISC further explained that the safety performance might be similar even when deploying a two-year management cycle.

51. The JWG requested that the ISC develop guidance and criteria for defining exceptional circumstances, particularly with respect to risks related to low recruitment, and provide them to the JWG.

52. The JWG noted that exceptional circumstances procedures would be important regardless of the selected HCR, particularly for addressing potential recruitment drops.

53. The JWG acknowledged that while agreement on specific HCRs had not been reached, there was unanimous appreciation to the ISC for the excellent work on the MSE, noting that the quality of the scientific work remained outstanding regardless of the difficulty in reaching consensus on HCR selection.

54. The JWG re-emphasized its commitment to agree to a long-term harvest strategy based on the MSE and the intention to keep the stock above the second rebuilding target. The members committed to holding intersessional discussions to advance the long-term harvest strategy, as outlined in the workplan.

55. The JWG recognized the success of the rebuilding efforts and the significant impacts these had on stakeholders, acknowledging the considerable efforts made by all parties. The JWG expressed a strong commitment that no one wanted to see the stock fall back below the 20% rebuilding target. The JWG also noted broad agreement on the importance of protecting Age-0 fish as a key element of future management measures.

**AGENDA ITEM 6 REVIEW OF CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES FOR PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA**

56. No discussions were held on this agenda item.

**AGENDA ITEM 7 CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME**

57. Mr. Shingo Ota (Japan), Chair of the 6th Joint Working Group on Catch Documentation Scheme Technical Meeting (JWG-CDS-06), presented the key outcomes of the technical meeting held on 9 July 2025.

58. Mexico expressed appreciation for the Chair's Summary Report and noted that it contained fishing methods that are not used across regions. Mexico observed that while the resolutions would have essentially the same content in both commissions, there would be some differences based on what is permitted or does not exist in the respective commissions. Mexico requested that this distinction be reflected in the report.

59. In response, Mr. Ota acknowledged Mexico's comment and confirmed that he would consult with the rapporteur to include additional text in the summary to address this point before submitting the revised document to the Secretariat.

60. Co-Chair Miyahara asked if there were any other comments on the Chair's Summary Report. With the single amendment proposed by Mexico, the JWG adopted the report.

**AGENDA ITEM 8 NEXT JWG MEETING**

61. The JWG affirmed the commitment to complete work related to the long-term harvest strategy, catch documentation scheme, and amendments to MCS in 2026. To achieve these goals, the JWG propose

the following work plan:

2025:

- JWG Members work to support progress on the long-term harvest strategy through bilateral and multilateral meetings conducted on the margins of the IATTC and WCPFC meetings. JWG Members will communicate their preferences to the JWG Co-Chairs by December 2025 so that they can make arrangements for virtual or in-person intersessional meeting(s) as needed.
- ISC begins work to develop guidance and criteria for defining exceptional circumstances, particularly with respect to risks related to low recruitment, to be provided to JWG-11.

2026:

- The JWG will hold intersessional meetings as needed to finalize the long-term harvest strategy at JWG-11.
- JWG recommends a long-term harvest strategy, including additional management measures triggered by exceptional circumstances, which will be implemented in 2027.
- JWG recommends a CDS CMM/resolution.
- JWG recommends amendments to the existing MCS CMM/resolution after reviewing reports on the implementation of PBF measures.

62. The JWG considered the tentative date and location for the JWG-11 meeting in 2026. After the discussion, the JWG agreed that the next meeting would be scheduled for July 8 - 11 in Japan, subject to final confirmation of arrangements.

63. The JWG noted that the 7th Joint Working Group on Catch Documentation Scheme Technical Meeting (JWG-CDS07) would be held in conjunction with JWG11, with the duration to be determined based on progress made in intersessional work.

**AGENDA ITEM 9 OTHER BUSINESS**

64. Korea expressed appreciation for the collective efforts of all JWG members and noted that the 2024 scientific assessments demonstrate that PBF stock is in rapid recovery, meeting rebuilding targets ahead of schedule. Korea emphasized that this success has created new realities for coastal states, including unprecedented increases in PBF abundance in Korean waters, likely due to climate change altering migratory patterns and distribution. While coastal states of the WCPFC hold the rights to manage highly migratory species in their territorial and archipelagic waters, Korea noted that they have voluntarily participated in the international management framework with limited catch limits based on historical records, these rigid historical quotas are creating severe socio-economic strain on coastal fishing communities who face economic hardship while seeing abundant resources in their traditional fishing grounds. Korea stated that the remarkable recovery must translate into adaptive and equitable management, emphasizing that the long-term management framework should fully consider the current state of the resource and the legitimate rights and needs of coastal states experiencing dramatic changes in stock distribution, and reaffirmed their commitment to sustainable PBF management while identifying ensuring the livelihoods of fishing communities as a top priority **(Annex E)**.

**AGENDA ITEM 10 ADOPTION OF REPORT**

65. The IATTC-NC JWG10 adopted the report.

**AGENDA ITEM 11 CLOSE OF MEETING**

66. The meeting was brought to a close at 11:12 AM on 12 July 2025.

**ANNEXES**

Annex A – List of participants

Annex B – Agenda

Annex C – Draft Reporting Template of CMM 2024-02 / Resolution C-24-03

Annex D – Chair’s Summary of 6th CDS Technical Meeting

Annex E – Korea’s statement

**Annex A**

**JOINT IATTC AND WCPFC-NC WORKING GROUP MEETING ON THE MANAGEMENT OF PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA**
**TENTH SESSION (JWG-10)**

Toyama, Japan (Hybrid)
9 – 12 July 2025

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

**CO-CHAIR**

**Josh Madeira**
Monterey Bay Aquarium
Director of Policy & Stakeholder Engagement
jmadeira@mbayaq.org

**CO-CHAIR**

**Masanori Miyahara**
Fisheries Agency of Japan
Advisor to the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
masamiyafaj1@gmail.com

**CDS Technical Meeting CHAIR**

**Shingo Ota**
Fisheries Agency of Japan
Special Adviser to the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
shingo_ota810@maff.go.jp

**CANADA**

**Kristen Cote**
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Senior Policy Advisor
kristen.cote@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

**Sarah Hawkshaw**
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Biologist
sarah.hawkshaw@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

**CHINA**

**Fanshuqi**
Shanghai Ocean University
assistant scientist
1582187049@qq.com

**Li Yan**
China Overseas Fisheries Association
Deputy Director of Highseas Fisheries
liyan@cofa.net.cn

**Zhe Geng**
Shanghai Ocean University
Stock Assessment Scientist
zgeng@shou.edu.cn

**FIJI**

**Epi Batibasaga**
Head of Delegation
Ministry of Fisheries
Fisheries Officer
batibasaga@gmail.com

**Moses Mataika**
Ministry of Fisheries
Fisheries Officer - Data
mataika.moses@gmail.com

**JAPAN**

**Takumi Fukuda**
Fisheries Agency of Japan
Resource Management Department
takumi_fukuda720@maff.go.jp

**Akari Oonami**
Fisheries Agency of Japany
staff
akari_onami830@maff.go.jp

**Anna Inomata**
Fisheries Agency of Japan
Staff
anna_inomata570@maff.go.jp

**Hidetoshi Ito**
Taiyo A & F Co., Ltd.
Director
hid-itou@maruha-nichiro.co.jp

**Hirofumi Niiyama**
Hokkaido Bluefin Tuna Association
vice chairman
bluefin@bf.hokkaidooffice.jp

**Hirohide Matsushima**
Fisheries Agency of Japan
International Affairs Division

**Hiromu Fukuda**
Fisheries Research and Education Agency of Japan, Fisheries Resources Institute
Head, Bluefin Tunas Group, Highly Migrately Resources Division
fukuda_hiromu57@fra.go.jp

**Katsuya Sato**
Fisheries Agency of Japan
staff
katsuya_sato770@maff.go.jp

**Kazushige Hazama**
National Offshore Tuna Fisheries Association of Japan
Manager
hazama@kinkatsukyo.or.jp

**Keiko Imoto**
"Sanin purse seine Fisheries cooperative association"
Associate Director
imoto@sanmaki.jp

**Kengo Tanaka**
All Japan Purse Seine Fisheries Association
Managing Director
zenmaki05@atlas.plala.or.jp

**Kenichi Sakuragi**
Fisheries Department
Director
kenichi_sakuragi@kyokuyo.co.jp

**Kenji Aoki**
Nitto Suisan
Managing Director
kenji.aoki@nittosuisan.com

**Kirara Nishikawa**
Fisheries Resources Institute, FRA
Scientist, Bluefin Tunas Group, Highly Migratory Resource Division
nishikawa_kirara68@fra.go.jp

**Mako iioka**
Fisheries Agency of Japany
Fisheries Agency of Japany
mako_iioka540@maff.go.jp

**Meiko Kawahara**
Taiyo A & F Co., Ltd.
Deputy General Manager
m-kawahara@maruha-nichiro.co.jp

**Nobushige Shimizu**
Fisheries Agency of Japany
Staff
nobushige_shimizu640@maff.go.jp

**Norio Takahashi**
Highly migrately resources division, Japan Fisheries Resources Institute
Senior Scientist
takahashi_norio91@fra.go.jp

**Ryusuke Sakamoto**
Ishikawa Prefecture Fisheries Division
Chief Engineer
ryu-saka@pref.ishikawa.lg.jp

**Sakura Ito**
Fisheries Agency of Japan
Staff
sakura_ito700@maff.go.jp

**Samuel Coyle**
Fisheries Agency of Japan
Staff
coyle@urbanconnections.jp

**Satoshi Miyazaki**
Agricultural and Marine Products Office, Trade Control Department, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry
Assistant Director
miyazaki-satoshi@meti.go.jp

**Shuya Nakatsuka**
Fisheries Resources Institute
Deputy Director, Highly Migratory Resources Division
nakatsuka_shuya49@fra.go.jp

**Susumu Oikawa**
Taiyo A & F Co., Ltd.
Managing Director
s-oikawa@maruha-nichiro.co.jp

**Takashi Kouyama**
Taiyo A＆F Co., Ltd.
Deputy General Manager
t-kouyama@maruha-nichiro.co.jp

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

**Yoshihiro Notomi**
National Offshore Tuna Fisheries Association of Japan
Managing Director
notomi@kinkatsukyo.or.jp

**Yuji Uozumi**
Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative Association
Adviser

**REPUBLIC OF KOREA**

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

**Heewon Park**
National Institue of Fisheries Science(NIFS)
Republic of Korea

**Hong Seo Jin**
National Fishery Products Quality Management Service
English editor

**Jae-geol Yang**
Korea Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Center
Policy Analyst
jg718@kofci.org

**Jung-re Riley Kim**
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
Head of Fisheries Negotiation Unit
riley1126@korea.kr

**Min-kyung Kim**
National Fishery Products Quality Management Service (NFQS)
Assistant director
kyung91206@korea.kr

**PHILIPPINES**

**Isidro Tanangonan**
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Aquaculturist II
itanangonan@bfar.da.gov.ph

**Joeren Yleana**
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Supervising Aquaculturist
joerenyleana@yahoo.com

**CHINESE TAIPEI**

**Shao-Wei Lu**
Head of Delegation
shaowei0220@ms1.fa.gov.tw
Associate Technical Specialist,
Fisheries Agency, Ministry of Agriculture

**Shui-Kai Chang**
Graduate Institue of Marine Affairs,
National Sun Yat-sen University
Professor
skchang@faculty.nsysu.edu.tw

**Joseph Chia-Chi Fu**
joseph@ofdc.org.tw
CEO,
Overseas Fisheries Development Council

**Tzu-Ching Yu**
evan@ofdc.org.tw
Project Manager,
Overseas Fisheries Development Council

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**Christa Marie Svensson**
PFMC
Commissioner
cmsvensson@gmail.com

**Alex Kahl**
NOAA Fisheries - Pacific Islands Regional Office
International Fisheries
alex.kahl@noaa.gov

**Andrew Lawler**
NOAA
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for
International Fisheries
andrew.lawler@noaa.gov

**Dave Rudie**
PFMC
Chair HMSAS
rudie.dave@gmail.com

**Desiree Tommasi**
Fisheries Collaborative Program, University of California Santa Cruz
Project Scientist
detommas@ucsc.edu

**Dorothy Lowman**
Lowman and Associates
Owner/ Consultant
dmlowman01@comcast.net

**Emily Reynolds**
NOAA Fisheries, Pacific Islands Regional Office
Fishery Policy Analyst
emily.reynolds@noaa.gov

**Huihua Lee**
Southwest Fisheries Science Center, NMFS
Research Mathematical Statistician
huihua.lee@noaa.gov

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

**Joshlyn Cardoza**
AAFA
Assistant director of operations
admin@americanalbacore.com

**Kerry Griffin**
Pacific Fishery Management Council
Staff Officer - Highly Migratory Species
kerry.griffin@pcouncil.org

**Kosha Arabi**
MAGUROHANTA,LLC
Manager
info@magurohanta.com

**Larry Phillips**
American Sportfishing Association
Pacific Fisheries Policy Director
lphillips@asafishing.org

**Lucy Bulkeley**
NOAA WCR HMS

IATTC Policy Support
lucille.bulkeley@noaa.gov

**Mike Conroy**
West Coast Fisheries Consultants
President
Mike@wecofm.com

**Mike Thompson**
US COMMISSIONER / IATTC
REC fisheries rep
thompsonmike148@gmail.com

**Rachael Wadsworth**
NOAA Fisheries
Fishery Policy Analyst
rachael.wadsworth@noaa.gov

**Rachel Ryan**
U.S. Department of State
Foreign Affairs Officer
RyanRL@state.gov

**Roger Dang**
Fresh Island Fish Co.
General Manager

**Ryan Wulff**
NOAA
ARA for Sustainable Fisheries
ryan.wulff@noaa.gov

**Sarah Malloy**
NOAA Fisheries
Regional Administrator, Pacific Islands Regional Office
sarah.malloy@noaa.gov

**Steven Teo**
NOAA Fisheries
Research Fisheries Biologist
steve.teo@noaa.gov

**Stuart Chikami**
Western Pacific Fisheries, Inc.
Manager

**Theresa Labriola**
Wild Oceans
Pacific Program Director
tlabriola@wildoceans.org

**Valerie Post**
NOAA Fisheries
Fishery Policy Analyst
valerie.post@noaa.gov

**VANUATU**

**Lucy Joy**
Vanuatu Fisheries Department
Principal Data Officer
ljoy@fisheries.gov.vu

**Rocky Kaku**
Vanuatu Fisheries Department
Research officer
rky.kaku@gmail.com

**MEXICO**

**Martha Betancourt Aguirre**
FIDEMAR
Member of delegation
martha.betancourt@uabc.edu.mx

**Michel Dreyfus Leon**
FIDEMAR
In charge of research
mchldryfs@gmail.com

**NEW ZEALAND**

**Robert Gear**
Ministry for Primary Industries
Manager, Highly Migratory Species and Pacific Fisheries Team
robert.gear@mpi.govt.nz

**INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION (IATTC)**

**Brad Wiley**
IATTC
Policy Officer

bwiley@iattc.org

**Mark Maunder**
IATTC
Head of stock assessment program
mmaunder@iattc.org

**NORTH PACIFIC MARINES SCIENCE ORGANIZATION (PICES)**

**Kathryn Berry**
BECI Science Director
Kathryn.berry@pices.int

**PACIFIC ISLAND FORUM FISHERIES AGENCY SECRETARIAT**

**Marina Abas**
Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)
Fisheries Management Advisor
marina.abas@ffa.int

**Joyce Samuelu Ah-leong**
Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)
Fisheries Management Adviser
joyce.samuelu-ahleong@ffa.int

**MARINE STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL**

**Bill Holden**
Marine Stewardship Council
Senior Tuna Fisheries Outreach Manager
bill.holden@msc.org

**MONTEREY BAY AQUARIUM**

**Andre Boustany**
Monterey Bay Aquarium
Director of Science
aboustany@mbayaq.org

**OCEAN GOVERNANCE INSTITUTE (OGI)**

**Hiroshi Ohta**
The Ocean Governance Institute (OGI)
Director-General
hohta21@gmail.com

**Isao Sakaguchi**
Gakushuin University
Professor
isao.sakaguchi@gakushuin.ac.jp

**Yasuhiro Sanada**
Ocean Governance Institute
Chief Research Officer

**THE OCEAN FOUNDATION**

Emil Aalto
Stanford University
Research Scientist
aalto@stanford.edu

**THE PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS (PEW)**

Dave Gershman
Senior Officer, RFMO Policy-International Fisheries
dgershman@pewtrusts.org

**WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE (WWF)**

Shuhei Uematsu
Manager of Fisheries Resource Management
uematsu@wwf.or.jp

**WCPFC SECRETARIAT**

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

**Eidre Sharp**
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC)
Deputy 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

**Hilary Ayrton**
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Fisheries Management and Compliance Adviser
hilary.ayrton@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

**Nicole Solomon**
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
Secretary/Receptionist
nicole.solomon@wcpfc.int

**Simson Nanpei**
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries
Commission (WCPFC)
IT Officer
simson.nanpei@wcpfc.int

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

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

**Annex B**

**JOINT IATTC AND WCPFC-NC WORKING GROUP MEETING ON THE MANAGEMENT OF PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA**
**TENTH SESSION (JWG-10)**

Toyama, Japan (Hybrid)
9 – 12 July 2025

**AGENDA**

## 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

## 2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND MEETING PROCEDURES

Any additional issues raised here will be covered under the agenda OTHER BUSINESS.

## 3. REPORTS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA MEASURES

Each CCM or CPC involved in Pacific bluefin tuna fisheries and/or farming shall submit a report to the Executive Director on implementing relevant measures by 15 June each year.

JWG10 will review implementation reports from WCPFC and IATTC Members regarding CMM 2024-01, CMM 2024-02, RESOLUTION C-24-02, and RESOLUTION C-24-03. CCMs and CPCs are reminded that new measures related to Monitoring Control and Surveillance (MCS) are now in force per WCPFC CMM 2024-02 and IATTC Resolution C-24-03. These new reporting obligations will be reviewed by JWG-10 and subsequently reviewed by the appropriate committees at WCPFC and IATTC.

## 4. SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION ON PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA

### 4.1 Catch limit scenario projections

The ISC Pacific Bluefin Tuna Working Group (PBFWG) will provide JWG10 with updates on projection results based on CMM 2024-01 and Resolution C-24-02 using the 2024 benchmark stock assessment, as requested by JWG-09.

### 4.2 Research on migratory patterns

The PBFWG will provide an update on research on Pacific bluefin tuna migratory patterns, as requested by WCPFC21.

4.3 Review of conversion factors

The PBFWG will provide analysis regarding conversion factors to inform discussions on long-term harvest strategy and review of conservation and management measures.

4.4 Reports from WCPFC-SC and IATTC-SAC

The 21st meeting of the WCPFC Scientific Committee (August 13–21, 2025, Tonga) will occur after JWG10; hence, no SC outcome will be available.

IATTC will present key outcomes from the 16th Meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee (May 26 – June 6, 2025, San Diego).

## 5. LONG-TERM HARVEST STRATEGY

5.1 Development of the long-term harvest strategy

The Co-Chairs will provide a summary of the development of the long-term harvest strategy to date and expectations for 2025.

5.2 Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE)

The PBFWG will provide the results of the MSE and any relevant guidance provided by ISC in June 2025.

5.3 Recommendations on the long-term harvest strategy

JWG-10 will discuss harvest strategy elements, including reference points and management procedures, and make recommendations for consideration by NC21 and IATTC.

5.4 Review the workplan

JWG-10 will review the workplan for the long-term harvest strategy and recommend next steps to consider and incorporate new information.

## 6. REVIEW OF CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES FOR PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA

JWG10 will review relevant CMMs and Resolutions and propose any revisions, including any amendments to align with the long-term harvest strategy, as needed and appropriate.

## 7. CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME

The Chair of the CDS Technical Meeting will present key outcomes. JWG10 will review progress on:

- Development of the electronic Pacific Bluefin Catch Documentation System (ePBCD),
- Drafting a CMM/Resolution to establish a PBF Catch Documentation Scheme.

## 8. NEXT JWG MEETING

The JWG10 will consider the tentative date and location of the JWG11 meeting in 2026, including the duration of the CDS Technical Meeting.

## 9. OTHER BUSINESS

Issues raised under Agenda Item 2 will be discussed here.

## 10. ADOPTION OF REPORT

## 11. CLOSE OF MEETING

**Annex C**

**JOINT IATTC AND WCPFC-NC WORKING GROUP MEETING ON THE MANAGEMENT OF PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA**
**TENTH SESSION (JWG-10)**

Toyama, Japan (Hybrid)
9 – 12 July 2025

**Draft Reporting Template of Conservation and Management Measure 2024-02 for the Monitoring, Controlling, and Surveillance of Pacific Bluefin Tuna / Resolution C-24-03 on Monitoring and Control Measures for the Bluefin Tuna Fishery in the EPO**

Related provisions of CMM 2024-02/Resolution C-24-03

2. *Each CCM/CPC that has Pacific bluefin tuna fisheries and/or farming shall report to the Executive Director/Director by 15 June each year on the implementation of its monitoring and control measures it has taken in the previous calendar year to ensure its compliance with CMM2024-01/Resolution C-24-02 that include the following components:*
3. *CCMs/CPCs that do not have Pacific bluefin tuna fisheries and/or farming, shall report to the WCPF/IATTC Secretariat annually any by-catches of Pacific bluefin tuna under paragraph 9 of CMM 2024-01/footnote 1 of Resolution C-24-02.*

**2(1) Monitoring and control measures for fisheries**

| | |
|---|---|
| a. Registration of commercial fishing vessels that are authorized to fish for Pacific bluefin tuna (including the WCPFC RFV in accordance with CMM 2018-06 on WCPFC Record of Fishing Vessels and Authorization to Fish) / a) Registration of commercial fishing vessels in the IATTC Regional Vessel Register in accordance with Resolution C-24-07 on the Regional Vessel Register | |
| b. Registration of set nets that are authorized to fish for Pacific bluefin tuna (including registration scheme, number of registered set nets) / b) Registration of set nets that are authorized to fish for Pacific bluefin tuna (including registration scheme, number of registered set nets) | |

| | |
|---|---|
| c. Allocation of catch limits by fishery within the CCMs, where such allocation exist /<br>c) Allocation of catch limits by fishery within the CPCs, where such allocation exist | |
| d. Reporting requirements for catches for fisheries (targeted, incidental, and discards) /<br>d) Reporting requirements for catches for fisheries (targeted, incidental, and discards), including Resolution C-03-05 on data provision | |
| e. Measures to monitor catch (e.g. landing receipts, landing inspection, observer program, etc.) /<br>e) Measures to monitor catch (e.g. landing receipts, landing inspection, observer program, etc.) | |
| f. Measures to monitor landings (including CMM 2017-02 on Minimum Standards for Port State Measures) /<br>f) Measures to monitor landings, including Resolution C-21-07 on port state measures | |
| g. Measures to monitor domestic transactions /<br>g) Measures to monitor domestic transactions | |

**(2) Monitoring and control measures for farming**

| | |
|---|---|
| a. Registration of farms that are authorized to farm Pacific bluefin tuna (including registration scheme, number of registered farms, number of registered 'holding pens' or 'cages') | |
| b. Reporting requirements for caging of fish | |
| c. Reporting requirements for harvest of farmed fish | |
| d. Measures to monitor farming activities (including Rules, standards, and procedures to monitor transfer and caging activities) | |

**Annex D**

**JOINT IATTC AND WCPFC-NC WORKING GROUP MEETING ON THE MANAGEMENT OF PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA**
**TENTH SESSION (JWG-10)**

Toyama, Japan (Hybrid)
9 – 12 July 2025

# CHAIR'S SUMMARY OF THE 6TH CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME (CDS06) TECHNICAL MEETING

**IATTC-NC-CDS06-2025/00**

## 1. OPENING OF MEETING

### 1.1 Welcome

1. Mr. Shingo Ota, Chair of the CDS Working Group, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants.

### 1.2 Appointment of rapporteur

2. Mr. Samuel Coyle of Japan was appointed the rapporteur for the meeting.

### 1.3 Adoption of the agenda

3. The provisional agenda was adopted without any change (**Appendix 1**).

### 1.4 Meeting arrangements

4. Japan explained the meeting arrangements.

## 2. DEVELOPMENT OF A CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME FOR PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA

### 2.1 Recap of the 5th CDS Technical Meeting and intersessional activities

5. The Chair noted that the participants at the 5th CDS Technical Meeting had revisited and reaffirmed the conclusions drawn at the 4th CDS Technical Meeting, except for the demarcation of responsibility between the IATTC and WCPFC Secretariats in operational work for system development and maintenance.

6. The Chair recalled that the 5th CDS Technical Meeting had identified two differing views about system development: one system for both organizations versus a separate but harmonized system for each organization, with participants agreeing to continue discussing both approaches.

7. The Chair summarized the key agreements from the 5th CDS Technical Meeting on draft CMM elements, including: initially covering international transactions; excluding heads, eyes, roes, guts and tails

from scope; mandating registration of fishing vessels targeting PBF and farms; including information on vessel, catch, trade, caging, harvesting and transshipment; keeping tagging optional with exemption of tagged fish from validation; requiring validation by government authorities or delegated organizations; establishing a reconciliation process for automatic data validity checking; and agreeing to further discuss treatment of vessels not targeting PBF, data confidentiality arrangements, communication protocols, and exceptional arrangements.

8. The Chair noted that the Small Working Group had been tasked to produce an amended draft CMM based on the 5th CDS Technical Meeting discussions and present it at the current meeting.

9. The Chair noted that the draft letter of agreement between the IATTC/WCPFC and the SPC was successfully endorsed by the JWG and signed on May 9, 2025.

**2.2 Framework and governance of ePBCD**

10. The participants continued to discuss options for budgetary and administrative consideration, including system architecture and the roles and responsibilities of the IATTC and WCPFC Secretariats.

11. The participants revisited the two differing views about system development: one system for both organizations and a separate but harmonized system for each organization.

12. The participants generally agreed to support one system for both organizations, with general preference expressed for a single system as being more cost-effective than developing two separate systems.

13. The participants agreed to make a final decision on this point after evaluating the technical and financial implications of supporting one system, taking into account the ongoing informal discussions with Shore Informatics regarding the feasibility of developing an ePBCD based on the CCSBT's e-CDS system.

14. The participants agreed that given the difference in conservation and management measures for PBF between the IATTC and WCPFC, certain flexibility should be considered when formulating actual resolutions or CMMs for the CDS in each commission.

**2.3 Review of the revised draft CMM**

15. Japan presented the working draft CMM Resolution, emphasizing that it was prepared by the Small Working Group as a basis for discussion and had not received formal authorization from the Small Working Group.

16. The presentation covered the background, noting that the 5th CDS Technical Meeting in 2024 tasked the Small Working Group to produce an amended draft CMM, and that both the 102nd IATTC meeting and 21st WCPFC Regular Session agreed to consider the establishment of a CDS for Pacific bluefin tuna fisheries by December 31, 2026.

17. Japan outlined what has been agreed upon from previous meetings, including: (1) exclusion of seafood traceability and specific monitoring, controlling and surveillance measures (3rd CDS Technical Meeting, 2022); (2) stepwise approach initially covering international transactions; (3) exclusion of heads, eyes, roes, guts and tails from scope; (4) mandatory registration of fishing vessels targeting PBF and farms;

(5) optional rather than mandatory tagging with exemption of tagged fish from validation; (6) validation by government authorities or delegated organizations; (7) verification system following other RFMOs practices; and (8) automatic reconciliation process for data validity checking.

18. The presentation detailed the draft CMM structure across eight parts: (I) General Provisions and Application, covering objective, scope, and definitions; (II) Documents and Information Required, specifying information for ePBCD and ePBRC; (III) Validation, establishing recording and validation procedures; (IV) Tag, providing optional tagging provisions; (V) Verification for PBF trade, covering examination and verification procedures; (VI) Communication, addressing notification requirements; (VII) Data Sharing and Confidentiality, establishing data handling protocols; and (VIII) Exceptional Arrangements, providing for paper documentation under specific circumstances.

19. Key provisions presented included: prohibition of export, import or re-export without completed and validated ePBCD or ePBRC; pilot testing phase for at least X years on voluntary basis before mandatory implementation; automatic reconciliation function to detect data inconsistencies; validation requirements by authorized government officials or delegated organizations; and exceptional arrangements allowing paper documentation under specific circumstances such as small catches less than 1 metric ton, system malfunctions, or technical difficulties.

20. Following the presentation, the participants provided suggestions to revise the draft resolution. The participants made revisions to multiple sections, including paragraphs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, and 14, to improve readability and clarify terms and phrases. The participants also made changes to paragraphs 15, 17, 19, 22, 26, 27, and 28, and added a new paragraph 29 as a placeholder for a text to be proposed by Korea. The participants postponed their suggestions regarding specific time frames for paragraphs 8 and 26. The outcomes of the discussion are reflected in **Appendix 2**.

21. The participants discussed concerns about Annex F regarding artificial fry, particularly the potential for mixing artificial fry with wild fry and the need for proper identification systems to prevent loopholes and regulatory avoidance.

22. The participants discussed the question of whether the ePBCD system should use one form for export and re-export and another for the other activities, such as catch and caging, or combine landing and export information in one form and a separate form for re-export, as in the case of ICCAT, with the WCPFC Secretariat noting feedback from CCSBT suggesting they would have preferred the former one if designing from scratch due to software complications.

23. The participants agreed that Japan will contact the CCSBT Secretariat to better understand the difficulties they faced with having the ICCAT system and share this information with the Small Working Group.

## 3. NEXT MEETING

24. The participants agreed to convene the 7th CDS Technical Meeting in conjunction with the 11th JWG meeting.

25. The participants agreed to give the Small Working Group discretion to propose additional virtual technical working group meetings before the 7th Meeting, depending on the progress made by the Small

Working Group.

26. The participants agreed that the duration of the next technical meeting will be decided intersessionally, depending on the progress made by the Small Working Group and any additional working group meetings.

## 4. OTHER BUSINESS

27. WWF welcomed the good progress made on the CDS and emphasized the need to introduce the CDS as soon as possible given the expanding distribution of PBF, noting that the system does not need to be perfect from the start and can be improved stepwise. WWF recommended holding additional Small Working Group meetings if needed to ensure completion by 2026.

28. The Chair noted that the Small Working Group will work intersessionally, possibly through email exchange, and that the success of producing a completed draft CMM depends on the Small Working Group's efforts.

## 5. CHAIR'S SUMMARY AND REPORT TO THE JWG

29. The Chair will provide his summary of the CDS technical meeting to the JWG as usual.

**Appendix 1**

**JOINT IATTC AND WCPFC-NC WORKING GROUP**
**SIXTH CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME TECHNICAL MEETING**
**(CDS-06)**

Toyama, Japan (Hybrid)
09:00 – 15:00, 9 July 2025

**ANNOTATED AGENDA**

## 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

### 1.1 Welcome
Mr. Shingo Ota, Chair of the CDS Technical Meeting, will open the meeting.

### 1.2 Appointment of rapporteur
A rapporteur will be appointed.

### 1.3 Adoption of the agenda
An agenda will be adopted. Any additional issues will be discussed under Other Matters.

### 1.4 Meeting arrangements
The Chair will explain the meeting arrangements, process, and reporting to the JWG.

## 2. DEVELOPMENT OF A CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME FOR PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA

### 2.1 Recap of the 5th CDS Technical Meeting and intersessional activities
The Chair will briefly review the results of the 5th CDS Technical Meeting and intersessional work.

### 2.2 Framework and governance of ePBCD
The meeting participants will continue discussing options for budgetary and administrative consideration, including system architecture and the roles and responsibilities of the IATTC and WCPFC secretariats**.**

### 2.3 Review of the revised draft CMM
The meeting participants will continue to discuss elements to be included in the CMM submitted by the small working group.

## 3. NEXT MEETING
The participants will discuss the venue and timing of the next meeting.

## 4. OTHER BUSINESS
Any other matters raised under Agenda Item 1.3 will be discussed here.

## 5. CHAIR'S SUMMARY AND REPORT TO THE JWG

The Chair will summarize the results of the CDS Technical Meeting to be reported to the Joint IATTC-WCPFC NC Working Group.

## 6. CLOSE OF THE MEETING

**Appendix 2**

**JOINT IATTC AND WCPFC-NC WORKING GROUP**
**SIXTH CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME TECHNICAL MEETING**
**(CDS-06)**

Toyama, Japan (Hybrid)
09:00 – 15:00, 9 July 2025

**Working Draft CMM Resolution for Pacific Bluefin Tuna CDS**

**IATTC-NC-CDS06-2025/02**

**Small Working Group under the CDS Technical Meeting**

**Background**

In 2019 and 2020, the virtual working group established under the CDS Technical Meeting discussed a draft CMM/Resolution for Pacific bluefin tuna Catch Documentation Scheme. The draft CMM/Resolution received many comments and suggestions from the members of the virtual working group. In June 2022, Japan, as the lead, circulated the 3rd draft of the CMM/Resolution among members of virtual working group, with all comments and suggestions tentatively incorporated. However, since the text became quite busy with those comments and suggestions, including provisions related to traceability and monitoring, controlling and surveillance measures, some of which were considered to be beyond the scope of the CDS, the 3rd draft was not directly discussed at the 3rd CDS Technical meeting.

The 3rd CDS Technical meeting in July, 2022 agreed that "the scope and functions of the draft CMM for the development of CDS would: i) not include seafood traceability and not go beyond the scope of the bluefin tuna CDSs utilized by the CCSBT and ICCAT, and ii) not include specific monitoring, controlling and surveillance measures."

The 4th CDS Technical meeting in July 2023 tentatively agreed to use resources from the CCSBT e-CDS as the platform for the system development of ePBCD. This choice has some implication to the Draft CMM/Resolution. On the other hand, there were several pending issues that need further discussion, such as demarcation between IATTC and WCPFC.

In July 2024, the small working group submitted a working draft CMM/Resolution to the 5th CDS Technical meeting. This draft was developed based on the 3rd draft and by simplifying some of the text to reflect the agreement in 2022 to narrow the scope and functions of the draft CMM/Resolution. The 5th CDS Technical meeting tentatively agreed to take a stepwise approach to determine the scope of application and to initially set the scope as covering international transactions. The 5th CDS Technical meeting also agreed to task the small working group to produce an amended draft CMM and to present it at the next CDS Technical meeting.

Furthermore, at the 102nd meeting of the IATTC in September 2024 and the 21st regular session of the WCPFC in December 2024, the CPCs/CCMs agreed to consider the establishment of a CDS for Pacific bluefin tuna fisheries in the EPO/WCPO by 31 December 2026.

In light of these progress, the small working group wishes to submit the amended working draft CMM/Resolution as attached. This working draft has not received any authorization from the virtual working group or small working group established under the CDS Technical meeting. Rather, this document was created for the purpose of having a basis for further discussion at the 6th CDS Technical meeting and thereafter.

**Part I: General Provisions and Application**

1. The objective of the Pacific bluefin tuna Catch Documentation (PBCD) program is to identify the origin and movement of Pacific bluefin tuna (PBF) in its processed or unprocessed form (wild capture or farmed) in order to support the implementation of Conservation and Management Measure (CMM)/Resolution for PBF, including by providing a tool to assist in combating IUU fishing.

2. This CMM/Resolution applies to PBF, except for those captured in sport and recreational fisheries when their sales are prohibited.

3. For the purpose of this CMM/Resolution:
   (1) "Catch" means:
   Commercial wild capture of PBF, except when the captured PBF is not retained on board.
   (2) "Caging" means:
   The relocation of live PBF from a fishing vessel, trap or transport cage to a farming cage, including a fattening cage.
   (3) "Export" means:
   Any movement of PBF from the territory of the Commission Member, Cooperating Non-member and participating Territory (hereinafter referred to as CCM)/Member and Cooperating Non-Member (hereinafter referred to as CPC) where the fishing vessel is flagged (hereinafter referred to as flag CCM/CPC) or where the trap or farm is established (hereinafter referred to as trap CCM/CPC or farm CCM/CPC, respectively) to the territory of another CCM/CPC or non-CCM/non-CPC of the Commission, or from the fishing grounds to the territory of a CCM/CPC which is not the flag CCM/CPC or to the territory of a non-CCM/non-CPC of the Commission.
   (4) "Harvest [(from cages)]" means:
   Removal of PBF from farming cages for consumption, processing, export or other purposes that result in the death of the animal.
   (5) "Import" means:
   Any introduction of PBF into the territory of a CCM/CPC [or non-CCM/CPC] from another CCM/CPC or non-CCM/CPC of the Commission, or from the fishing grounds to the territory of a CCM/CPC, which is not the flag CCM/CPC, trap CCM/CPC or farm CCM/CPC.
   (6) "Re-export" means:
   Any movement of PBF from the territory of a CCM/CPC where it was previously imported to the territory of another CCM/CPC or non-CCM/non-CPC.
   (7) "Transshipment" means:
   The unloading of all or any of PBF on board a fishing vessel to another fishing vessel either at sea or in port.

4. [Export, import or re-export of PBF without a completed and validated electronic Pacific bluefin tuna Catch Documentation (ePBCD) or electronic Pacific bluefin tuna Re-export Certificate (ePBRC) shall be prohibited.] Export, import or re-export of fish parts other than the meat or collars (i.e., heads, eyes, roes, guts and tails) shall be exempted from the requirement of this CMM/Resolution.

5. Development and implementation of ePBCD and [ePBRC]
   (1) For the implementation of this CMM/Resolution, an interoperable ePBCD system [between IATTC and WCPFC] will be developed. This system will also be made available for [ePBRC]. WCPFC and IATTC Secretariats should formulate the Terms of Reference for an open tender for the system development before the end of 20XX, or as soon as possible thereafter. Such Terms

of Reference shall be approved by both WCPFC and IATTC. The Secretariat shall report to the Commission the result of tenders and progress on the system development thereafter.

(2) A pilot testing phase will be undertaken at least for [X] years to implement ePBCD and [ePBRC]. The pilot testing will involve CCMs/CPCs on a voluntary basis and cover range of actions required in this CMM/Resolution.

(3) Use of the ePBCD system is mandatory of all CCMs/CPCs once the establishment of the ePBCD system is completed with necessary modifications as a result of the pilot testing phase.

(4) Notwithstanding paragraph 4 and subparagraph (3), paper PBCDs and [PBRCs], whose formats are attached as Annex A and B, respectively, or printed ePBCDs and [ePBRCs] may be used in cases falling under the exceptional circumstances specified in paragraph 26. The provisions of paragraph 4 and Parts II through VII shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to paper PBCDs and PBRCs or printed ePBCDs and [ePBRCs].

(5) The ePBCD system will include a function that automatically detects any inconsistencies in the input data and notifies the relevant CCMs/CPCs of these inconsistencies. Such inconsistencies shall include the following:

a. The accumulated catch attributed to a CCM/CPC recorded in the ePBCD system exceeds that CCM/CPC's catch quota or catch limit for the relevant management year (notification will be sent to the CCM/CPC).

b. The amount of exported Pacific bluefin tuna recorded in the ePBCD system originating from a single vessel or trap on a single day exceeds the recorded amount of PBF caught by that vessel or trap on that day (notification will be sent to the exporting CCM/CPC).

**Part II: Documents and Information Required**

6. The following information shall be recorded in the ePBCD. Each item shall be in accordance with the specifications in Annex C.

(1) Information on catch
(2) Information on transshipment
(3) Information on harvest [(from cages)]
(4) Information on first sale after catch
(5) Information on [export] and import

7. The following information shall be recorded in the [ePBRC]. Each item shall be in accordance with the specifications in Annex D.

(1) Information on imported PBF, including information on related ePBCD(s)
(2) Information on re-export and import

**Part III: Validation**

8. Record in ePBCD and [ePBRC]

(1) The master or operator of a vessel, the trap or farm operator, the exporter, their authorized representative, or the authorized representative of the flag CCM/CPC, trap CCM/CPC, farm CCM/CPC or the CCM/CPC where PBF is exported from (hereinafter referred to as export CCM/CPC) shall record the information specified in paragraph 6 in the appropriate section of the ePBCD on each occasion it catches, transships, harvests [(from cages)], first sells, or exports PBF.

(2) For PBF that is not exported, catch and transshipment information must be recorded in the ePBCD, however, the additional information required in sub-paragraph (1) is not required.

(3) Information on catch shall be recorded within [ 7] days of the landing. However, if the landing of PBF by one vessel or one trap at a time is less than [1] metric ton, or the PBF is tagged in accordance with Part IV, the information may be recorded within [ ] days. When PBF is caged, information on catch shall be recorded within [ ]. Any transfer of the caged PBF shall be prohibited until the information on catch is recorded.

(4) The re-exporter, its authorized representative, or the authorized representative of the CCM/CPC where the PBF is re-exported from (hereinafter referred to as re-export CCM/CPC) shall record the information specified in paragraph 7 in the appropriate section of the [ePBRC] on each occasion they re-exports PBF.

9. Validation of ePBCD and [ePBRC]

(1) The ePBCD and [ePBRC] must be validated by an authorized government official, or other authorized individual or institution, of the flag CCM/CPC, trap CCM/CPC, farm CCM/CPC, export CCM/CPC or re-export CCM/CPC that caught, harvested [(from cages)], exported or re-exported PBF.

(2) The ePBCD shall be validated only when:

a. All the information provided in the ePBCD has been established to be accurate;

b. The accumulated catch attributed to a CCM/CPC is within that CCM/CPC's catch quota or catch limit for the relevant management year; and,

c. The PBF in the ePBCD was caught, transshipped, harvested [(from cages)] or sold in compliance with other applicable provisions of CMMs/Resolutions.

(3) The [ePBRC] shall be validated only when:

a. All the information provided in the [ePBRC] has been established to be accurate;

b. All the ePBCD numbers relating to the previously imported PBF products are included.

c. Each related ePBCD had been validated and accepted for the importation of the products declared on the [ePBRC]; and,

d. The products to be re-exported are wholly or partly the same product on the validated ePBCD(s).

**Part IV: Tag**

10. Notwithstanding paragraph 9, validation of ePBCD shall not be required when PBF is tagged by the flag CCM/CPC or trap CCM/CPC in accordance with the following criteria:

(1) All PBF in the ePBCD concerned are individually tagged;

(2) The minimum information associated with the tag includes:

a. Identifying information on the vessel or trap that caught PBF;

b. The date of catch or landing;

c. The area of catch of the PBF;

d. The type of product and weight of the PBF;

e. Information on the exporter and importer (where applicable);

f. The point of export (where applicable).

(3) Information on tagged fish is compiled by the responsible CCM/CPC and made available to the Secretariat upon its request.

11. CCMs/CPCs may require their vessels or traps to affix a tag to each PBF preferably at the timing of kill, but no later than the time of landing. The tags shall have unique country-specific numbers and be tamper proof. The tag numbers shall be linked to the ePBCD.

12. Such tags shall only be used when the accumulated catch attributed to a CCM/CPC is within that CCM/CPC's catch quota or catch limit for the relevant management year, including where appropriate individual quotas allocated to vessels or traps.

**Part V: Verification for PBF trade**

13. Each CCM/CPC shall ensure that its competent authorities, or other authorized individuals or institutions take steps to identify each consignment of PBF imported into or exported or re-exported from its territory and request and examine the validated ePBCD(s) and [ePBRC(s)] as well as other related documentation for each consignment of PBF when it is exported, imported or re-exported. These authorities, individuals or institutions may also examine the contents of the consignment to verify the information contained in the ePBCD and in related documents and, where necessary, shall carry out verifications with the importer or exporter concerned.

14. If as a result of examinations or verifications carried out pursuant to paragraph 13, questions arise regarding the information contained in an ePBCD or [ePBRC], the final importing CCM/CPC and the CCM/CPC whose competent authorities validated the ePBCD(s) or [ePBRC(s)] shall cooperate to address such questions.

15. If a CCM/CPC involved in export, import or re-export of PBF identifies a consignment in violation of paragraph 4, it shall notify the findings to the relevant CCM/CPC. The relevant CCM/CPC shall take necessary measures, including investigations, and share the results with the informing CCM/CPC.

16. Pending the examinations or verifications under paragraph 13 to confirm compliance of PBF consignment with the requirements in this CMM/Resolution and any other relevant CCMs/Resolutions, the CCMs/CPCs shall not grant its release for export, import and re-export.

17. Where a CCM/CPC, as a result of examinations or verifications under paragraph 13 and in cooperation with the validating authorities concerned, determines that an ePBCD or [ePBRC] is invalid, import, export and re-export of the PBF consignment shall be prohibited.

**Part VI: Communication**

18. Each CCM/CPC shall notify the Secretariat of the name, title, organization and address of the government officials or other authorized individuals specified in paragraph 9(1), and the name and address of the other authorized institutions specified in the same paragraph and, where appropriate, the name and title of the officials who are individually empowered within those institutions. This notification shall indicate the date at which the authorization comes into force. Any changes to the content of the notification under this paragraph shall be promptly notified to the Secretariat.

19. Each CCM/CPC shall notify the Secretariat of the name, address and contact details of the organization that will serve as the point of contact for questions related to ePBCDs or [ePBRCs] concerning the CCM/CPC. Any changes to the content of the notification under this paragraph shall be promptly notified to the Secretariat.

20. All CCMs/CPCs concerned shall, as soon as possible for the ePBCD system implementation, submit to the Secretariat the data necessary to ensure the registration of their users in the ePBCD system.

Access to and use of the system cannot be ensured for those who fail to provide and maintain the data required by the ePBCD system.

21. The Commission shall request the non-CCMs/non-CPCs that are involved in export, import or re-export of PBF to cooperate with the implementation of the program and to provide to the Commission data obtained from such implementation.

22. Access to the ePBCD system shall be granted to non-CCMs/non-CPCs to facilitate trade of PBF. Until such time as the functionality is developed that allows non-CCMs/non-CPCs access to the system, this shall be accomplished through completion by the non-CCMs/non-CPCs of paper PBCD and [PBRC] consistent with the terms of paragraph 5(4) and submission to the Secretariat for entry into the ePBCD system. The Secretariat shall communicate without delay to those non-CCMs/non-CPCs known to import, export or re-export PBF to make them aware of the ePBCD system and the applicable provisions of this CMM/Resolution.

**Part VII: Data Sharing and Confidentiality**

23. The information notified under paragraph 18 shall be handled as non-public domain data and the Secretariat shall facilitate access to this information by authorized CCM/CPC users through the secure pages of the Commission website.

24. The Secretariat shall facilitate access to the information notified under paragraph 19 through the public pages of the Commission website.

25. All the data in ePBCD shall be processed in accordance with the Rules of Procedures for the Protection, Access to, and Dissemination of Data Compiled by the Commission/Resolution on Confidentiality.

**Part VIII: Exceptional Arrangements**

26. Paper PBCDs and [PBRCs], whose formats are attached as Annex A and B, respectively, or printed ePBCDs and [ePBRCs] may be used in accordance with paragraph 5(4), if any of the following circumstances apply:
    (1) The landing or caging of PBF by one vessel or one trap at a time is less than [1] metric ton, or the PBF is tagged in accordance with Part IV. In this case, the logbook or the sales note may be used as a temporary PBCD. Such paper PBCDs, printed ePBCDs or temporary PBCDs shall be converted to ePBCDs within a period of [ ] days or prior to the export, whichever is first;
    (2) PBF is caught prior to the full implementation of the ePBCD system as specified in paragraph 5(3);
    (3) Technical difficulties arise with the ePBCD system that preclude a CCM/CPC from using the system. In this case, the CCM/CPC shall follow the procedures set forth in Annex E. Delays by CCMs/CPCs in taking necessary actions, such as providing the data necessary to ensure the registration of users in the ePBCD system or other avoidable situations, do not constitute technical difficulties in this subparagraph.
    (4) In the case of trade between CCMs/CPCs and non-CCMs/non-CPCs, where access to the ePBCD system by non-CCMs/non-CPCs through the Secretariat in accordance with paragraph 22 is not possible or is not timely enough to ensure that trade is not unduly delayed or disrupted.

27. When a paper PBCD or [PBRC], or a printed ePBCD or [ePBRC] is used in accordance with paragraphs 5(4) and 26, importing CCMs/CPCs, solely on the basis of the use of such paper or printed PBCD and [PBRC], shall not be cited as a reason to delay or deny import of PBF.

28. Where requested by a CCM/CPC, the Secretariat shall facilitate the conversion of paper PBCDs or [PBRCs], or printed ePBCDs or [ePBRCs] to ePBCDs or [ePBRCs].

29. New text to be proposed by Korea

**Annex A: Format of Paper PBCD**
Need to be considered based on the discussion in the main text.

**Annex B: Format of Paper PBRC**
Need to be considered based on the discussion in the main text.

**Annex C: Information to be Recorded in ePBCD**
Need to be considered based on the discussion in the main text.

**Annex D: Information to be Recorded in ePBRC**
Need to be considered based on the discussion in the main text.

**Annex E: Procedures for Technical Difficulties with the ePBCD system**
Need to be considered based on the discussion in the main text.

**Annex F: Artificial Fry**
Need to be considered based on the discussion in the main text.

**Annex E**

**JOINT IATTC AND WCPFC-NC WORKING GROUP MEETING ON THE MANAGEMENT OF PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA**
**TENTH SESSION (JWG-10)**

Toyama, Japan (Hybrid)
9 – 12 July 2025

**KOREA'S STATEMENT**

Thank you, co-chairs.

The Republic of Korea would first like to express its sincere appreciation for the collective and

arduous efforts of all members of the Joint Working Group. The latest scientific assessments from 2024 have provided clear and encouraging evidence that the Pacific bluefin tuna stock is in a period of rapid recovery, meeting our ambitious rebuilding targets well ahead of schedule. This is a testament to the effectiveness of our collaborative conservation measures over the past two decades and a shared success we can all be proud of.

This very success has brought forth new and pressing realities for coastal states, including the Republic of Korea. In recent years, our waters have witnessed an unprecedented and dramatic increase in the abundance of Pacific bluefin tuna. While the precise causes are still under investigation, it is widely presumed that factors such as climate change are altering the migratory patterns and distribution of this valuable species. We note that Korea is not alone in observing these significant shifts.

While coastal states of the WCPFC hold the rights to manage highly migratory species in their territorial and archipelagic waters, the Republic of Korea has voluntarily and steadfastly participated in this international management framework with very limited catch limits based on historical catch records that no longer reflect the reality of the resource's distribution and abundance. We have done so as the stock was in a dire situation and to implement the principle that cooperative management is the most effective path to the long-term sustainability of this highly migratory species.

However, the stock is rapidly recovering now. Catch limits based solely on catch records from 20 years ago have created a severe socio-economic strain on our coastal fishing communities. These communities, which are facing economic hardship and the threat of decline, now see a resurgent and abundant resource in their traditional fishing grounds, yet they are constrained by rigid, historical quotas. It is an untenable situation for a responsible coastal state to simply watch as its fishing communities suffer while a healthy and plentiful resource is at their doorstep.

The remarkable recovery of the Pacific bluefin tuna is a collective achievement that must now translate into adaptive and equitable management. Looking forward, it is imperative that the long-term management framework for this species fully considers the current state of the resource and the legitimate rights and acute needs of coastal states that are experiencing these dramatic changes in stock distribution.

The Republic of Korea remains fully committed to the sustainable management of Pacific bluefin tuna. A long-term management regime that fully considers the new realities will motivate Korea to maintain its commitment. As a costal state, one of Korea's top priorities is to ensure the livelihoods of our fishing communities who depend on the resources in our territorial waters.

We believe that by working together and acknowledging the changed circumstances, we can ensure both the continued health of the Pacific bluefin tuna and the vitality of the coastal communities that depend on it.
Thank you.