



North Pacific Fisheries Commission

NPFC-2026-TCC09-Adopted Report

9th Meeting of the Technical and Compliance Committee REPORT

8–11 April 2026

This paper may be cited in the following manner:

Technical and Compliance Committee. 2026. 9th Meeting Report. NPFC-2026-TCC09-Final Report.
XX pp. (Available at www.npfc.int)

Contents

Agenda Item 1. Opening of the Meeting	1
Agenda Item 2. Report from Secretariat	1
Agenda Item 3. Review of MCS related issues from SC	5
3a. TCC review of SC responses on data needs for an NPFC ROP	5
Agenda Item 4. SWG Reports on Progress, Priorities and Recommendations	6
4a. SWG Planning and Development - Report and Recommendations	6
4b. SWG Operations - Report and Recommendations	6
4c. Terms of Reference for the TCC SWGs	7
Agenda Item 5. Conservation and Management Measures – Amendments or new CMMs ...	7
Agenda Item 6. IUU Vessel List	11
6a. Recommendation for Provisional IUU Vessel List to the Commission.....	11
6b. Recommendations for amendments to current NPFC IUU Vessel List to Commission	16
Agenda Item 7. Compliance Monitoring Scheme	17
7a. Response to Chair’s Letter on 2025 CMS	17
7b. Draft Compliance Monitoring Reports for 2025 -presentation by Secretariat	18
7c. Develop Provisional Compliance Report- Annual determination of compliance status and potential responses for each obligation subject to assessment for each Member.....	22
7d. List of obligations for consideration for the Compliance Monitoring Scheme in 2026.....	22
Agenda Item 8. Historic Existing Level	23
Agenda Item 9. Transshipment	23
Agenda Item 10. Vessel Monitoring System	25
10a. Secretariat report on implementation.....	25
Agenda Item 11. High Seas Boarding and Inspection	26
11a. Secretariat Report.....	26
11b. Member Reports	26
Agenda Item 12. Review of Applications for CNCP Status	26
Agenda Item 13. Climate Change	26
Agenda Item 14. Cooperation with Other Organizations	27
14a. MoU with SPRFMO	27
14b. MoU with WCPFC	27

14c. NPFC-NPAFC Work Plan.....	27
14d. IMCS Network	28
Agenda Item 15. Performance Review- Recommendations relevant to TCC.....	28
Agenda Item 16. Other Matters	28
Agenda Item 17. Review and Endorsement of TCC Work Plan for 2026/2027	28
Agenda Item 18. Recommendations to the Commission.....	29
Agenda Item 19. Next Meeting	31
Agenda Item 20. Adoption of the Report.....	31
Agenda Item 21. Close of the Meeting	31
LIST OF ANNEXES.....	31
Annex A: Agenda	32

North Pacific Fisheries Commission
9th Meeting of the Technical and Compliance Committee

8–11 April 2026
Osaka, Japan

ADOPTED REPORT

Agenda Item 1. Opening of the Meeting

1a. Welcome to Participants

1. The 9th Meeting of the Technical and Compliance Committee (TCC) was held in a hybrid format, with participants attending in-person in Osaka, Japan, or online via WebEx, on 8–11 April 2026, and was attended by Members from Canada, China, the European Union (EU), Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Chinese Taipei, the United States of America (USA), and Vanuatu, and Panama as a Cooperating Non-Contracting Party (CNCP). The meeting was opened by Ms. Alisha Falberg (USA), who served as the TCC Chair.

1b. Appointment of Rapporteur

2. Mr. Alex Meyer was appointed as rapporteur.

1c. Introduction of Observers

3. The Chair introduced approved observers permitted to be present. The accredited observers were the Pew Charitable Trusts (Pew), the Ocean Foundation, Ocean Governance Institute (OGI), World Wildlife Fund (WWF), and the North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission (NPAFC). The observers were admitted without objection.

1d. Adoption of Agenda

4. The provisional agenda was adopted (Annex A). The List of Documents and List of Participants are attached (Annexes B, C).

1e. Meeting Arrangements

5. The Compliance Manager, Ms. Judy Dwyer, outlined the meeting arrangements.

Agenda Item 2. Report from Secretariat

2a. Fisheries Overview 2025

6. The Compliance Manager presented the overview of NPFC fisheries in 2025 (NPFC-2026-TCC09-IP01).

7. The Compliance Manager explained that this year's fisheries overview did not include vessel authorizations. She reminded the TCC that issues with the vessel registry data held by the Secretariat and discrepancies between these data and the data held by Members had resulted in several revisions to the fisheries overview at TCC08. The Secretariat has been investigating the issues in the vessel registry and found issues including duplicate or triplicate authorizations and the use of inconsistent vessel and gear codes. The Secretariat has been working on these issues but had not been able to resolve them in time for TCC09. The Secretariat will continue to address these issues and can work with Members individually or collectively, as appropriate, to do so.
8. Korea expressed appreciation for the new format of the fisheries overview, noting that it is more factual and simpler than previous years. The USA recognized the value of the new fisheries overview format in that it is more focused on factual information and acknowledged that there were issues with historical vessel authorization data that the Secretariat had not yet been able to resolve. However, the USA also pointed out that the more comprehensive information provided in previous years was useful for understanding the historical context. The USA also noted that other historical data besides vessel authorizations, such as historical catch, could have been presented, and requested that the Secretariat find a better balance in the kinds of information that it includes in the fisheries overview.
9. China noted that Table 2 presented chub mackerel catch for the 2025 calendar year, whereas Conservation and Management Measure (CMM) 2025-07 For Chub Mackerel applies a fishing year that runs from June 1 to May 31 and a catch limit based on fishing year. China considered the use of different time periods for reporting and for setting catch limits to be confusing and expressed its intention to propose that the Commission revert to using calendar year for setting catch limits for chub mackerel at COM10.
10. In response to a request for clarification regarding Members reporting bycatch in their Annual Report, the Secretariat explained that under the current data reporting template, Members are only required to report one amount for total catch and the Secretariat cannot verify whether or not this amount includes discards and bycatch.
11. The USA expressed concern regarding the significant increase in catch of Japanese sardine, noting the limited scientific advice and lack of an assessment for this stock at the NPFC level. The USA also requested Japan elaborate on its significant reported quantities of shark bycatch.
12. In response to the request for clarification, Japan explained that its shark bycatch was taken from its bottom fisheries and that over 80% of this bycatch consists of lantern shark.

13. The TCC requested that future annual report templates include a description of which fishery such bycatch is associated with, so this information can be included in future fisheries overviews
14. The USA pointed out that even though the fisheries overview and other papers were submitted to TCC before the mandated deadline, it can nevertheless be challenging for Members and the Secretariat to adequately prepare for the meeting if most documents are being posted around the same time towards the end of the submission period, shortly before the meeting. The USA suggested that papers be submitted and posted earlier and in a more staggered way, if possible.
15. The Compliance Manager agreed that this would be beneficial for Members and the Secretariat, while pointing out that its ability to post documents earlier depends on when it receives data and papers from Members, though for the Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) and transshipment the goal/plan is to review these throughout the year.

2b. Data Management System Update and Initiatives for 2026

16. The Data Coordinator, Mr. Sungkuk Kang, presented a summary of the status of all TCC-related data management systems and new initiatives for further development in 2025 by the Secretariat (NPFC-2026-TCC09-IP02). Updates have been made to the Members Home, Significant Dates/Events, Transshipments Map, Annual Reports, Vessel Registry, High Seas Boarding and Inspection (HSBI) Events, e-IUU, Pacific Saury Weekly Report, Chub Mackerel Monthly/Weekly Report, and Collaboration sections. New Member Reporting Dashboard and Aerial Surveillance pages were also launched. As for VMS, it is in operation and continuously monitors the positions and movements of all NPFC fishing vessels operating in the Convention Area. The Secretariat will continue to provide Members with an inspection presence with access to VMS data to support inspection activities and address any technical needs. In 2026, the Secretariat intends to advance the following key initiatives: upgrading the NPFC Vessel Registry by enhancing its authorization management functionality; updating the NPFC Annual Report module to improve data integrity; developing an e-Implementation Questionnaire module similar to the e-Annual Report; creating a Monitoring, Control, and Surveillance (MCS) page to cover HSBI Events, Air Surveillance, and related Focal Points; and regularly updating the NPFC website in line with Member requirements.
17. The Data Coordinator informed the TCC that the Secretariat had received a request from Korea to enable individual users to create their own accounts in addition to the current process of group administrators having that ability. However, he explained that this functionality has not been implemented due to security considerations, as unrestricted account creation could expose the NPFC domain to unauthorized traffic or malicious activities.

18. The Data Coordinator explained that the Secretariat recently experienced an unusually high level of traffic to the NPFC domain (npfc.int). This resulted in a deterioration of the domain's "trust rating," causing outbound emails to be flagged as spam or quarantined by many recipients. To safeguard the domain's integrity, the Secretariat was advised by its service provider not to develop functionality allowing account creation by any user; instead, the Group Administrator of each Member continues to create and manage their group users' accounts, ensuring network security and reliable email delivery.
19. The TCC noted that Members do not have permission to update the authorization period and target species of their authorized vessels and asked for an explanation from the Secretariat.
20. The Secretariat explained that this issue had previously been discussed among Members and the Secretariat, and it was concluded that Members should not have the ability to make such updates retroactively and that only the Secretariat should have that permission. The Secretariat further explained that, perhaps unintentionally, this resulted in Members also not having permission to make such updates for future authorization periods and target species. The Secretariat suggested that it would work with Members and the service provider to reintroduce that functionality as part of its work to address the aforementioned issues in the vessel registry.
21. The TCC noted that it is possible for Members to revise their annual reports after they have been submitted, including after the submission deadline. Some Members expressed concern about Members editing their reports after the deadline. The TCC agreed that information should be recorded on whether Members submitted their reports before the deadline and whether they made any changes to their reports after the deadline.
22. The Secretariat confirmed that the NPFC data management system does currently record what changes have been made, when, and by whom.
23. When asked about facilitating access for registered observers to the NPFC Collaboration site, the Secretariat explained that it is continuing to work with the service provider on facilitating this, but that there have been many unexpected technical and security issues that have prevented faster progress.
24. China pointed out that for their annual reports, Members must manually select all their active vessels from a list of all their authorized vessels, which can be very time-consuming and cumbersome. China suggested that it would be helpful if this process could be automated in some way, such as if the selection could be done automatically based on a separate list of active vessels submitted by a Member to the Secretariat or based on the VMS position reports

sent to the Secretariat.

25. The USA suggested that a disclaimer be added to the Reporting Dashboard that clarifies that it is still each Member's responsibility to meet the reporting requirements under the NPFC CMMs in the case of any potential omissions or errors. The USA also suggested that a check box be added that Members must mark when submitting their annual reports that indicates that they are responsible for the accuracy of the data they are submitting.

Agenda Item 3. Review of MCS related issues from SC

3a. TCC review of SC responses on data needs for an NPFC ROP

26. The Chair reminded the TCC that she, the Scientific Committee (SC) Chair, and the SC had continued to engage in communication in the intersessional period regarding potential scientific components of an NPFC At-Sea Regional Observer Program (ROP) and explained that the responses from SC to the questionnaire from the TCC have been provided in NPFC-2026-TCC09-IP03.
27. Some Members considered the responses from the SC to be a summary of areas of scientific interest and not a conclusion on the necessities, scope, or design of a ROP. Furthermore, they noted that existing data needed for stock assessment work are already derived largely from Members' domestic programs and port sampling, that additional verification is not considered necessary, and that the level of monitoring required cannot yet be determined. They suggested that there is therefore not an urgent need to establish an ROP for scientific purposes.
28. Other Members believed that the information from the SC provided an adequate basis for beginning more full-fledged discussions on the development of an ROP, including potential components of an NPFC ROP. They also disagreed with the suggestion that the SC is already collecting all the data it needs and that additional verification is not needed, noting that there were a number of areas where the SC said it did not have enough information to answer the questions from the TCC. They further noted that the establishment of an ROP is required under the Convention, that an ROP should cover not only scientific aspects but also compliance aspects, and that the need for an ROP was reinforced by the Performance Review Panel.
29. **Recommendation:** That the Commission task TCC to work intersessionally through the SWG on Planning and Development (SWG PD) to develop a paper on TCC-related components of an NPFC ROP and submit the paper to TCC10. In developing the paper, the SWG PD should review other data collection methods, including current data collection methods such as Members' domestic observer programs and port sampling programs, as well as possibilities for the use of e-monitoring (EM).

30. The Ocean Foundation expressed concern at some Members' reluctance to move forward with the establishment of an ROP when this is a commitment under the Convention. The Ocean Foundation noted the continued occurrence of data-related issues at the TCC, the SC and the Commission and expressed concern over the SC's lack of clarity regarding its level of confidence in, and uncertainties associated with, its stock assessments. The Ocean Foundation emphasized that an ROP is intended not only for collecting more data but independently verifying the data being collected, which is an instrumental part of modern fisheries management.

Agenda Item 4. SWG Reports on Progress, Priorities and Recommendations

4a. SWG Planning and Development - Report and Recommendations

31. Ms. Amber Lindstedt (Canada), Co-Lead of SWG PD, presented a summary of the work conducted by SWG PD in the 2025–2026 intersessional period. SWG PD held six meetings and advanced key files through email communication. Two priority tasks were completed: development of a three-year Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMS) workplan and of a draft proposal to establish a CMM on Minimum Standards for Port State Measures. SWG PD began implementing the new CMS workplan and started by revising the implementation questionnaire, which was subsequently used for Members' 2025 submissions. SWG also advanced the draft ToR for SWGs for the TCC's consideration. In addition, SWG PD reviewed the SC's responses on scientific components of an NPFC ROP and the SC's input on the proposal from the EU for a CMM on Minimum Draft Standards for the Collection, Reporting, Verification, and Exchange of Data in NPFC.

4b. SWG Operations - Report and Recommendations

32. Ms. Patricia DeMille (Canada), Lead of the SWG on Operations (SWG Ops), presented a summary of the work conducted by SWG Ops in the 2025–2026 intersessional period (NPFC-2026-TCC09-IP04 (Rev.1)). SWG Ops held six meetings and prepared an amendment to CMM 2023-01 On Information Requirements for Vessel Registration to reflect accepted vessel marking practices. SWG Ops also worked with the Secretariat and a service provider to develop a reconfigured "MCS" page to replace the current HSBI page. SWG Ops advanced work on historical existing levels by holding further discussions and considered various approaches to identifying historical existing levels including: 1. using the maximum number of authorized vessels found between 2015 and the year members were to refrain from expansion for each individual species measure, 2. using one point from the year prior to CMM adoption, or 3. consider explicit recommendations from TCC08 that described the average number of vessels in various year ranges for relevant measures. With regard to the taskings related to serious violations, SWG Ops has firstly developed a voluntary Inspector's Guide to support inspectors during HSBI. Secondly, SWG Ops considered Article 17 Paragraph 4 and Member obligations where it has been established that a flag vessel has committed a serious

violation, but no further progress was made.

33. The USA expressed some concerns with the voluntary inspectors guide and had questions about the intent of the document and alignment with the serious violations tasking, noting a lack of clarity regarding how it will continue to be updated and the need to ensure the potential for Members to adapt it does not lead to different interpretations.
34. The SWG Ops Lead also pointed out that meetings of SWG Ops invited participation from MCS practitioners so as to facilitate exchanges on shiprider, air surveillance and at sea patrols. She noted an online session to focus on practical issues with the online tools had been well received and expressed her intention to continue this practice going forward, noting that this would provide an opportunity to focus even more on technical considerations, including potential compliance or conservation issues that are not currently regulated by any NPFC measures.
35. The TCC held further discussions on historical existing levels under Agenda Item 8.

4c. Terms of Reference for the TCC SWGs

36. The TCC reviewed and revised the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for the TCC SWGs prepared by SWG PD. The TCC endorsed the ToR for the TCC SWGs (Annex X).
Recommendation: That the Commission adopt the ToR for the TCC SWGs (Annex X).

Agenda Item 5. Conservation and Management Measures – Amendments or new CMMs

37. Canada presented its proposal for amendments to CMM 2024-02 To Establish a List of Vessels Presumed to Have Carried out Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing Activities in the Convention Area of the NPFC (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP03). Canada explained that the proposed amendments are intended to clarify the timelines in paragraphs 5 and 6, as they could currently be interpreted to mean that vessels can only be proposed for listing on the NPFC IUU vessel list for violations that occurred in the previous year, which would severely limit and potentially prevent the ability to conduct post-inspection review of reporting requirements and ensure that all potential violations are considered by the TCC and the Commission.
38. Several Members acknowledged the potential need to investigate cases and propose IUU vessel listings based on activities that occurred further in the past than the current CMM allows, but they believed that five years would be too long a time period. One Member believed that the period should be the current year or previous calendar year in principle but that the period could be extended where relevant reporting information is only available after the submission of the annual reports of the Members and CNCPs. Some Members also noted that under a certain interpretation of the current CMM, there is a particular period of time in which, if a

Member encountered a case of potential IUU fishing activity, it would not procedurally be able to nominate the vessel for inclusion on the draft IUU vessel list.

39. The TCC reviewed and revised the proposal (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP03 Rev.3).
40. The USA presented its proposal for amendments to CMM 2024-02 (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP05). The USA explained that the proposed amendments are aimed at clarifying the implementation of certain provisions, strengthening the CMM's effectiveness as a tool to combat and deter IUU fishing in the Convention Area, and making other non-substantive edits.
41. Several Members did not support inclusion of the measure to remove fishing privileges for vessels tied to beneficial owners of vessels on the NPFC IUU Vessel List, pointing out the difficulty of defining "beneficial owners" and also disagreeing with the justification of punishing other vessels that had not engaged in IUU fishing activities. The USA recognized the difficulty of defining "beneficial owners" and explained that it had therefore sought to include such a stipulation in a flexible way that would allow Members to take such action, rather than mandating it. However, in the spirit of compromise and in the interest of reaching consensus on a strengthened CMM, the USA agreed to withdraw those proposed provisions.
42. Some Members were uncomfortable with the proposed addition of provisions on measures to be taken by Members and CNCPs towards vessels included on the IUU vessel lists of other regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) before the NPFC has established a cross-listing procedure.
Recommendation: That the Commission task the SWG PD to develop a proposal for a procedure for cross-listing vessels from the IUU vessel lists of other RFMOs and determining which RFMOs' IUU vessel lists should be considered.
43. During the TCC's review of the US proposal, the EU proposed the addition of text to paragraph 3c) specifying that non-recording or non-reporting of incidental catches of other NPFC species and any discards would constitute presumed IUU fishing activities. The EU explained that the addition was intended to specify obligations that are already set out in other CMMs. Some Members did not support the addition, pointing out that the NPFC has no clear guidelines on reporting of discards and that the current CMM text has been serving its purpose with regard to non-recording or non-reporting of incidental catches. The EU agreed to withdraw the proposed addition.
44. Noting that part of the US proposal (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP05) sought to address the same issue as the Canadian proposal, Canada offered to withdraw its proposal once consensus was reached on paragraphs 5 and 6 of CMM 2024-02.

45. The TCC reviewed and revised the proposal (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP05 Rev.2).
Recommendation: That the Commission adopt the proposed amendments to CMM 2024-02 (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP05 Rev.2).
46. The USA and Korea presented a joint proposal for the establishment of a CMM on Scientific Research Activities (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP04 Rev.1). They explained that the proposed CMM is aimed at considering scientific research activities separately from commercial fishing activities, clarifying related procedures around information sharing and the application of CMMs, and promoting scientific research in the Convention Area while ensuring such activities do not undermine the objectives of the Convention and CMMs.
47. Several Members expressed general support for the measure. Some Members noted the relatively novel nature of a CMM that seeks to distinguish between commercial fisheries vessels and fisheries research vessels and called for caution in developing such a measure. In particular, they cautioned against creating undue burdens that would disincentivize Members from conducting research. They also noted the potential wide-ranging impacts of such a CMM due to the broad range of species covered by the Convention. Another Member expressed concern that exemption for research vessels from most CMM obligations could introduce MCS-related loopholes.
48. Members held further productive discussions in the margins but was unable to reach a consensus. The United States and Korea expressed their intention to submit an updated proposal to the Commission.
Recommendation: That the Commission further consider the proposal for the establishment of a CMM on Scientific Research Activities, taking into account the discussions at TCC.
49. The EU presented a proposal for the establishment of a CMM On Minimum Standards for the Collection, Reporting, Verification, and Exchange of Data (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP06). The EU explained that the proposed CMM is intended to establish a more efficient and consistent approach for the collection, reporting, verification and exchange of data in NPFC, with the aim of contributing to strengthening the capacity of the SC in fulfilling its tasks, including undertaking conclusive and robust assessments, and facilitating the monitoring and enforcement of CMMs.
50. Members recognized the importance of establishing a unified data collection system. However, several Members pointed out that the standards in the proposed measure were not feasible in light of operational realities and that the input their scientists provided to SWG Data and the SC had not been reflected.

51. The EU noted that SWG Data and SC input had been considered, and for the information, updated the proposal with background comments provided by Members to SWG Data and the SC and with recent comments from Members. The TCC reviewed the proposal and updated it further (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP06 Rev.3). The TCC noted that several substantive issues remained unresolved despite productive discussions.
Recommendation: That the Commission further consider the proposal for the establishment of a CMM On Minimum Standards for the Collection, Reporting, Verification, and Exchange of Data (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP06 Rev.3), taking into account the discussions at TCC.
52. The Lead of SWG Ops, Ms. DeMille, presented a proposed amendment to CMM 2023-01 On Information Requirements for Vessel Registration (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP07), explaining that the amendment is intended to clarify that, under paragraph 4 of Annex 2, vessels are permitted to display both a name and other identification mark, rather than one or the other.
53. The TCC reviewed and endorsed the proposal.
Recommendation: That the Commission adopt the proposed amendment to CMM 2023-01 (Annex X).
54. The Co-Lead of SWG PD, Ms. Lindstedt, presented a proposal to establish a CMM on Minimum Standards for Port State Measures (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP08). She explained that a joint proposal by Canada, EU, and Korea to establish such a measure was discussed at COM09 and that the Commission had tasked the SWG PD to develop the proposal further. Some sections remained in square brackets because consensus had not yet been reached or because they depended on a decision about the technological solution that NPFC will use for collecting and managing the data requirements under this measure.
55. Regarding the scope and application of the measure, one Member expressed its strong preference for allowing carrier vessels with a regional observer on board for the full trip to be exempt from port inspections, pointing out the extra burden of requiring both 100% regional observer coverage and port inspections for those vessels, and the duplicative nature of the activities of the regional observers and the port inspections. Several Members disagreed with exempting such vessels from port inspections, pointing out such exemption is not in line with PSMA and the importance of the cross-verification mechanism provided by having both the transshipment observer program and port inspections, and the different and complementary functions served by each.
56. The TCC discussed the potential technological solutions for collecting and managing the data required under the proposed measure. Most Members expressed that an electronic Port State

Measures (e-PSM) system adapted from, for example, the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) or the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), for the NPFC would be the preferred option. Several Members were of the view that all Members should use the same technological solution and should use an e-PSM adapted to the NPFC. One Member stated that it could accept other Members using the e-PSM but that it intends to use the Global Information Exchange System (GIES), that it is using GIES for other RFMOs, and that being required to use the e-PSM as well would be highly burdensome. The TCC noted that if some Members were to use one solution and other Members were to use another solution, it would be important to ensure that data could be transmitted bidirectionally between the two solutions. The Secretariat indicated that this would be complicated but could be feasible.

57. The TCC reviewed and revised the proposal (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP08 Rev.2). The TCC noted that a number of substantive issues remained unresolved despite productive discussions. **Recommendation:** That the Commission further consider the proposal for the establishment of a CMM on Minimum Standards for Port State Measures (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP08 Rev.2), taking into account the discussions at TCC.
58. TCC agreed that paragraph 23(g), which requires each Member and CNCP to “ensure that inspections are carried out thoroughly and in an expeditious manner, carried out in accordance with international law, and, to the extent possible, conducted within 72 hours of port entry, but not later than 5 working days,” will be interpreted to mean that the time of port entry triggering the timeframe for conducting a port inspection is the time at which the vessel has berthed in port and is physically available for inspection. **Recommendation:** That the Commission endorse the TCC’s interpretation of paragraph 23(g) when considering the proposal to establish a CMM on Minimum Standards for Port State Measures.

Agenda Item 6. IUU Vessel List

6a. Recommendation for Provisional IUU Vessel List to the Commission

59. The Compliance Manager presented the draft IUU Vessel List (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP01). The draft list contained five vessels nominated for inclusion on the Provisional IUU Vessel List, two nominated by Japan and three nominated by Canada.
60. Japan presented information on vessel No. 1, a Chinese vessel it nominated. The Japanese inspection vessel observed that the fishing vessel discarded what appeared to be incinerator ashes and plastic bags. Following bilateral communication with China, China sanctioned the vessel owner. Japan was therefore satisfied that China had taken effective action in response to the violation.

61. China added that it also imposed a fine on the vessel captain.
62. The TCC noted that China has taken effective measures by imposing sanctions of adequate severity on the vessel owner and vessel captain and agreed not to include vessel No. 1 on the Provisional IUU Vessel List.
63. Japan presented information on vessel No. 5, a Chinese vessel it nominated. Japan explained that the vessel recorded the mixture of Japanese sardine and chub mackerel under 40 grams as Japanese sardine in the logbook and transshipment records. The captain explained that even for a mixture that consists of mackerel (90%) and sardine (10%), he has recorded such a mixture as sardine. Japan considered this a case of serious misreporting as the vast majority of the mixture consisted of chub mackerel but was recorded as simply Japanese sardine. Furthermore, when the Japanese inspectors asked the captain to communicate with the fishing company and asked for the total catch amount of chub mackerel caught by the fishing vessel as of that date, the total amount reported did not include chub mackerel in the mixed fish bags. Since the total number of the mixed fish bags onboard was approximately 450, inspectors considered this as serious misreporting of the chub mackerel catch, which is subject to catch limit control. Japan expressed concern that there may be widespread underreporting of chub mackerel by Chinese fishing vessels.
64. China explained that its vessels can use either paper logbooks or e-logbooks, but their formats are slightly different. This is because China created a large volume of paper logbooks in 2024, prior to the establishment of an NPFC catch limit for chub mackerel. Part of the issue is also that there is no standard NPFC logbook. China's paper logbook does not include a column for recording mixed catches of chub mackerel and Japanese sardine, whereas the e-logbook does. In the e-logbook, vessels can record catches of a mixture of Japanese sardine and chub mackerel, and there is an additional column for recording the ratio of Japanese sardine to chub mackerel. In the paper logbook, the Chinese authorities have instructed vessels to record mixed catches of Japanese sardine and chub mackerel as Japanese sardine, regardless of which species constituted the majority of the catch, and to record the ratio of chub mackerel species in the "notes/remarks" column to synchronize the recording practice and avoid potential input error. The vessel in question reported the mixed catch of Japanese sardine and chub mackerel correctly in both logbook formats, so there was no misreporting of the catch. Chinese domestic regulations also require third-party verification of the catch harvested by purse seiners catching chub mackerel through the random sampling of 50 kg of each haul and determination of species composition and catch ratios, and this was done for the vessel. China did, however, find issues with the non-standardization of the vessel's fishing logbook and transshipment records and fined the vessel owner for it.

65. China and Japan informed the TCC that they had held constructive bilateral consultations regarding vessel No. 5. They explained that they had clarified some of the facts in the case, identified some remaining problems, and noted the need for further discussions on how to prevent similar events occurring again in future. They informed the TCC that they planned to discuss this matter further at the Commission, including ways in which the implementation of the relevant measures could be improved.
66. The TCC agreed to include vessel No. 5 on the Provisional IUU Vessel List.
67. Canada presented information on vessel No. 2, a Russian vessel it nominated. Aerial surveillance indicated that the vessel's top or horizontal IRCS identifier was absent, that the side IRCS was believed to be too small to meet the size requirements, and that there were three alphanumeric identifiers instead of two.
68. Russia explained that it has sanctioned the vessel owner and the vessel has corrected its markings. It further explained that if a Russian vessel is undergoing repairs and does not include information that it will operate in the Convention Area, the vessel will be painted in a different way that is compliant with domestic legislation but not NPFC regulations. Russia also informed the TCC that it has issued instructions to the authorities that issue fishing permits to check vessels' markings before any fishing activity in the Convention Area.
69. The TCC noted that the vessel has corrected its vessel markings and that Russia has taken effective measures by imposing sanctions of adequate severity on the vessel owner and issuing instructions to prevent recurrence of such issues. The TCC agreed not to include vessel No. 2 on the Provisional IUU Vessel List.
70. Canada presented information on vessel No. 3, a Russian vessel it nominated. A HSBI event found several violations. These included catch of salmon on board, shark bycatch that was not recorded, a VMS transmitter that was not tamper-proof, and significant quantities of NPFC products that could not be inspected or identified by species because they had been rendered down into oil and fish meal. A review of catch records showed no bycatch was recorded and the weight of products was not that of the whole catch but the reduced liquefied weight. Canada was concerned that bycatch was not being correctly recorded and that catch documentation does not accurately reflect the catch weight of NPFC resources that are extracted from the Convention Area. Canada noted that the flag State did not respond to Canada's initial report but did submit a response to some of Canada's concerns once the vessel was added to the draft IUU vessel list.
71. Russia explained that it has thoroughly investigated all the alleged violations presented by

Canada. Regarding the Canadian inspectors' indication that bycatch records were absent from the logbooks, Russia explained that it has recently introduced e-logbooks and it is continually revising and enhancing these e-logbooks through the issuance of new versions. At the time the vessel was inspected in June 2025, it had been at sea since December 2024 and had therefore not been set up with a sufficiently enhanced e-logbook. Consequently, the vessel master could not provide e-logbook records of catch and bycatch. Nevertheless, all information on the catch was reported in daily paper logbooks, which are collected and analyzed by Russia's fisheries monitoring center. The translation of those logbooks has been provided to Canada and NPFC. The vessel has now also been set up with an e-logbook system that enables proper reporting of bycatch. Based on its investigation, which included close scrutiny of the vessel master, Russia believed that his failure to convey all the bycatch information to the Canadian inspectors was due to his lack of experience undergoing such an HSBI in the Convention Area. Following this incident, a meeting with the heads of the fishing companies operating in the Convention Area was held. Methodical regulations were also circulated to vessels about the correct recording of bycatch.

72. Regarding the alleged violation related to the VMS mobile transmitting unit (MTU), Russia explained that the switching off of MTUs is strictly prohibited and punishable under domestic law. It is considered one of the most serious fisheries violations and can result in the liquidation of the vessel owner's business. Russia investigated the alleged violation thoroughly and concluded that the MTU was fully compliant with the standards under Russian legislation. The investigation showed that all seals were intact and found no evidence that the MTU had been tampered with. The transmission of data was also uninterrupted. VMS data transmissions are constantly monitored and if there are any interruptions of data transmission, notification is immediately made to the monitoring authorities and this information is further transmitted to the Russian fishing ministry and coast guard authorities. Russia also pointed out that CMM 2024-12 does not contain detailed criteria for determining whether an MTU is tamper-proof.
73. Regarding the presence of salmon on board the vessel, Russia explained that based on its investigation, it found that some of these were salmon that the vessel crew had previously purchased at port for crew consumption. However, Russia also found that some pink salmon were caught in the Russian EEZ, these fell out of the net onboard, and some were taken by a crew member for personal use, in violation of the vessel rules and Russian legislation. The master of vessel, at the time of investigation, was unaware that that had occurred and naturally assumed these salmon were part of the supply purchased for crew consumption at port. The vessel owner was fined the maximum amount allowable under Russian legislation for this kind of violation. Further disciplinary measures were imposed on the vessel owner and the crew. Specifically, they have been required to culture salmon juveniles with a scientific facility for

release into the wild.

74. Regarding the onboard processing of fish oil and fish meal, Russia clarified that the vessel specializes in production of such products from sardine. Russia explained there are rigorous domestic restrictions on the content of fish oil and that it could not reasonably be assumed that other species had been added to the mix. As for the fish meal, if there were any suspicion that other species had been mixed in, Russia would conduct a rigorous investigation, including genetic research, but this was not considered necessary in this case as there was no evidence of the mixing of species in production.
75. Based on the above explanations, Russia believed that it had implemented all necessary measures, as a flag Member, to mitigate the violation and prevent future violations. Furthermore, Russia noted that neither the vessel owner nor the vessel master was involved in the violations that took place and that all fines and compensatory measures have been executed by the vessel owner. Russia emphasized that there was therefore no reason to include vessel No. 3 on the Provisional IUU Vessel List.
76. Three Members were of the view that Russia had demonstrated effective action in response to all of the alleged IUU fishing activities, while three other Members held the opposite view. The TCC noted there was a lack of clarity in CMM 2024-02 on the procedure to be taken when there is such a lack of consensus. The TCC agreed, based on its reading of CMM 2024-02 and the Convention, and past practice, to include vessel No. 3 on the Provisional IUU Vessel List, while also noting that there were differing views among Members.
Recommendation: That the Commission provide guidance on the appropriate procedure to follow when there is a lack of consensus at the TCC on whether or not to include a vessel on the Provisional IUU Vessel List.
77. Canada presented information on vessel No. 4, a Russian vessel it nominated. Aerial surveillance identified a significant number of sharks onboard the vessel and verification of the 2025 annual report confirmed that the vessel failed to record this bycatch. Canada noted that in bilateral communication with Russia, Russia indicated that the sharks had been caught outside the Convention Area and towed into it. However, Canada's analysis of the vessel's AIS tracks and speed did not support that analysis.
78. Russia pointed out that the alleged incident occurred in 2024 and that it is clear, under paragraphs 5 and 6 of CMM 2024-02 To Establish A List Of Vessels Presumed To Have Carried Out Illegal, Unreported And Unregulated Fishing Activities In The Convention Area Of The North Pacific Fisheries Commission that only activities during the years from the previous meeting to the current year can be considered for listings on the NPFC IUU Vessel

List. Russia stated that the alleged incident falls outside the scope of the CMM. Nevertheless, Russia conducted a thorough investigation, including analysis of trawl movements, and found no fishing activity in the Convention Area. Russia indicated that based on the vessel's tracks and catch reports, the sharks had been caught outside the Convention Area in the Russian exclusive economic zone (EEZ) and towed into it. Furthermore, domestic regulation requires vessels to remove any gear from the water before entering the Convention Area and no fishing is allowed to be conducted when a vessel crosses from the Russian EEZ into the Convention Area. Russia therefore concluded that the sharks were caught in the Russian EEZ.

79. Several Members agreed with Russia that the activities in question fall outside the scope of CMM 2024-02 and that the vessel should not have been included on the draft IUU vessel list to begin with, although some of these Members understood the concerns raised by Canada.
80. Canada and the USA disagreed with these Members' interpretation of the scope of CMM 2024-02. They believed that paragraphs 5 and 6 are ambiguously phrased and that the intent of these paragraphs was not to exclude consideration of activities from before the period between one meeting and the next. Canada and the USA also pointed out that Canada had practical reasons for not immediately nominating the vessel and that the other Members' interpretation of the scope of CMM 2024-02 would create considerable practical issues going forward, including for example, difficulty nominating a vessel for the draft IUU vessel list for activities that occur shortly before a TCC meeting. They pointed out that if other Members insist on their current interpretation of CMM 2024-02, it would be essential to adopt a new measure that is clearer and provides a longer historical timeframe for considering potential IUU fishing activities.
81. Although Members did not have consensus interpretation of paragraphs 5 and 6 of CMM 2024-02, the TCC was satisfied with the effectiveness of the actions taken by Russia based on bilateral consultation between Canada and Russia in the margins and discussion in TCC. Therefore, the TCC agreed not to include vessel No. 4 on the Provisional IUU Vessel List.
82. **Recommendation:** That the Commission consider the Provisional NPFC IUU Vessel List (Annex X), while noting that there was a lack of consensus on the inclusion of one of the two vessels on the Provisional NPFC IUU Vessel List.

6b. Recommendations for amendments to current NPFC IUU Vessel List to Commission

83. The Compliance Manager presented information concerning seven fishing vessels (Nos. 17–23) on the current NPFC IUU Vessel List (NPFC-2026-TCC09-IP08). These vessels had been added to the NPFC IUU Vessel List as unidentified IUU fishing vessels that had assumed the identities of legitimate vessels (LU RONG YU Nos. 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 108, and 109).

In 2025, the EU had noticed that the listings for these vessels contained a mix of photographs of both the legitimate and illegitimate vessels. Subsequently, the EU had requested the Secretariat to seek clarification from China on these vessels and China had provided the additional documentation. Based on this, the TCC was requested to consider whether to amend the current NPFC List by removing the photographs of the legitimate, authorized Chinese vessels from the listings of those illegitimate vessels.

84. In response to questions for clarification, China provided additional explanations. China explained that it compared photos of the legitimate vessels in shipyards against the photos of the legitimate vessels and IUU vessels on the current NPFC IUU Vessel List to confirm which photos on the list were of the legitimate vessels. China also explained that the legitimate vessels have since changed their names, IMO certificates and International Radio Call Signs. In response to a request from one Member, China agreed to clarify the new MMSI numbers of the legitimate vessels.
85. The TCC agreed that there were photos of legitimate vessels mixed in with the photos of IUU vessels that had impersonated these vessels on the current NPFC IUU Vessel List and that the photos of the legitimate vessels should be removed.

Recommendation: That the Commission amend the current NPFC IUU Vessel List by removing the photographs of the legitimate, authorized Chinese vessels (LU RONG YU Nos. 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 108 and 109) and task the Secretariat to amend any incorrect text descriptions on the current NPFC IUU Vessel List that were based on the photographs of the legitimate, authorized Chinese vessels.

Agenda Item 7. Compliance Monitoring Scheme

7a. Response to Chair's Letter on 2025 CMS

86. The TCC Chair introduced a Letter of Concern by the Commission Chair, Mr. Shingo Ota (Japan), to China, which was assessed as “non-compliant” at TCC08 (NPFC-2026-TCC09-IP09). The Letter of Concern was sent in accordance with paragraph 24 of CMM 2025-13 For the Compliance Monitoring Scheme and invited China to present to TCC09/COM10 an explanation of what measures it currently has in place to ensure that incidents such as those for which it was found “non-compliant” will not be repeated.
87. China explained the case of the *WanTong*, while emphasizing the unusual nature of the case. The vessel was flagged to Panama and Panama sanctioned the vessel for IUU fishing activities. It then de-listed the vessel and nominated it for inclusion on the NPFC IUU Vessel List. A new owner purchased the vessel and it was flagged to Comoros. However, Comoros did not wish to seek to get the vessel delisted from the NPFC IUU Vessel List. Ultimately, China engaged in negotiations with the vessel owner on settlement for scrapping and the vessel was

scrapped at the end of 2024 in Bangladesh. China acknowledged that it had been non-compliant because it did not fulfil its obligation to deter the vessel from entering Chinese ports nor deter Chinese vessels from conducting transshipments with the vessel. China explained that it has in place regulations to ensure that vessels on the IUU vessel lists of RFMOs for which China is a member are not allowed in Chinese ports and are not allowed to conduct transshipments with Chinese flagged vessels. China also expressed its commitment to ensure that such a situation does not occur again.

88. China submitted a letter in response to the Commission Chair's letter of concern during the meeting, while explaining that it had been unclear what, if any response, was required to the Chair's letter. China also provided English translations of its relevant domestic regulation.

89. The TCC noted that there was a lack of clarity around the process, purpose, and expected response for Letters of Concern under CMM 2025-13 For the Compliance Monitoring Scheme and that it would be beneficial to have a clearer and more established process.

Recommendation: That the Commission endorse a process for the sending of Letters of Concern whereby Members are notified when a Letter of Concern is sent, the Letter states the expectation that the Member receiving the Letter is to provide a written response with the actions taken by the Member, and the Letter specifies a timeline for the Member's written response and actions.

90. China believed it would be important for this process to eventually be reflected in CMM 2025-13 so as to establish the requirement to provide a response to the Letter of Concern as a legal obligation that can be assessed as part of the CMS process.

7b. Draft Compliance Monitoring Reports for 2025 -presentation by Secretariat

91. The Compliance Manager presented the Draft Compliance Report, which contained data retrieved from various sources on compliance with the 85 obligations listed in Annex II of the Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMM 2025-13). The sources included the implementation reports submitted by Members, annual reports, HSBI reports including aerial surveillance, and reviews of VMS and transshipment data.

92. The TCC reviewed each area of potential non-compliance highlighted by the Secretariat.

93. In its review of the Draft Compliance Report, the TCC noted that it was unable to assess any obligations related to historical existing levels as the NPFC has yet to agree on a method of identifying historical existing levels.

94. Regarding China's vessel marking issue (CMM 2024-01, paragraph 5), China believed that

the vessel fully complied with the obligation as the measurement conducted immediately after the HSBI activity confirmed that the markings do meet the 1 m requirement. Japan explained that its inspectors' measurements found the markings were smaller than 1 m, but the difference was marginal and Japan did not consider this to be a serious issue. Based on the information provided by China and Japan, the TCC determined this case to be "Compliant."

95. Regarding Russia's vessel marking issue, Russia noted that this case related to vessel No. 2 on the draft IUU vessel list, which was considered under agenda item 6. Russia reiterated that it has sanctioned the vessel owner, the vessel has corrected its markings, and that the issue occurred due to technical reasons relating to differences in Russian domestic legislation and NPFC regulations. Some Members pointed out that an assessment of a Member's compliance with an obligation under a NPFC CMM should be based not only on actions taken by the Member in response to a violation, but also how the Member is implementing the obligation through its domestic regulations. In response to the request from the TCC, Russia presented further information on its relevant domestic regulations. Based on the information provided by Russia, the TCC determined this case to be "Compliant."
96. Regarding Chinese Taipei's vessel marking issues (CMM 2024-01, paragraph 5), two vessels were identified through HSBI events. Chinese Taipei explained that the cases had been investigated and adequately resolved as the vessels were sanctioned with fines in accordance with its domestic law, including the Distant Water Fisheries Act. Based on the information provided by Chinese Taipei, the TCC determined this case to be "Compliant."
97. Regarding Vanuatu's vessel marking issue (CMM 2024-01, paragraph 5), Vanuatu provided a verbal explanation that upon receiving report of the issue from Japan, it conducted its own investigation and instructed the vessel owners to rectify the matter. Vanuatu explained that the vessel owners have rectified the issue and presented a photo of the updated markings. The TCC noted the explanation provided by Vanuatu but also noted that Vanuatu had not provided any written response to the Secretariat when it was notified of the potential non-compliance nor any subsequent written explanation about its response as a flag Member. Therefore, the TCC determined this case to be "Non-Compliant."
98. Regarding China's potential transshipment reporting non-compliance issue (CMM 2025-03, paragraph 9), the TCC noted that this case related to vessel No. 5 on the draft IUU vessel list, which was discussed under agenda item 6. The TCC noted the explanations provided by Japan, the nominating Member, and China, the flag Member, under agenda item 6. Given that the TCC agreed to include the vessel on the Provisional IUU Vessel List, the TCC determined this case to be "Non-Compliant."

99. Regarding Russia's potential non-compliance issue related to transshipment observer obligations (CMM 2025-03, paragraphs 26, 29, 31, 34), Russia explained that in its view, the obligations related to the deployment of observers under CMM 2025-03 are only applicable to transshipments in the Convention Area. Russia further explained that it does not conduct any transshipments in the Convention Area, that it only conducts transshipments in its own EEZ, and that all such transshipments are subject to inspection by Russian domestic inspectors. Russia also pointed out that its inspectors conduct inspections that are of a stricter standard than the monitoring and reporting requirements of observers. Some Members disagreed with Russia's interpretation of the CMM and believed that the obligations applied to all transshipments of NPFC resources, regardless of if they take place in the Convention Area or in a Member's EEZ. Other Members considered there to be ambiguities in the applicability of paragraphs 26, 29, 31, and 34 of CMM 2025-03 and did not think they clearly applied to transshipments in Members' EEZs. Some Members also pointed out that having inspectors inspect all transshipment activities was not equivalent to ensuring onboard observers for all carrier vessels and that inspectors may not necessarily conduct the same duties as observers. Consensus could not be reached on Russia's compliance status on paragraphs 26, 29, and 31, of CMM 2025-03, with different Members suggesting statuses of "Compliant," "Non-Compliant," or "Unable to be Assessed at this time." Regarding paragraph 34 of CMM 2025-03, the TCC noted ambiguity in the drafting of the paragraph as it states, "An observer shall," which could be interpreted as meaning that the obligation is placed on the observer, rather than the Member or CNCP. The TCC therefore agreed on a compliance status of "Unable to be Assessed at this time."
100. Some Members reiterated their concerns about the interpretation that the observer deployment obligations under CMM 2025-03 apply also to Members' EEZs. They also emphasized that this would be particularly problematic when parts of CMM 2025-03 are superseded by CMM 2025-17 On Transshipment Observer Program, as the deployment of regional observers in Members' EEZs and ports would be legally challenging. Other Members expressed serious concern over those Members' views, pointing out that during the extensive discussions and negotiations held to draft CMM 2025-17, it was made clear and explicit that the scope of the measure covered both the Convention Area and EEZs, including Members' ports.
101. Regarding Russia's potential non-compliance issues related to HSBI (CMM 2024-09, paragraph 31), Russia explained that it was the first year that Russia conducted HSBI and there were some technical issues at the local level in terms of inspectors' understanding of the communication and reporting requirements. As a result, Russia submitted a number of HSBI reports later than the stipulated deadline. Russia is implementing internal measures to improve inspectors' understanding of the CMM and communication and reporting requirements. Russia expressed its commitment to make improvements and strive to comply with CMM

2024-09. Based on the information provided by Russia, the TCC determined the status of this case to be “Delayed Submission.”

102. Regarding China’s potential non-compliance issues related to the reporting of catch, including incidental catch and discards, in its chub mackerel, sardine and squid fisheries (CMM 2025-07, paragraph 6 and CMM 2025-11, paragraph 6), the TCC noted that this related to incidents involving two vessels, one of which was vessel No. 5 on the draft IUU vessel list, which was discussed under agenda item 6. Regarding vessel No. 5, the TCC noted the explanations provided by Japan, the nominating Member, and China, the flag Member, under agenda item 6. Regarding the other vessel, China explained that it has imposed fines on the vessel owner and the vessel master, that it suspended the vessel from fishing for six months, and that the vessel did not leave port for 1 year as the fishing season had ended by the time the suspension period ended. The TCC was satisfied with China’s actions as the flag Member in response to this latter vessel. As for vessel No. 5, the TCC agreed to include the vessel on the Provisional IUU Vessel List, and it therefore determined this case to be “Non-Compliant.”
103. Regarding China’s potential non-compliance issues related to sharks (CMM 2023-14, paragraph 7) and anadromous fish (CMM 2024-16, paragraph 5), arising from violations by a Chinese vessel, China explained that it has sanctioned the vessel owner and the vessel master, that it suspended the vessel from fishing for six months, and that the vessel did not leave port for 1 year as the fishing season had ended by the time the suspension period ended. Based on the information provided by China, the TCC determined this case to be “Compliant.”
104. The TCC noted that several of Russia’s potential non-compliance issues related to vessel No. 3 on the draft IUU vessel list, which was discussed under agenda item 6. Specifically, these were issues related to reporting of transshipments of bycatch and unregulated species (CMM 2025-03, paragraph 9), chub mackerel (CMM 2025-07, paragraph 6), recording shark catch (CMM 2023-14, paragraph 9), and anadromous fish (CMM 2024-16, paragraphs 5 and 11). The TCC noted the explanations provided by Russia under agenda item 6. Consensus could not be reached on Russia’s compliance status for these issues. Some Members considered that Russia had taken effective action and suggested a status of “Compliant.” Other Members did not agree that they had enough information to support such a conclusion and suggested a status of “Non-Compliant.”
105. Regarding Russia’s potential non-compliance issues related to annual reporting of shark catches (CMM 2023-14, paragraph 10), Russia believed that paragraph 10 concerned the obligation of Russia to report shark catches to the Secretariat and was independent of the obligation in paragraph 9 to record shark catches. Russia explained that it had reported all relevant information that it had to Secretariat before the deadline and in accordance with the

relevant requirements and Russia therefore considered itself to be compliant with this provision. Some Members agreed with Russia's explanation and interpretation of paragraph 10. Other Members disagreed, pointing out that paragraphs 9 and 10 were interrelated, that HSBI events indicated that there were Russian vessels that could not correctly record shark bycatch, and that it was therefore also not possible for Russia to correctly report shark catches in its annual report. Consensus could not be reached on Russia's compliance status for this issue, with some Members suggesting a "Compliant" status and other Members suggesting a "Non-Compliant" status.

106. Regarding China's potential non-compliance issues related to marine pollution (CMM 2024-15, paragraph 7), the TCC noted that this related to vessel No. 1 on the draft IUU vessel list, which was discussed under agenda item 6. The TCC noted the explanations provided by Japan, the nominating Member, and China, the flag Member. The TCC agreed that China has taken effective measures in response to the violations by the vessel and determined this case to be "Compliant."
107. China expressed the view that inspector comments from the remarks section of HSBI reports should not be the basis for flagging cases of potential non-compliance.
108. The TCC thanked the Secretariat for making improvements to the Compliance Table in the CMR, including adding a column with responses from Members. The TCC requested that the Secretariat continue to improve the Compliance Table by providing more detailed descriptions of the cases of potential non-compliance, including the reasons that the Secretariat identified them as such.

7c. Develop Provisional Compliance Report- Annual determination of compliance status and potential responses for each obligation subject to assessment for each Member

109. Based on the above discussions, the TCC developed and adopted the Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report including the Executive Summary.

Recommendation: That the Commission consider the Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report adopted by the TCC, along with the attached Executive Summary.

7d. List of obligations for consideration for the Compliance Monitoring Scheme in 2026

110. As part of the development of the Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report and the Executive Summary, the TCC recommended the addition of a number of obligations for consideration for the Compliance Monitoring Scheme in 2026. Considering that some CMMs may become effective before others, the paragraph numbers and contents may change following decisions at the Commission meeting. The TCC agreed that the final review of obligations to be assessed under Annex 2 of the CMS CMM should occur at the Commission

meeting.

Recommendation: That the Commission consider the TCC's list of obligations for consideration for the Compliance Monitoring Scheme in 2026 as described in the Executive Summary of the Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report.

Agenda Item 8. Historic Existing Level

111. The TCC considered the options prepared by SWG Ops in NPFC-2026-TCC09-IP04 Rev.1.
112. The TCC noted that the historical existing level for the Northwest bottom fishery is already set out in CMM 2025-05 as the level agreed in February 2007, and therefore focused its discussion on the remaining species under the purview of the NPFC.
113. Several Members expressed a preference for basing the historical existing level on the maximum authorizations in the relevant timeframe, rather than the average authorizations over that timeframe, to avoid disadvantaging Members for year-to-year anomalies.
114. Some Members expressed a preference for options D or E. One Member expressed its preference for C, while stating that it could accept option D for the sake of achieving consensus. Another Member believed that 1 or 3-year timeframes were too short.
115. The TCC could not reach consensus on defining historical existing levels and noted the need for further discussions at the Commission.
Recommendation: That the Commission note that the TCC was unable to reach consensus on defining historical existing levels and hold further discussions on this matter.
116. Canada and the United States expressed disappointment that the TCC could not make progress on the hard work of SWG Ops or provide further clarity. They emphasized the importance of defining historical existing levels for compliance assessments. They also suggested that if Members could not agree on how to define historical existing levels, they may need to consider establishing other effort controls based on the best available scientific information.

Agenda Item 9. Transshipment

9a. Secretariat Report on 2025 activity

117. The Compliance Manager presented the 2025 Transshipment Overview (NPFC-2026-TCC09-IP05). The number of transshipment events of fish products from the Convention Area in 2025 increased from 2024 with 2,477 reported in 2025 and 2,082 for the previous year. The volume of fish transshipped in 2025 (383,699 MT) also showed a corresponding increase over 2024 (306,503 MT). Although the overall catch in the Convention Area was down slightly in 2025, the percentage that was transshipped increased from 57.8% in 2024 to 72.7% in 2025, and the

average amount of fish products transshipped per event increased from 147 MT in 2024 to 155 MT in 2025. In 2025, there were 389 more “Other Transfer Activities” (OTA) events (at 2,902) in the Convention Area than the previous year (2,513 in 2024). Fish transshipment and OTA events showed similar trends in both seasonal event counts and spatial distribution. There were 226 OTA events reported as Force Majeure activities in 2025. No potential non-compliance issues were reported in 100 random samples of observer reports, and with the implementation of the transshipment observer program in April, it is expected that enhanced analysis will be available for the 2026 season.

9b. TCC review of CMM 2025-3 (per paragraph 52)

118. The Chair noted that pursuant to paragraph 52 of CMM 2025-03 On Transshipments, the Commission will review the CMM regularly at the Annual Session, taking into account, *inter alia*, the latest advice from the TCC regarding the effectiveness of this measure in (i) providing the Commission with information about transshipments; and (ii) supporting effective MCS activities in line with the obligations of the Convention and CMMs.
119. **Recommendation:** That the Commission note that the TCC did not have any concerns or advice regarding the effectiveness of CMM 2025-03 On Transshipments in providing the Commission with information about transshipments and supporting effective MCS activities in line with the obligations of the Convention and CMMs.
120. The TCC held additional discussions regarding the implementation and applicability of CMM 2025-03 On Transshipments.
121. China explained that its vessels had faced difficulties with using the transshipment declaration in certain circumstances. Specifically, China explained that it has purse seiners that target both chub mackerel and Japanese sardine and they often catch a mix of both species and the two species are transshipped together in mixed bags. China noted that the transshipment declaration requires species-by-species reporting and was unsure how to record this in the case of the mixed bags, as it would be highly impractical to divide out the Japanese sardine and chub mackerel and weigh them separately. The TCC suggested that China could report the two species together using bags that have the mixed products in weight, but not in unit of number of bags, while providing the associated species codes and comments regarding the estimated proportion of each species once the online system enables such reporting. The Secretariat pointed out that it may be necessary to modify the transshipment API to enable such reporting but believed that such a modification would be feasible.
122. The TCC discussed the applicability of the provisions of CMM 2025-03 On Transshipments to Members’ EEZs. Some Members were of the view that the CMM contained ambiguities in

this regard, and considered that the reporting requirements under the CMM applied to both the Convention Area and Members' EEZs, but that the observer deployment requirements only applied to the Convention Area. Other Members were of the view that the CMM did not contain ambiguities in its scope and that all provisions applied to both the Convention Area and Members' EEZs. The TCC noted that Members had different interpretations of the applicability of some of the provisions of CMM 2025-03 On Transshipments to Members' EEZs.

Agenda Item 10. Vessel Monitoring System

10a. Secretariat report on implementation

123. The Compliance Assistant, Mr. Jumpei Hinata, presented the 2025 VMS Overview (NPFC-2026-TCC09-IP06 Rev.2). Over the past four years, the NPFC VMS has progressed into a robust and reliable tool for tracking activities in the Convention Area. Cooperation from Members has been vital in addressing both anticipated and unexpected challenges, resulting in prompt resolutions to most issues. Notably, there have been an estimated 122 cases of data interruptions exceeding 4 hours across all Members, and the use of manual reporting continually helps to bridge data gaps. These developments, coupled with refinements in vessel entry/exit detection, are expected to significantly reduce the number of data interruptions in 2026. The Secretariat will continue to enhance vessel identification procedures and strengthen data security measures. Emphasizing globally recognized identifiers, timely updates to the vessel registry, and efficient communication channels will preserve the momentum built thus far.
124. The TCC noted that in previous years, the Secretariat has included an analysis comparing the actual time and location of transshipment events compared to the time and location listed in the advance notifications of said transshipments. The TCC requested that the Secretariat continue to include such analyses in future reports.
125. The Compliance Manager explained that the Secretariat intends to continue to do such analyses going forward and that this year's analysis is still ongoing as the Secretariat had been occupied with dealing with data backlogs and preparing for the transition to fully electronic transshipment reporting.
126. The TCC considered the Secretariat's suggestion that the North Atlantic Format (NAF) be annexed to CMM 2025-12 On the VMS and that the existing NAF format be updated to make the IMO number a mandatory field. Some Members noted that IMO number is the most reliable unique vessel identifier available and is effective for MCS purposes, particularly in identifying IUU fishing vessels assuming the identities of legitimate vessels. No Members opposed the suggested changes, but some expressed the need to hold further intersessional

discussions on the mandatory reporting of IMO numbers, including practical aspects and the added burden on vessel owners.

Recommendation: That the Commission task SWG Ops to hold intersessional discussions on the potential inclusion of the North Atlantic Format (NAF) as an annex to CMM 2025-12 On The VMS and the updating of the existing NAF format to make the IMO number a mandatory field.

Agenda Item 11. High Seas Boarding and Inspection

11a. Secretariat Report

127. The Compliance Assistant presented the HSBI summary for 2025 (NPFC-2026-TCC09-IP07). In 2025, five Members deployed nine patrol vessels, inspecting almost 11% of the active fishing vessels in the Convention Area. Over the May–October period, 66 inspections were carried out, with “no violations” detected in 56 (85%) of these. Of the remaining 10 events (identifying 21 violations), one of these events identified two “serious violations” involving misreporting and obstruction. As in previous years, most of the “violations” identified related to potential vessel registry offences. However, other areas of potential non-compliance were identified, including misreporting, retaining salmon, marine pollution and obstruction. While the number of “serious violations” rose in 2025, the overall number of inspections with “no violations” identified continued a three-year upward trend.
128. The TCC noted that the Secretariat has proposed updates to the Annual Report template for 2027 to improve data collection that may include possibly requesting additional HSBI and patrol-related details. The TCC was generally supportive of the suggested updates, while recognizing the concerns expressed by one Member about sharing sensitive information, such as entry and exit dates and other detailed information about patrol activities, that could potentially compromise the effectiveness of patrols.

11b. Member Reports

129. Noting that more information on HSBI is provided in Members’ Annual Reports and the SWG Ops Annual Summary for 2025–2026, Canada and the USA presented brief reports of their HSBI activities for 2025.

Agenda Item 12. Review of Applications for CNCP Status

130. The TCC noted that no applications for CNCP status have been received.

Agenda Item 13. Climate Change

131. The TCC noted that climate change is a standing agenda item but that there have been no papers submitted to the TCC on this agenda item and discussions on it at recent meetings. The TCC noted that it was unclear what the TCC should discuss in relation to climate or whether

it should continue to be a standing agenda item. The TCC noted that it would be useful if the Secretariat could prepare a summary paper of climate change-related information of relevance to the TCC.

Recommendation: That the Commission provide further guidance on whether or not climate change should continue to be a standing agenda item for the TCC and, if so, to provide further guidance on the intended purpose of this agenda item and to task the Secretariat to prepare a paper that compiles climate change-related discussions and developments from the Commission and its subsidiary bodies, with a particular focus on compliance and technical considerations, of relevance to the TCC for discussion at TCC10.

Agenda Item 14. Cooperation with Other Organizations

132. The Executive Secretary explained that NPFC and the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) are developing a Memorandum of Understanding and that the latest draft text, which is scheduled to be discussed at COM10, will have relevance to the TCC's discussions on e-monitoring.

14a. MoU with SPRFMO

133. The Executive Secretary explained that there was no information regarding the MoU with South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO) that was relevant to the TCC.

14b. MoU with WCPFC

134. The Executive Secretary explained that there was no information regarding the MoU with Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) that was relevant to the TCC.

14c. NPFC-NPAFC Work Plan

135. The Executive Secretary explained that the NPFC and the North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission (NPAFC) have continued to cooperate closely. He highlighted the holding of two NPAFC workshops alongside its annual meeting in May, which are both related to the NPAFC and the NPFC's shared ecosystem, plans to update the work plan for the implementation of the NPFC-NPAFC Work Plan, and a recent focus on the exchange of data and information between the two organizations, including through a joint NPAFC/NPFC SharePoint.

136. The NPAFC Executive Director, Mr. Yoshikiyo Kondo, provided an update on cooperation with NPFC (NPFC-2026-TCC09-OP02 Rev.1). Many items in the five-year NPFC-NPAFC Work Plan are completed or ongoing. Key remaining items are the exchange of data and information between the two organizations through a data sharing platform and the voluntary sharing of Pacific salmon bycatch data from NPFC fishing vessels. Progress is being made and expected on these tasks. NPAFC has also updated its IUU vessel list and will discuss it

further at its annual meeting in May. When adopted, the list will be linked to from the NPFC website. One of the workshops to be held alongside the annual meeting will be on Interactions Between Fisheries and Anadromous Fish in the North Pacific High Seas and is expected to produce recommendations about cooperation between NPAFC and NPFC and the five-year Work Plan. NPAFC remains committed to continuing its close cooperation with NPFC, which is essential to the NPAFC's efforts to fulfil its purpose.

14d. IMCS Network

137. The Executive Secretary reminded the TCC that the NPFC joined the International Monitoring, Control, and Surveillance (IMCS) Network in 2023. He informed the TCC that the NPFC hosted a Tuna Compliance Network and Pan Pacific Fisheries Compliance Network (TCN/PPFCN) meeting at the NPFC office in Tokyo in June 2025. He also explained that the IMCS Network will host Global Fisheries Enforcement Workshop (GFETW) 8 in March 2027 and that it is planned for the new Compliance Manager to attend, pending approval of the Secretariat Workplan by the Commission.

Agenda Item 15. Performance Review- Recommendations relevant to TCC

138. The Executive Secretary presented an update (NPFC-2026-COM10-IP02) on the status of the Performance Review Recommendations relevant to the TCC.

139. The TCC noted the ongoing work to address the recommendations from the Performance Review Panel and the progress made in the intersessional period.

Recommendation: That the Commission task the TCC to continue to review and provide updated input on the Performance Review Panel Recommendations through the intersessional process initiated in 2025–2026.

Recommendation: That the Commission task SWG Ops to work intersessionally with the Secretariat to address the issues with the vessel registry and thereby address Performance Review Panel Recommendation 5.3.1.

Agenda Item 16. Other Matters

140. The TCC noted that one SWG Ops Co-Lead position is vacant. There were no nominations to fill the vacancy.

141. The TCC thanked the outgoing Compliance Manager and acknowledged the work that she has done for the NPFC.

Agenda Item 17. Review and Endorsement of TCC Work Plan for 2026/2027

142. The TCC reviewed the TCC/SWG Work Plan for 2026/2027 (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP10 (Rev.1)) against the progress made to date and in consideration of new items of work arising

from TCC09.

Recommendation: That the Commission revise the draft Work Plan developed by the TCC, including work completed, and consider further revisions, then task TCC and relevant SWGs with the activities in the revised Work Plan (Annex X).

Agenda Item 18. Recommendations to the Commission

143. The TCC recommended the following to the Commission:

(Agenda Item 3)

- (a) That the Commission task TCC to work intersessionally through the SWG on Planning and Development (SWG PD) to develop a paper on TCC-related components of an NPFC ROP and submit the paper to TCC10. In developing the paper, the SWG PD should review other data collection methods, including current data collection methods such as Members' domestic observer programs and port sampling programs, as well as possibilities for the use of e-monitoring.

(Agenda Item 4)

- (b) That the Commission adopt the ToR for the TCC SWGs (Annex X).

(Agenda Item 5)

- (c) That the Commission task the SWG PD to develop a proposal for a procedure for cross-listing vessels from the IUU vessel lists of other RFMOs and determining which RFMOs' IUU vessel lists should be considered.
- (d) That the Commission adopt the proposed amendments to CMM 2024-02 (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP05 Rev.2).
- (e) That the Commission further consider the proposal for the establishment of a CMM on Scientific Research Activities, taking into account the discussions at TCC (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP04).
- (f) That the Commission further consider the proposal for the establishment of a CMM On Minimum Standards for the Collection, Reporting, Verification, and Exchange of Data (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP06 Rev.3), taking into account the discussions at TCC.
- (g) That the Commission adopt the proposed amendment to CMM 2023-01 (Annex X).
- (h) That the Commission further consider the proposal for the establishment of a CMM on Minimum Standards for Port State Measures (NPFC-2026-TCC09-WP08 Rev.2), taking into account the discussions at TCC.
- (i) That the Commission endorse the TCC's interpretation of paragraph 23(g) when considering the proposal to establish a CMM on Minimum Standards for Port State Measures.

(Agenda Item 6)

- (j) That the Commission provide guidance on the appropriate procedure to follow when there is a lack of consensus at the TCC on whether or not to include a vessel on the Provisional IUU Vessel List.

- (k) That the Commission consider the Provisional NPFC IUU Vessel List (Annex X), while noting that there was a lack of consensus on the inclusion of one of the two vessels on the Provisional NPFC IUU Vessel List.
- (l) That the Commission amend the current NPFC IUU Vessel List by removing the photographs of the legitimate, authorized Chinese vessels (LU RONG YU Nos. 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 108 and 109) and task the Secretariat to amend any incorrect text descriptions on the current NPFC IUU Vessel List that were based on the photographs of the legitimate, authorized Chinese vessels.

(Agenda Item 7)

- (m) That the Commission endorse a process for the sending of Letters of Concern whereby Members are notified when a Letter of Concern is sent, the Letter states the expectation that the Member receiving the Letter is to provide a written response with the actions taken by the Member, and the Letter specifies a timeline for the Member's written response and actions.
- (n) That the Commission consider the Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report adopted by the TCC, along with the attached Executive Summary.
- (o) That the Commission consider the TCC's list of obligations for consideration for the Compliance Monitoring Scheme in 2026 as described in the Executive Summary of the Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report.

(Agenda Item 8)

- (p) That the Commission note that the TCC was unable to reach consensus on defining historical existing levels and hold further discussions on this matter.

(Agenda Item 9)

- (q) That the Commission note that the TCC did not have any concerns or advice regarding the effectiveness of CMM 2025-03 On Transshipments in providing the Commission with information about transshipments and supporting effective MCS activities in line with the obligations of the Convention and CMMs.

(Agenda Item 10)

- (r) That the Commission task SWG Ops to hold intersessional discussions on the potential inclusion of the North Atlantic Format (NAF) as an annex to CMM 2025-12 On The VMS and the updating of the existing NAF format to make the IMO number a mandatory field.

(Agenda Item 13)

- (s) That the Commission provide further guidance on whether or not climate change should continue to be a standing agenda item for the TCC and, if so, to provide further guidance on the intended purpose of this agenda item and to task the Secretariat to prepare a paper that compiles climate change-related discussions and developments from the Commission and its subsidiary bodies, with a particular focus on compliance and technical considerations, of relevance to the TCC for discussion at TCC10.

(Agenda Item 15)

- (t) That the Commission task the TCC to continue to review and provide updated input on the Performance Review Panel Recommendations through the intersessional process initiated in 2025–2026.
- (u) That the Commission task SWG Ops to work intersessionally with the Secretariat to address the issues with the vessel registry and thereby address Performance Review Panel Recommendation 5.3.1.

(Agenda Item 17)

- (v) That the Commission revise the draft Work Plan developed by the TCC, including work completed, and consider further revisions, then task TCC and relevant SWGs with the activities in the revised Work Plan (Annex X).

Agenda Item 19. Next Meeting

144. **Recommendation:** That the Commission hold the next TCC meeting in conjunction with the next Commission meeting.

Agenda Item 20. Adoption of the Report

145. The report was adopted by consensus.

Agenda Item 21. Close of the Meeting

146. The meeting closed at 21:35 on 11 April 2026, Osaka time.

LIST OF ANNEXES

Annex A – Agenda

Annex B – List of Documents

Annex C – List of Participants

Annex D –

Annex E –

Annex F –

Annex A:
Agenda