



SIOFA | APSOI

Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement
Accord relatif aux Pêches dans le Sud de l'Océan Indien

Report of the 10th Meeting of the Compliance Committee (CC) of the Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA)

Savoy Resort & Spa Seychelles, Beau Vallon, Seychelles

1–3 July 2026

Agenda item 1 – Opening of the session	5
1.1 Opening statements	5
Agenda item 2 – Administrative arrangements	5
2.1 Adoption of the agenda	5
2.2 Confirmation of meeting documents	5
2.3 Appointment of rapporteur.....	6
Agenda item 3 – SIOFA Compliance Monitoring Scheme.....	6
3.1 Consideration of the Draft SIOFA Compliance Report (dSCR) and adoption of the Provisional SIOFA Compliance Report (pSCR)	6
3.2 Review of Recommendations from the Final SIOFA Compliance Report (fSCR) adopted by the 12 th Meeting of the Parties.....	8
Agenda item 4 – New or Amended Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs).....	9
4.1 Recommendations from the Scientific Committee	9
4.2 Proposals for amendments to Conservation and Management Measures	10
4.3 Proposals for new Conservation and Management Measures	14
4.4 Discussion on the application of current CMMs	17
Agenda item 5 – Listing of IUU Vessels	17
5.1 Draft IUU Vessel List	17
5.2 Current SIOFA IUU Vessel List	17
Agenda item 6 – Monitoring, Control and Surveillance	18
6.1 Port inspection reports (CMM 08(2020) Port Inspection).....	18
6.2 Sighting of Vessels without Nationality (CMM 04(2016) Vessels without Nationality) and vessels flagged to Non-CCPs (CMM 09(2022) Control)	18
6.3 Review of Catches of Portuguese dogfish in Subarea 2 (CMM 12(2025) Sharks).....	18
6.4 Register of Authorised Vessels (CMM 07(2025) Vessel Authorisation)	19
6.5 Entry/Exit reports (CMM 10(2023) Monitoring)	19
6.6 At sea Transfer and Transshipment reports (CMM 10(2023) Monitoring)	19
Agenda item 7 – Operationalisation of the SIOFA VMS	19
7.1 Update of Workplan & Progress Toward Operationalization of the SIOFA VMS.....	19
7.2 Potential Amendments to SIOFA CMMs and the Standards, Specifications and Procedures (SSPs) for the SIOFA VMS.....	20
Agenda item 8 – Review of the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CNCs) 20	
Agenda item 9 – Implementation of Article 13 of the Agreement.....	21
Agenda item 10 – Capacity Building	21
Agenda item 11 – The SIOFA Performance Review.....	22
Agenda item 12 – Election of a Chair and Vice Chair for the Compliance Committee	22
Agenda item 13 – Any other business	23
Agenda item 14 – Adoption of the CC report	23
Agenda item 15 – Close of the meeting	23

List of Annexes

Annex A	List of registered participants
Annex B	Agenda
Annex C	List of meeting documents
Annex D	Provisional SIOFA Compliance Report
Annex E	China's proposal to amend CMM 10(2023) (Monitoring)
Annex F	Mauritius' proposal to amend CMM 11(2020) (Compliance Monitoring Scheme)
Annex G	Mauritius' proposal for an alternate method for collecting data required by paragraph 12 of CMM 02(2025) on Data Standards
Annex H	Australia's proposal to amend CMM 15(2025) (Management of Demersal Stocks)
Annex I	The EU's proposal to amend CMM 15(2025) (Management of Demersal Stocks)
Annex J	Japan's proposal to amend Annex 1 of CMM 17(2025) (New and Exploratory Fisheries)
Annex K	Mauritius' proposal to amend Annex 1 of CMM 17(2025) (New and Exploratory Fisheries)
Annex L	China's proposal for a new CMM for Fishery Independent Research Cruise in the SIOFA Area
Annex M	The Cook Islands' proposal for a new CMM for a SIOFA Allocation Framework
Annex N	The EU's Proposal for a New CMM for Research Cruise by Research Vessel in the SIOFA Area
Annex O	The EU's proposal for a new CMM for Scientific Research by Fishing Vessel in the SIOFA Area
Annex P	France (OT)'s proposal for a new CMM on promoting the objectives of SIOFA through cooperation with the BBNJ Agreement
Annex Q	Potential Amendments to SIOFA CMMs and the Standards, Specifications and Procedures (SSPs) for the SIOFA VMS
Annex R	Options to facilitate and address the capacity needs of CCP Developing States

Annex S Implementation plan for the SIOFA Performance Review Panel
recommendations

Agenda item 1 – Opening of the session

1.1 Opening statements

1. The Compliance Committee (CC) Chairperson, Mrs Meera Koonjul (Mauritius), opened the meeting at 09:00 am. The meeting was held at the Savoy Resort & Spa Seychelles, Beau Vallon, Seychelles.
2. The Chairperson welcomed all delegates and thanked them for their attendance. She congratulated Seychelles on 50 years of independence and thanked the government and authorities of Seychelles for their hospitality and for hosting the meeting. The Chairperson also expressed her gratitude to delegations for their contributions and dedication to the work of the CC and her thanks to the Secretariat for its hard work preparing for the meeting. The Chairperson also highlighted the full agenda, noting that it reflected the growing maturity of the CC and the scale of its work, and looked forward to productive discussions.
3. Seychelles welcomed all participants to CC10 and to Seychelles and expressed its wish for fruitful discussions and a pleasant meeting.
4. The Executive Secretary, Mr Thierry Clot, welcomed the participants on behalf of the Secretariat. He expressed his deep gratitude to the government and authorities of Seychelles and his congratulations on the 50th anniversary of Seychelles' independence. The Executive Secretary stated that the Secretariat has worked hard to ensure all documents and logistical arrangements are in order for the meeting and that the Secretariat looks forward to supporting the CC in its work.
5. The Chairperson opened the floor for delegation introductions. The list of participants is available in **Annex A**.
6. The Chairperson noted that Korea could not attend the meeting in person and was observing the discussions online.
7. The Chairperson welcomed the Observers attending the meeting in person and online. Comoros attended in person and India participated remotely as Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CNCs). The Joint Commission of the Seychelles-Mauritius Joint Management Area (JMA), Pew Charitable Trusts (Pew) and the Southern Indian Ocean Deepsea Fishers Association (SIODFA) attended in person. The Deep Sea Conservation Coalition (DSCC), the Environmental Justice Foundation (EJF), the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC), the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO), and the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC) attended remotely.

Agenda item 2 – Administrative arrangements

2.1 Adoption of the agenda

8. The CC reviewed the provisional agenda (CC-10-ADM-03).
9. The CC adopted the agenda (**Annex B**).

2.2 Confirmation of meeting documents

10. The Compliance Officer, Mr Johnny Louys, explained that one paper, CC-10-32, a proposal from France (Overseas Territories (OT)) for a new CMM related to the Agreement under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ Agreement), had been submitted late.
11. France (OT) explained that the proposal had been submitted late due to internal consultations and that it was based on a proposal that was also discussed and adopted at

the annual session of the IOTC, which took place a short time before CC10.

12. Chinese Taipei did not object to accepting the paper but cautioned against deviating from SIOFA's Rules of Procedure and setting a precedent for accepting the late submission of meeting documents.
13. The CC agreed to accept paper CC-10-32, despite its late submission, noting that it relates to the important matter of the BBNJ Agreement.
14. China requested that information paper CC-10-INFO-02 not be included or considered in any discussions at CC10 or MoP13 as the paper concerned alleged activities by light-seining vessels flagged to China that are operating in the northwest Indian Ocean, outside the area of jurisdiction and regulatory scope of the Agreement.
15. The European Union (EU) acknowledged that the alleged activities took place outside the SIOFA Agreement area. However, the EU noted that the alleged activities target squid, that there is no evidence indicating that such squid are not part of the same stock as the squid in the SIOFA Agreement area, and that this matter is therefore of interest to SIOFA. The EU also noted that, at China's suggestion, SIOFA has previously discussed the potential extension of the SIOFA Area to cover the northwest Indian Ocean and squid fisheries. The EU informed the CC that this matter was also raised at the IOTC, where China offered to investigate the matter and share the results of its investigation with the IOTC. The EU stated that it could accept China's request to not discuss CC-10-INFO-02 at SIOFA, provided China would share the results of its investigation of the matter with SIOFA as well.
16. China emphasised that it is essential to respect the SIOFA Agreement and its Rules of Procedure, and confine discussions to matters within SIOFA's mandate. Accordingly, China is not mandated to engage in reporting to SIOFA on any investigation relating to matters outside its area of competence. China attaches great importance to the conservation, management and long-term sustainable use of fishery resources, and strictly requires its distant-water fishing fleet to comply with the CMMs adopted by the relevant regional fisheries management organisations (RFMOs). Should there be any relevant investigation findings, the Chinese government will share such information through the appropriate channels.
17. The EU reiterated that this is a matter of interest to SIOFA as the squid targeted in the alleged activities may be part of a straddling stock with the squid in the SIOFA Area, as was noted by the SC11 (paragraph 299, SC11 Report). The EU therefore considered SIOFA to be one of the appropriate channels for reporting the findings of the Chinese government's investigation.
18. The CC agreed that it would not discuss CC-10-INFO-02.
19. The list of meeting documents is presented in CC-10-ADM-04-Rev1 (**Annex C**).

2.3 Appointment of rapporteur

20. The CC agreed to appoint Mr Alexander Meyer (Urban Connections, Tokyo) as rapporteur.

Agenda item 3 – SIOFA Compliance Monitoring Scheme

3.1 Consideration of the Draft SIOFA Compliance Report (dSCR) and adoption of the Provisional SIOFA Compliance Report (pSCR)

21. The Compliance Officer presented the draft SIOFA Compliance Report (dSCR) outlined in CC-10-01. He explained that two CCPs submitted their CCP Compliance Reports (CCRs) after the established deadline of 7 May 2026 and that two CCPs did not provide comments on their respective sections of the dSCR. He noted that although commenting on the draft report is voluntary, such input is an important part of the review process, as

it enables the Secretariat to consider additional information, clarifications, and corrections prior to finalising the dSCR.

22. The CC reviewed the dSCR and assigned the compliance status and relevant follow-up actions in accordance with the provisions of Conservation and Management Measure (CMM) 11(2020) (Compliance Monitoring Scheme) as described in CC-10-01.
23. During its review, the CC held substantive discussions on a number of matters as described below.
24. Regarding the status of the Cook Islands' compliance with paragraph 15 of CMM 02(2025) and CMM 02(2023) (Data Standards), the Cook Islands accepted the proposed compliance status and the CC agreed to apply a status of "non-compliant".
25. Regarding the status of the Cook Islands' compliance with paragraph 12 of CMM 11(2020) (Compliance Monitoring Scheme), the Cook Islands accepted the proposed compliance status and the CC agreed to apply a status of "non-compliant".
26. Regarding the status of the Cook Islands' compliance with paragraphs 3, 4, 6, 8, and 9 of CMM 18(2025) (Benthic Fishery Closures), the Cook Islands provided additional information explaining that it ensures that these obligations are implemented through its specific and targeted high-seas authorisation conditions. The CC agreed to apply statuses of "compliant".
27. Regarding the status of the EU's compliance with paragraph 8 of CMM 18(2025) (Benthic Fishery Closures), the EU accepted the proposed compliance status and confirmed that the vessel did not report prior to entering and exiting a BFC from the entry into force of the CMM in 2025. The EU explained that the vessel transmits its position every hour, it can be followed and monitored, it had low levels of catches in Magneto, Coral, and Walter Shoal in October–December 2025, and that this reporting issue has been solved, with the first report in 2026 already sent to the SIOFA Secretariat. The CC agreed to apply a status of "non-compliant".
28. Regarding the status of France OT's compliance with paragraph 8 of CMM 18(2025) (Benthic Fishery Closures), France OT accepted the proposed compliance status and explained that it was late in implementing this obligation and has since issued a reminder to all of its vessels operating in the applicable areas. The CC agreed to apply a status of "non-compliant".
29. Regarding the status of Japan's compliance with paragraph 9 of CMM 02(2025) and CMM 02(2023) (Data Standards), Japan accepted the proposed compliance status and the CC agreed to apply a status of "non-compliant".
30. Regarding the status of Mauritius' compliance with paragraph 10 of CMM 10(2023) (Monitoring), Mauritius provided additional information demonstrating that it is implementing the obligations of this paragraph through its domestic regulations. The CC agreed to apply a status of "compliant".
31. Regarding the status of Seychelles' compliance with paragraphs 6 and 7 of CMM 02(2025) and CMM 02(2023) (Data Standards), Seychelles accepted the proposed compliance statuses and provided some additional explanation. Seychelles explained that its two industrial longline vessels only started operating in the SIOFA Area in 2024 and that Seychelles is still adapting to the different data reporting protocols and requirements under SIOFA. Seychelles suggested that the current SIOFA data standards require highly detailed, set-by-set information, which is appropriate for bottom longlines, but not necessarily for pelagic longline operations. Nevertheless, Seychelles is working to adapt its logbooks to the SIOFA data standards. The CC agreed to apply statuses of "non-compliant".

32. Regarding the status of Seychelles' compliance with paragraphs 12, 14, 15, 19 of CMM 02(2025) and CMM 02(2023) (Data Standards), and paragraph 11 of CMM 09(2022) (Control), Seychelles accepted the proposed compliance statuses and provided some additional explanation. Seychelles explained that it has difficulty deploying human observers on its two industrial longline vessels and is working with industry to implement an electronic monitoring system (EMS), hopefully by early 2027. The CC agreed to apply a status of "non-compliant" for Seychelles' compliance with paragraph 14 of CMM 02(2025) and CMM 02(2023) and "critically non-compliant" for its compliance with paragraphs 12, 15, and 19 of CMM 02(2025) and CMM 02(2023) and paragraph 11 of CMM 09(2022).
33. Japan requested Seychelles to submit the details of its EMS plans to the SC for the SC's evaluation and advice.
34. France (OT) pointed out that CMM 02(2025) may need to be amended to enable the use of EMS for fulfilling observer obligations and believed that the CMM, as currently written, could be read as requiring these obligations to be fulfilled specifically by human observers.
35. Regarding the status of Seychelles' compliance with paragraph 10 of CMM 10(2023) (Monitoring), Seychelles provided additional information demonstrating that it is implementing the obligations of this paragraph through its domestic regulations. The CC agreed to apply a status of "compliant".
36. Regarding the status of Comoros' compliance with paragraphs 21, 23, 28, 30 and 32 of CMM 10(2023) (Monitoring), Comoros accepted the proposed compliance statuses and informed the CC that it will take necessary measures to amend its domestic regulations and ensure that they are aligned with the obligations under the SIOFA CMMs. The CC agreed to assign statuses of "critically non-compliant".
37. The Chairperson encouraged Comoros to seek assistance from the Secretariat as necessary for ensuring alignment between its domestic regulations and the SIOFA CMMs.
38. Regarding the status of India's compliance with paragraph 12 of CMM 11(2020) (Compliance Monitoring Scheme), India accepted the proposed compliance status and explained that the delay of one day in submitting its report was due to administrative reasons. The CC agreed to assign a status of "non-compliant".
39. France (OT) pointed out that for some items, CCPs were unsure whether to assign a compliance status or indicate that a provision is "not applicable". France (OT) suggested that the CCR template could be reviewed and the wording for some items could be revised and clarified in order to avoid such uncertainty and ambiguity.
40. **The CC adopted the provisional SIOFA Compliance Report (pSCR) outlined in CC-10-18 (Annex D) and agreed to forward it to the Meeting of the Parties (MoP) for its consideration.**

3.2 Review of Recommendations from the Final SIOFA Compliance Report (fSCR) adopted by the 12th Meeting of the Parties

41. The Compliance Officer explained that pursuant to paragraph 5 of CMM 11(2020) (Compliance Monitoring Scheme) the CC and the MoP are required to review any other recommendations made by the MoP in the previous years' Final Compliance Reports. The Compliance Officer presented CC-10-09, which provided a review of recommendations of MoP12 on the Final SIOFA Compliance Report (fSCR).
42. The CC reviewed and updated the status of the implementation of the recommendations from MoP12, as described in CC-10-09.
43. **The CC recommended that the MoP note the status of the implementation of the recommendations from MoP12 outlined in CC-10-09.**

44. The CC suggested that under “Status of Implementation”, when a CCP has provided feedback, a summary of the details of the feedback received from the CCP should be provided. The CC tasked the Secretariat to include this information when preparing future versions of this paper.

Agenda item 4 – New or Amended Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs)

4.1 Recommendations from the Scientific Committee

45. The SC Vice Chairperson, Dr Zhou Fang (China), presented a summary of the SC11 report and the recommendations from SC11 that were relevant to the CC (CC-10-05-Rev1).
46. The CC discussed paragraph 75 of the SC11 report regarding the SC’s request for clarification on the scope of the application of paragraph 6 of CMM 18(2025) and whether paragraph 6 of CMM 18(2025) (BFCs) regarding the reporting requirements for vessels engaging in fishing within a BFC applied to all fisheries or only bottom fisheries. The EU expressed the view that, as paragraph 2 of the CMM states it applies to all bottom fishing vessels, paragraph 6 also applies only to bottom fishing vessels. Several other CCPs were of the view that paragraph 6 was intended specifically to capture all other vessels that are not bottom fishing vessels so as to ensure that any such vessels fishing in the vicinity of a BFC are monitored and taken into account in the BFC evaluation process, as some of the BFCs include features that are important not only to benthic species but to the broader ecosystem.
47. **The CC noted that there are some potential ambiguities in the current wording of CMM 18(2025) (BFCs) and recommended that the MoP discuss the scope of the application of paragraph 6 further at MoP13.**
48. The CC noted that a number of SC recommendations concerned proposals for amended or new CMMs and discussed these under agenda items 4.2 and 4.3, respectively.
49. The CC noted paragraph 209 of the SC11 report and the SC’s definition and description of benthopelagic trawls. **The CC noted that introducing a new definition for benthopelagic trawls may have ramifications for CCPs interpreting the applicability of CMMs and recommended that the MoP provide clarity as to which CMMs apply to benthopelagic trawls, should it adopt this new definition.**
50. The CC tasked the Secretariat to prepare a document assessing the implications of this potential new definition on existing CMMs and provide it for further consideration by the CC and MoP.
51. Japan commented on paragraphs 213 and 216 and the SC’s recommendations that the MoP reclassify any mid-water trawl using the agreed algorithm (Annex I, SC11 Report) where benthopelagic trawl gears are flown close to the seabed, typically between 6-50 metres, and do not have sustained seabed contact but infrequent unintended seabed contact can occur (Annex H, SC11 Report), and that the MoP prohibit the conducting of benthopelagic trawls in the SIOFA BFCs as this gear may occasionally contact the sea bottom. Japan stated that it supports the recommendation to prohibit the conducting of benthopelagic trawls in BFCs in principle based on the precautionary approach until such a time that the SC advises otherwise.
52. Australia commented on paragraph 445 of the SC11 report and the SC’s request for clarification from the MoP on the overall objectives of the SIOFA EM programme, including whether the data could also be used for compliance purposes. Australia pointed out that a number of different RFMOs have agreed or are developing EM standards and the objectives can vary slightly. Australia shared its own experience from the IOTC, where

EM is mainly used as a data collection tool for improving the quality of data collected but there should be no constraints on the CCP and their decision whether to also use EM for compliance purposes.

53. The Cook Islands noted that in the original version of CC-10-05, two recommendations from the SC11 report had been omitted in the summary, as they were not highlighted as recommendations in the SC11 report, and requested the Secretariat to take steps to prevent such an occurrence in the future.
54. The CC noted a lack of clarity around the intended role of the CC in reviewing the SC's recommendations. The CC further noted that most of the SC's recommendations were phrased as being addressed at the MoP and that while some of these recommendations were relevant to the CC, this was not clearly indicated in their wording. The CC agreed that going forward, it should focus its discussions on the SC recommendations that are of interest to the CC. The CC requested that the SC and the Secretariat facilitate this by specifically mentioning the CC when formulating recommendations if they are of relevance to the CC and by highlighting these recommendations when presenting the SC's recommendations at meetings of the CC.
55. The CC recommended that for these recommendations, in future SC reports, they should begin with "The SC recommended to the MoP and the CC..."

4.2 Proposals for amendments to Conservation and Management Measures

56. The CC noted paragraph 124 of the SC11 Report. **The CC endorsed the SC's recommendation that the MoP adopt the draft amendments to CMM 02(2025) (Data Standards) (Annex D, SC11 Report).**
57. The CC noted paragraph 265 of the SC11 report. **The CC endorsed the SC's recommendation that the MoP adopt a modified version of Annex A (Vessel Catch and Effort Data) in CMM 02(2025) (Data Standards) to include the number of species retained and discarded among the data that shall be collected, so that overlap statistics can be calculated (Annex D, SC11 Report).**
58. China presented CC-10-20, which proposed amendments to CMM 10(2023) (Monitoring). China explained that when conducting fisheries survey cruises in the SIOFA Area, it has had to submit repeated notifications of entry into or exit from the Agreement Area to the Secretariat due to survey station design and cruise routing requirements. China noted that this increases the compliance burden on CCPs and also adds to the Secretariat's workload. China explained that its proposed amendments aimed to streamline the reporting regime for research vessels entering and exiting the Agreement Area and enhance operational efficiency for scientific surveys, while upholding compliance with mandatory reporting obligations.
59. The Cook Islands expressed its general support for the proposal, while pointing out that an amendment to paragraph 5 to include research vessels would be needed. If that was included, the Cook Islands could be flexible on the loosening of requirements for entry and exit reporting for research vessels.
60. The EU and France (OT) stated that they could not support the current proposal due to conflicts with CMM 16(2025) (Vessel Monitoring System (VMS)). They also considered it necessary to distinguish between research vessels and fishing vessels that also conduct scientific activities.
61. Australia and Japan suggested that the use of VMS for automatic entry and exit notification could reduce the burden of entry/exit reporting on research vessels. Japan also suggested that China should share information about the area of its planned

- research activities, which would help other CCPs understand the operational realities and burdens China may face.
62. China noted that the discussions on the use of VMS for entry and exit notifications under agenda item 7.2 may have implications for its proposal. China expressed its intention to revisit its proposal at MoP13 based on the outcomes of the discussions under agenda item 7.2.
 63. **The CC agreed that the proposal (Annex E) requires further discussion and recommended that the MoP develop the proposal further at MoP13.**
 64. Mauritius presented CC-10-24, which proposed amendments to CMM 11(2020) (Compliance Monitoring Scheme) to include “minor non-compliant” as a compliance status in the table under Annex 1 Compliance Categories, based on the recommendation made by MoP11 on the Final SIOFA Compliance Report (fSCR) and reviewed by CC9 and MoP12.
 65. Several CCPs expressed their general support for the overall intention behind the proposal and expressed their interest in working with Mauritius in the margins to further refine the language of the proposal. But generally, CCPs suggested that “minor non-compliance” should be limited to issues like late submissions.
 66. Seychelles suggested that an alternative option to “minor non-compliant” could be “partially compliant”.
 67. China suggested that repeated minor non-compliances should qualify as non-compliance.
 68. Chinese Taipei suggested that the status of “minor non-compliant” should only be applied to administrative procedures and not to any matters of substantive fisheries management.
 69. **The CC agreed that the proposal (Annex F) requires further discussion and recommended that the MoP develop the proposal further at MoP13.**
 70. Mauritius presented CC-10-29, which proposed an alternate method for collecting data required by paragraph 12 of CMM 02(2025) on Data Standards that allow the Mauritius semi-industrial fishery to be exempted from the requirement to embark observers on board. Mauritius explained that it had made the proposal in light of the working conditions and limited space available on board its vessels operating on SIOFA Subarea 8 (Saya de Malha bank) and had submitted the proposal to SC11 for the SC’s review. Mauritius further explained that the SC requested it to submit a proposal detailing the current data collection system and future data collection plan, including indicative timeframes, addressing the observer data collection requirement for handlines on Mauritian semi-industrial vessels, to MoP13 and SC12, for further consideration and that the SC noted that this plan should effectively collect data independently from vessel reporting from all fields currently required under paragraph 12 of CMM 02(2025) (Data Standards) for this fishery.
 71. Several CCPs expressed understanding for the challenges for Mauritius to deploy human observers.
 72. The Cook Islands reiterated the SC advice that Mauritius add coverage targets for its port sampling plans, including number of trips covered and the portion of catch to be covered.
 73. Japan pointed out the need to carefully examine any exemption of Mauritius from the obligations of CMM 02(2025) and believed that care should be taken to avoid setting a precedent that weakens the effectiveness of CMMs. Japan suggested Mauritius’ implementation of CMM 02(2025) should be subject to annual review by the SC.
 74. The CC noted the need for the SC to review Mauritius’ plans for the use of EM, and requested that Mauritius share these plans, including further details about the EM pilot,

- including timelines and specifications, with SC12 for review by the SC.
75. The EU noted that SIOFA has not yet developed EMS standards for the fisheries operated by Mauritian semi-industrial vessels and suggested that Mauritius could help drive the development of such standards.
 76. Mauritius pointed out that it is new to the use of EMS and suggested that it would need to be guided by an SC framework on how EMS can be used for data collection, including appropriate methodologies.
 77. Seychelles pointed out that it has also experienced difficulties submitting data to SIOFA as it has vessels registered to both SIOFA and the IOTC and the two organisations require data submissions in different formats, with SIOFA requiring finer-scale data. Seychelles suggested that the SC could review SIOFA's data standards from the perspective of the identifying minimum requirements for types of data and resolutions (e.g. in IOTC the resolution for pelagic longliners is 5°x5°) for conducting adequate stock assessment work without placing undue burden on CCPs.
 78. **The CC agreed that the proposal (Annex G) requires further discussion and recommended that the MoP develop the proposal further at MoP13.**
 79. Australia presented CC-10-22, which proposed amendments to CMM 15(2025) (Management of Demersal Stocks) to implement recommendations from SC11, implement an outstanding recommendation from SC10 to establish the South Indian Ridge (SIR) Management Area, establish a catch sharing arrangement for SIR, and remove an obsolete paragraph. The amendments aim to:
 - a. set catch limits for the Williams Ridge (WR) and Del Cano Rise (DCR) Management Areas,
 - b. establish the proposed SIR Management Area with a catch limit and catch-sharing arrangement,
 - c. clarify the line spacing requirements for longlines,
 - d. modify paragraph 14 regarding the achievement and reporting of tag overlap statistics,
 - e. remove paragraph 44.
 80. **The CC agreed that the proposal (Annex H) requires further discussion and recommended that the MoP develop the proposal further at MoP13.**
 81. The EU presented CC-10-26, which proposed amendments to CMM 15(2025) (Management of Demersal Stocks) to implement recommendations from SC 10 and SC11 in relation to the management of toothfish, orange roughy and alfonsino. The amendments aim to:
 - a. establish the SIR Management Area with the TAC recommended by the SC11,
 - b. establish an allocation mechanism for the SIR Management Area,
 - c. increase the TAC in the DCR Management Area as recommended by the SC11,
 - d. amend the management system in the WR Management Area to retain the catch limit while removing the "effort" management system as a first step to implement paragraph 255 of the SC11 report,
 - e. set up a catch limit for orange roughy as recommended by SC10,
 - f. and set up a catch limit for alfonsino as recommended by SC10.
 82. Japan pointed out that under the EU's proposal, Japan would lose the opportunity to participate in the fisheries in the DCR and SIR Management Areas.
 83. The Cook Islands noted that there were similarities between the proposals from Australia and the EU and encouraged them to collaborate on a joint proposal. The Cook Islands noted that the EU proposal also introduced new paragraphs with catch limits for alfonsino

and orange roughy. The Cook Islands stated that it could not support their inclusion until a definite allocation framework is in place or specific allocations for these fisheries are agreed, as there would otherwise be a risk of causing a race to fish.

84. Mauritius and Seychelles echoed the concerns raised by the Cook Islands about establishing catch limits for alfonsino and orange roughy. Mauritius pointed out that there are also no mechanisms of continuous control and reporting for alfonsino, making it difficult to implement a catch limit. It also suggested that a more appropriate timing for discussing a catch limit for alfonsino would be after the stock assessment planned for 2027.
85. France (OT) expressed its support for the establishment of catch limits for alfonsino and orange roughy, in line with several recommendations of the SC.
86. **The CC agreed that the proposal (Annex I) requires further discussion and recommended that the MoP develop the proposal further at MoP13.**
87. Japan presented CC-10-23, which proposed amendments to Annex 1 of CMM 17(2025) (New and Exploratory Fisheries) to implement the recommendations by the SC11. The amendments aim to:
 - a. better reflect which gears are operated by which CCPs for each targeted-species/fisheries,
 - b. enable the incorporation of other commercially valuable species that have been taken by CCPs but are not currently listed,
 - c. reflect more detailed information about which areas are fished,
 - d. and update information about participants in established fisheries.
88. Chinese Taipei requested that more detailed area information about its oilfish fisheries be included in the proposal.
89. Japan presented a revised paper with more detailed area information about Chinese Taipei's oilfish fisheries (CC-10-23-Rev1).
90. Some CCPs pointed out that any proposed amendments to the table of established fisheries must first be reviewed by the SC as per past practices.
91. Chinese Taipei pointed out that it has submitted this information to the SC in its annual reports.
92. Mauritius expressed its reservations regarding the inclusion of benthopelagic trawl in the table of established fisheries, pointing out that this is a new definition, that the details need to be more carefully reviewed, and that further discussion is needed on the management implications, including whether or not the gear contacts the bottom and a bottom fishing impact assessment would be needed.
93. Japan noted that SC11 discussed the definition of benthopelagic trawl and acknowledged that further discussion of the management of benthopelagic trawl fisheries and the implications for CMMs is needed but believed that such discussion should be kept separate from discussions of the table of established fisheries.
94. **The CC agreed that the proposal (Annex J) requires further discussion and recommended that the MoP develop the proposal further at MoP13.**
95. Mauritius presented CC-10-25, which proposed amendments to Annex 1 of CMM 17(2025) (New and Exploratory Fisheries) to include Mauritius' alfonsino mid-water trawl fishery in the table of established SIOFA fisheries based on the recommendation of MoP12 and the advice of SC11. Mauritius noted that this amendment was also taken into account in Japan's proposal.
96. The Cook Islands expressed its preference to move forward with Japan's proposal on CMM 17(2025) as it is more closely aligned with the discussions at SC11. Mauritius agreed

to discuss with Japan as long as the Mauritius amendments are considered.

97. **The CC agreed that the proposal (Annex K) requires further discussion and recommended that the MoP develop the proposal further at MoP13.**

4.3 Proposals for new Conservation and Management Measures

98. China presented CC-10-19, which proposed a new CMM for Fishery Independent Research Cruise in the SIOFA Area. China explained that the CMM is intended to establish a clear and comprehensive framework to govern fishery independent research cruise activities and builds on discussions that were initiated by the EU proposal (MoP-12-48-Rev1) submitted at MoP12, and were further elaborated during the Scientific Committee Workshop WS2025 - ORS: Window of Opportunity – Research Vessels in SIOFA and SC11.
99. The EU suggested that provisions regarding the role of the CC should also be included in such a CMM.
100. The Cook Islands noted that the EU had also submitted a proposal for a new CMM on research cruises by research vessels (CC-10-27). The Cook Islands expressed its general support for both proposals, while expressing its slight preference for the EU proposal as it enables more explicit control by the SC and the MoP. The Cook Islands expressed its hope that SIOFA could adopt such a CMM this year.
101. Australia appreciated the Chinese and EU proposals and encouraged the two CCPs to collaborate on a joint proposal.
102. **The CC agreed that the proposal (Annex L) requires further discussion and recommended that the MoP develop the proposal further at MoP13.**
103. The Cook Islands presented CC-10-21, which proposed a new CMM for a SIOFA Allocation Framework based on the direction of the MoP and the discussions of the CC and the SC. The Cook Islands explained that it had presented the proposal to CC9 and MoP12 and had subsequently incorporated CCP feedback from those meetings, as well as ongoing intersessional consultations. Such feedback includes, for example, language to ensure that this measure does not conflict any other CMM in force, provisions for new entrants and ensuring certainty and transparency in the process for SIOFA CCPs, and provisions outlining the scope of proportional historical catch as an allocation criterion. Overall, the proposal seeks to ensure that the MOP applies effective, sustainable and fair criteria for allocating catch and effort in SIOFA fisheries within areas beyond national jurisdiction, and to ensure that the rights of all SIOFA CCPs are respected, while providing for the legitimate rights and aspirations of developing coastal States, particularly small island developing States (SIDS), in the development of sustainable fisheries.
104. Several CCPs offered initial comments on the proposal. While generally supportive, a number of CCPs pointed out that more substantive discussions would need to take place at the MoP.
105. Australia expressed general comfort with the proposal while pointing out the need to carefully review the provisions to avoid unintended consequences, particularly with regard to the use of proportional historical catch. Australia emphasised that the purpose of the inclusion of catch history is not to legitimise unsustainable catch, but to recognise the legitimate participation in a fishery and this should be reflected in the text.
106. The EU wondered whether an overall allocation framework is necessary in SIOFA and whether a stock-by-stock allocation may be more appropriate as SIOFA does not have many priority stocks.
107. Chinese Taipei raised questions about the exclusion of CNCPs from allocation rights in paragraph 1, the background behind the 6% figure for the reserve for new entrants in paragraph 5, and the prohibition of the transfer of quotas by new entrants within the first

three years in paragraph 11. The Cook Islands explained that the provision in paragraph 1 had been introduced based on feedback from a CCP at MoP12. Regarding the 6% figure, the Cook Islands explained that it was an attempt to find a balance between CCPs calling for a higher figure than was tabled in 2025, and the fact some fisheries may be close to fully subscribed. The Cook Islands clarified that the figure was tentative and was in square brackets to reflect that, but it noted that it would be willing to work on wording that could be more generalised. Regarding paragraph 11, the Cook Islands explained that this was introduced based on feedback from CCPs indicating their preference to avoid paper quotas, whereby new entrants receive a quota and immediately transfer it away, instead of utilising it.

108. China suggested that as this would be a general framework for all species, it may be more appropriate not to set a specific percentage for the reserve for new entrants.
109. **The CC agreed that the proposal (Annex M) requires further discussion and recommended that the MoP develop the proposal further at MoP13.**
110. The EU presented CC-10-27, which proposed a new CMM for Research Cruise by Research Vessel in the SIOFA Area. The EU explained that this version of the proposal builds on previous versions submitted to the MoP12 and SC11 and is intended to continue discussions on the establishment of a framework for considering research cruises by research vessels in the SIOFA Area. Research cruises have been conducted already in the SIOFA area by CCPs and non-CCPs. The EU also noted that if SIOFA adopts a CMM for research cruises, it may become necessary to amend CMM 02(2025) (Data Standards) to clearly identify data derived from research cruises and its data access arrangements.
111. The Cook Islands suggested that the new CMM would need to be brought into alignment with paragraph 1 of CMM 07(2025) (Vessel Authorisation).
112. In response to a request for clarification from Australia, the EU confirmed that the current proposal did not require research vessels to carry an observer onboard or to be equipped with a VMS.
113. **The CC agreed that the proposal (Annex N) requires further discussion and recommended that the MoP develop the proposal further at MoP13.**
114. The EU presented CC-10-28, which proposed a new CMM for Scientific Research by Fishing Vessel in the SIOFA Area. The EU explained that this version of the proposal builds on previous versions submitted to the MoP12 and SC11 and is intended to continue discussions on the establishment of a framework for considering scientific research by fishing vessels in the SIOFA Area.
115. The Cook Islands expressed concern that the proposed CMM would hinder observers from undertaking their duties. The Cook Islands did not consider it necessary to propose a research plan for ongoing observer activities or for vessels conducting scientific work such as acoustic surveys which are undertaken as a normal part of the fishing operations. The Cook Islands noted that if the intent of this proposal was aimed at unique fishing trips where the vessel is deviating from normal operations or testing alternative gears, then that should be clarified in the proposed measure.
116. Seychelles noted the usefulness of a CMM specifically for scientific research by fishing vessels given that some developing countries do not necessarily have dedicated or suitable research vessels.
117. **The CC agreed that the proposal (Annex O) requires further discussion and recommended that the MoP develop the proposal further at MoP13.**
118. France (OT) presented CC-10-32, which proposed a new CMM on promoting the objectives of SIOFA through cooperation with the BBNJ Agreement (the Agreement under

the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction). France (OT) explained that the BBNJ Agreement entered into force on the 17 January 2026 and that the proposed CMM is intended to facilitate the consideration of RFMOs' competences, objectives, knowledge and governance within the BBNJ decision-making process. France (OT) further explained that the IOTC, based on a proposal by the Maldives, adopted a resolution pursuing identical goals at its 2026 annual session, and that the proposed CMM presents a similar approach in its wording, in order to establish a coherent framework within the RFMOs of the Indian Ocean. France (OT) raised the question of which format would be most adequate for this proposal, and which would not necessarily be a CMM. France (OT) wished to explore whether other instruments of international law might be considered by the CC.

119. Several CCPs expressed general support for the proposal, in light of the importance and timeliness of discussing the BBNJ Agreement at SIOFA. Some CCPs were supportive but questioned whether a CMM would be the right format, or whether a less legally binding format may be more appropriate. One suggestion was for an MoP Decision instead, but France (OT) expressed its preference for a different instrument, as a Decision would not be very visible to those outside SIOFA.
120. The Executive Secretary informed the CC that under the Agreement, the MoP has two binding instruments available: CMMs under Article 6(1)(d), and decisions of general application under Article 8. Both are equally binding once adopted. There is currently no standing non-binding instrument, such as a Resolution, under the Agreement. A preliminary review of other RFMOs shows a range of practices and the IOTC's Resolution is, to the Secretariat's knowledge, the only example of a dedicated binding instrument on BBNJ cooperation. The Executive Secretary also noted a non-binding Memorandum of Understanding or Arrangement may also fit the kind of institutional cooperation proposed. SIOFA has precedent for this approach, such as its Arrangements with Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) or the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Fisheries and Resources Monitoring System (FIRMS). The Executive Secretary suggested the CC and the MoP could consider whether it would be appropriate to proceed within SIOFA's existing instruments or whether this points to a broader gap in the Rules of Procedure, which may be worth exploring. The Secretariat will look at alternative processes and aim to present these during MoP13.
121. France (OT) mentioned that SIOFA has an existing resolution on the Agreement Between the Government of the French Republic and the Secretariat of the Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement concerning the Headquarters of the Secretariat and its Privileges and Immunities in French Territory and therefore asked the Secretariat whether this tool could be replicated.
122. Chinese Taipei welcomed the proposal, while noting that it places a lot of responsibility on the Secretariat. Chinese Taipei questioned whether the Secretariat had sufficient capacity to carry out all these tasks and also whether SIOFA had sufficient budget for the proposed activities.
123. The Executive Secretary noted that paragraph 4(g) of the proposal creates a standing set of functions, paragraph 8(c) adds BBNJ as a standing MoP agenda item, paragraph 7 requires periodic reporting, and paragraphs 2(b) and 4 envisage participation in BBNJ Conference of the Parties and subsidiary meetings, which carry travel and participation costs that are currently not provided for. He also pointed out that the Secretariat's

current staffing capacity and budget are already fully committed to delivering its existing work programme and that any new obligations would need to be weighed against the current work programme. The Executive Secretary also invited the CC and the MoP to provide guidance on the Secretariat's mandate when participating in BBNJ meetings and how it should engage in said process.

124. **The CC agreed that the proposal (Annex P) requires further discussion and recommended that the MoP develop the proposal further at MoP13.**

4.4 Discussion on the application of current CMMs

125. The EU informed the CC that when it was filling out its CCR, it was unsure whether the obligation under paragraph 14 of CMM 1(2025) (Interim Management of Bottom Fishing) concerned reporting of all interactions with vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs) or only those where the VME encounter threshold was exceeded.
126. The Secretariat clarified that the obligation only concerned the reporting of interactions where the VME encounter threshold was exceeded.
127. The EU noted that it has been reporting all interactions with VMEs, regardless of whether the encounter threshold was exceeded, in its annual reports to the SC. The EU suggested that the MoP could consider asking the advice of the SC on whether the reporting of all interactions with VMEs in the annual report, even if the encounter threshold is not exceeded, would be useful. If so, the SC could recommend that the MoP request all CCPs to report such information in their annual reports going forward.
128. **The CC noted that the SC last reviewed the encounter thresholds in 2023 and recommended that the MoP task the SC to prioritise such a review in its workplan.**

Agenda item 5 – Listing of IUU Vessels

5.1 Draft IUU Vessel List

129. The Compliance Officer presented CC-10-02, which provided information regarding the draft illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) vessel list. He explained that the Secretariat did not receive any information about any vessels that are presumed to have engaged in IUU fishing activities.
130. **The CC noted that no vessels had been proposed for inclusion on the draft SIOFA IUU vessel list.**

5.2 Current SIOFA IUU Vessel List

131. The Compliance Officer presented CC-10-04-Rev1, which provided information regarding the current SIOFA IUU Vessel List. He explained that the list was updated intersessionally to include updates from the North Pacific Fisheries Commission (NPFC; Intersessional Cross Listing Procedure through Circular N° 2025-22), as well as SPRFMO and the IOTC (Intersessional Cross Listing Procedure through Circular N° 2026-06). Furthermore, he explained that the Secretariat did not receive any request to remove any vessels listed by SIOFA on the current SIOFA IUU Vessel List for consideration by the CC and the MoP. In addition, he explained that the Secretariat received comments from one CCP regarding changes in the IUU vessel lists of other RFMOs that have not been reflected for the vessels on the current SIOFA IUU Vessel List that have been cross-listed from other RFMOs. Based on this information, the following changes to the current SIOFA IUU Vessel List are proposed:
- Update the flag of *FREEDOM 7* from CAMEROON to UNKNOWN
 - Delist the vessel *FU HSIANG FA*, as it was removed from the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) IUU Vessel List in 2024.

- c. Provide additional details about *HE LI 1 HAO* based on the IOTC IUU vessel list (originating RFMO), namely IMO N°: 8524492; previous vessel name: *SINAR ABADI 69*.
 - d. Provide additional details about *OCEAN STAR N°2*: International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) IUU vessel list (originating RFMO), namely IMO N°: 8665193.
 - e. Provide additional details about *TA FU 1*: ICCAT IUU vessel list (originating RFMO), namely IMO N°: 9259070.
132. **The CC recommended that the MoP update the details for *FREEDOM 7*, *HE LI 1 HAO*, *OCEAN STAR N°2*, and *TA FU 1* on the current SIOFA IUU Vessel List based on changes to the IUU vessel lists of other RFMOs, as described in CC-10-04-Rev1.**
133. **The CC recommended that the MoP remove *FU HSIANG FA* from the current SIOFA IUU Vessel List based on the vessel's removal from the GFCM IUU Vessel List in 2024.**
134. **The CC recommended that these changes be made with immediate effect after adoption by the MoP.**

Agenda item 6 – Monitoring, Control and Surveillance

6.1 Port inspection reports (CMM 08(2020) Port Inspection)

135. The Compliance Officer presented a summary of port inspection reports received by the Secretariat pursuant to CMM 08(2020) (Port Inspection) as described in CC-10-03-Rev1. A total of 55 inspection reports were submitted to the Secretariat in 2025, with 23 reports from SIOFA CCPs and 32 reports from non-CCPs. These inspection reports were received through various channels, including the FAO Global Information Exchange System (GIES), the IOTC's electronic Port State Measures (ePSM) platform, and direct submissions via email to the Secretariat.
136. **The CC noted the summary of port inspection reports provided in CC-10-03-Rev1.**

6.2 Sighting of Vessels without Nationality (CMM 04(2016) Vessels without Nationality) and vessels flagged to Non-CCPs (CMM 09(2022) Control)

137. The Compliance Officer presented a summary of reports of sightings of vessels without nationality (CMM 04(2016) (Vessels without Nationality)) and vessels flagged to non-CCPs (CMM 09(2022) (Control)) as described in CC-10-03-Rev1. No reports of sightings of vessels without nationality or vessels flagged to non-CCPs in the Agreement Area were provided to the Secretariat in 2025.
138. **The CC noted the summary of reports of sightings of vessels without nationality and vessels flagged to non-CCPs provided in CC-10-03-Rev1.**

6.3 Review of Catches of Portuguese dogfish in Subarea 2 (CMM 12(2025) Sharks)

139. The Compliance Officer presented a review of catches of Portuguese dogfish in Subarea 2 as described in CC-10-03-Rev1. For 2025, the Secretariat received 11 monthly reports of catches of Portuguese dogfish from one CCP, which indicated catches of Portuguese dogfish for the months of February, March and October to December. The reported catch for 2025 was 513.473t, representing 70% of the established catch limit. All reports but one were submitted within the provided deadline. The Secretariat was of the view that there were no compliance issues with the monthly report submitted after the deadline, as the concerned report reported null catches, and the CMM imposes reporting requirements only in instances where there were actual catches of Portuguese dogfish.
140. **The CC noted the review of catches of Portuguese dogfish in Subarea 2 provided in CC-10-03-Rev1.**

6.4 Register of Authorised Vessels (CMM 07(2025) Vessel Authorisation)

141. The Data Officer, Mr Pierre Périès, presented an update on the status of the SIOFA Record of Authorized Vessels (RAV). As of the end of 2025, 94 vessels were registered on the SIOFA RAV, as described in CC-10-03-Rev1.
142. **The CC noted the summary of the status of the SIOFA RAV provided in CC-10-03-Rev1.**

6.5 Entry/Exit reports (CMM 10(2023) Monitoring)

143. The Data Officer presented the entry/exit notifications summary report, as described in CC-10-03-Rev1. A total of 1478 entry-exit notifications were received at the Secretariat from 1 January 2025 to 31 December 2025. 11 notifications were provided late, after the 24-hour period of delay.
144. **The CC noted the entry/exit notifications summary report provided in CC-10-03-Rev1.**

6.6 At sea Transfer and Transshipment reports (CMM 10(2023) Monitoring)

145. The Data Officer presented a report of CCPs' at sea transfers and transshipments, as described in CC-10-03-Rev1. For 2025, the Secretariat received notifications for 302 at sea transfers from the Cook Islands, 16 at sea transshipments and 6 at sea transfers from Japan, 1 at sea transshipment from Seychelles, 329 at sea transshipments and 186 at sea transfers from Chinese Taipei, and 7 at sea transfers from Thailand.
146. The Cook Islands explained that its at sea transfers are from its bunker vessel.
147. **The CC noted the report of CCPs' at sea transfers and transshipments provided in CC-10-03-Rev1.**

Agenda item 7 – Operationalisation of the SIOFA VMS

7.1 Update of Workplan & Progress Toward Operationalization of the SIOFA VMS

148. On behalf of the Chairperson of the SIOFA VMS Working Group (VMS-WG), Ms Fiona Harford, the Compliance Officer presented CC-10-10, which provided an update on the progress made by the VMS WG since MoP12. The VMS WG held four intersessional meetings, which resulted in the following conclusions: adoption of the Pilot Phase for the SIOFA VMS, completion of work related to the consideration of the use of the SIOFA VMS for the submission of entry and exit notifications, and review of CMM 16(2025) (VMS) in relation to possible amendments to the NAF messages data elements in Annex 2 of the CMM and Annex 1 of the SIOFA VMS standards, specifications and procedures (SSPs). Following the recommendations put forward by the Selection Panel for the SIOFA VMS, the Secretariat completed the procurement process for the SIOFA VMS, which resulted in the awarding of a contract to Collecte Localisation Satellites (CLS) as the provider of Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) VMS services to SIOFA for a period of thirty-six (36) months, commencing in January 2026. CLS has undertaken the set-up of the SIOFA VMS and provided training to SIOFA staff in the use and administration of the system. The Pilot Phase for the SIOFA Vessel Monitoring System was also completed and the detailed outcomes are described in CC-10-INFO-01. Based on the outcomes of the pilot phase, the VMS is considered to be operationally ready for its entry into operation, subject to endorsement of the CC and the MoP, and automated entry and exit reporting under the SIOFA VMS is considered to be technically feasible, under certain conditions. In addition, the Secretariat successfully completed a second scoping mission concerning the VMS of other RFMOs, this time with the SPRFMO Secretariat.
149. **The CC noted the progress made by the VMS WG towards the operationalisation of the SIOFA VMS.**
150. **The CC recommended that the MoP agree on the entry into operation of the SIOFA**

VMS.

151. The CC thanked Ms Fiona Harford for her hard work and leadership as the VMS WG Chairperson, the Secretariat for its diligent efforts to support the work to establish and enter the SIOFA VMS into operation, and CCPs for their constructive input and engagement.

7.2 Potential Amendments to SIOFA CMMs and the Standards, Specifications and Procedures (SSPs) for the SIOFA VMS

152. On behalf of the VMS WG Chair, the Compliance Officer presented CC-10-11, which provided potential amendments to CMMs and the SIOFA SSPs to support the entry into operation of the SIOFA VMS as discussed by the VMS WG. He explained that the VMS WG had proposed replacing paragraph 15 of CMM 10(2023) (Monitoring) with new provisions and the deletion of Annex I of CMM 10(2023) to facilitate the use of the SIOFA VMS for the submission of entry and exit notifications, and that it had also proposed potential amendments to the NAF messages data elements in Annex 2 of CMM 16(2025) (VMS) and Annex 1 of the SIOFA VMS SSPs. He also informed the CC that during the VMS WG's discussions, one CCP had proposed deleting the entry ('ENT') and exit ('EXI') data reporting elements from NAF messages but that these were inconsistent with the recommendations and conclusions formulated by the VMS WG in paper VMSWG-09-01 on the use of the VMS for the automation of entry and exit reporting.
153. The CC considered the proposal by Chinese Taipei to delete the entry ('ENT') and exit ('EXI') data reporting elements from NAF messages in Table 1 of Annex 2 to CMM 16(2025) and Annex 1 to the SSPs. The CCP that had made the suggestion explained that it had encountered technical issues whereby the entry and exit notifications could not be smoothly transmit notifications through its VMS. The CCP stated it needed to retain the option to send entry and exit notifications by email. To address the technical issues it faces, the CCP proposed some further amendments to paragraph 15bis of CMM 10(2023) (Monitoring) and the addition of a footnote to the table of NAF messages data elements in Annex 2 of CMM 16(2025) (VMS) and Annex 1 of the SIOFA VMS SSPs.
154. The CC endorsed the additional proposed amendments and the Compliance Officer presented a revised paper that incorporated these additions (CC-10-11-Rev1).
155. The CC reviewed and revised the paper further (CC-10-11-Rev2).
156. **The CC recommended that the MoP adopt the potential amendments to CMM 10(2023) (Monitoring), CMM 16(2025) (VMS), and the SIOFA SSPs to support the entry into operation of the SIOFA VMS as described in Annex Q.**

Agenda item 8 – Review of the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CNCPs)

157. The CC acknowledged that Comoros had written to the Secretariat on 4 May 2026 to apply to retain its CNCP status (CC-10-08).
158. **The CC recommended that the MoP determine that Comoros qualifies to retain its CNCP status.**
159. The CC encouraged Comoros to amend its domestic regulations to enhance their alignment with the SIOFA CMMs, particularly CMM 10(2023) (Monitoring), in time for CC11 and MoP13.
160. Comoros thanked the CC for supporting its application for renewal of its CNCP status and reiterated its intention to ensure compliance with the SIOFA CMMs and the Agreement as soon as possible.
161. The CC acknowledged that India had written to the Secretariat on 24 April 2026 to apply

to retain its CNCP status (CC-10-08).

162. **The CC recommended that the MoP determine that India qualifies to retain its CNCP status.**

163. The CC reiterated its encouragement for India to attend future meetings of the CC in person.

Agenda item 9 – Implementation of Article 13 of the Agreement

164. The Executive Secretary provided an update on the implementation of Article 13 in 2025–2026. In response to a request from the Cook Islands for capacity building and support regarding the management and processing of its data, with an emphasis on Microsoft Access Database and SIOFA data checking procedures, the Data Officer conducted training with four officers of the Ministry of Marine Resources from 15 to 23 November 2025 in Avarua. As for CP and non-CCP developing States, while SIOFA does not currently have a formal capacity building framework for them, it provides financial assistance to support their participation in SIOFA meetings. The Secretariat also reaches out to neighbouring coastal States every year to encourage their participation and accession to the Agreement and offers financial assistance to facilitate that as well. In 2026, the Secretariat has provided financial assistance to support participation by developing States in SC11 and MoP13.

165. The Cook Islands thanked the Secretariat and the Data Officer in particular for their capacity building assistance. The Cook Islands welcomed this assistance as a Small Island Developing State (SIDS) and explained that it has a small administration and that such assistance supports its effective participation in SIOFA processes.

Agenda item 10 – Capacity Building

166. The Executive Secretary presented CC-10-07 which outlined options to facilitate and address the capacity needs of CCP developing States. He explained that MoP11 had tasked the Secretariat to identify capacity building needs of developing States and provide options for addressing these needs. Through a first round of consultations with CCPs, the Secretariat developed a paper and submitted it to MoP12 for discussion. In order to efficiently implement the options and address the needs for capacity building, MoP12 tasked the Secretariat to correspond with the relevant CCPs again to seek their input on their preferences among the proposed options in MoP-12-25-Rev2 and to submit an updated paper, with CCPs' input, for review to SC11, CC10, and MoP13. The Executive Secretary suggested that it could be useful to engage a consultant to develop a capacity building action plan to 1) define criteria of vulnerability indices to gauge the eligibility for assistance; 2) establish a timeline of the priority actions to be done starting from January 2027; 3) determine the budget necessary for the in-person workshops; and 4) consult stakeholders to organise training and workshops virtually or in-person.

167. The CC reviewed the potential options for addressing capacity needs and provided further comments (CC-10-07-Rev1).

168. In response to a request for clarification, the Executive Secretary explained that the task of consolidating the different capacity building requests from CCPs and identifying areas of common need or higher priority is envisioned to be conducted by the consultancy.

169. The CC expressed general support for the recruitment of a consultant to prepare a Capacity Building Action Plan, noting the importance of SIOFA having a mechanism for building the capacity of all CCPs and supporting their ability to fully implement the SIOFA CMMs.

170. The CC suggested that the consultancy should be funded by voluntary contributions,

noting that one potential source could be the Sustainable Western Indian Ocean Programme (SWIOP).

171. Regarding the scope of the consultancy, the EU suggested that determining the eligibility for capacity building assistance may not be necessary as this has already been discussed and determined by the MoP.
172. Pew reminded the CC that it has developed a new capacity self-assessment tool (CSAT), the details of which are available in MoP-13-INFO-13. Pew explained that the tool is designed for use by CCPs internally to highlight areas of capacity need and suggested that the tool could be used to augment the list of capacity building needs identified in CC-10-07. Pew also informed the CC that it has funds available to support the utilisation of the CSAT.
173. The CC tasked the Secretariat to work with Pew to identify how the CSAT could be incorporated into SIOFA's capacity building work.
174. **The CC recommended that the MoP consider the CC's input on potential options for addressing capacity needs related to compliance and straddling themes (Annex R).**
175. **The CC recommended that the MoP endorse the recruitment of a consultant to prepare a Capacity Building Action Plan, which will be assessed during SC12, CC11 and presented for adoption to MoP14.**
176. **The CC recommended that the MoP seek voluntary contributions to fund the consultancy to prepare a Capacity Building Action Plan.**

Agenda item 11 – The SIOFA Performance Review

177. The Executive Secretary presented CC-10-06, which provided a summary of the status of the implementation of the recommendations proposed by the SIOFA Performance Review Panel in 2023 and adopted by MoP10. The summary was updated at MoP12, with input from the SC and the CC. Further updates have been proposed by SC11. The Executive Secretary highlighted the recommendations relevant to the CC and invited the CC to provide further comments as appropriate.
178. The CC reviewed and endorsed the implementation plan (**Annex S**).
179. **The CC recommended that the MoP note the CC's input and the current status of the plan adopted at MoP12 for the implementation of the SIOFA Performance Review Panel recommendations as detailed in Annex S.**
180. The Executive Secretary also highlighted that the first Performance Review Report recommended that another Performance Review process be held within an appropriate time frame, such as 5 years from the first iteration.
181. The CC considered this recommendation. Some CCPs offered initial comments, while noting that further discussions would need to take place at the MoP. Some CCPs supported the conducting of a second Performance Review and suggested a timeline in which a Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Performance Review could be adopted at MoP14, the Performance Review would be conducted in 2027–2028, and the results would be submitted to MoP15. The EU supported conducting a second Performance Review but expressed reservations about the proposed 5-year timeline. This CCP noted that there is still substantive work to do to address the recommendations from the first Performance Review and suggested that the MoP should not begin drafting a ToR until the recommendations from the first Performance Review have been addressed, so that progress on those recommendations can be fully taken into account in the drafting of the ToR.

Agenda item 12 – Election of a Chair and Vice Chair for the Compliance

Committee

182. The CC noted that the Chairperson, Mrs Meera Koonjul (Mauritius), and the Vice Chairperson, Mr Patrick Sachs (Australia), will have completed their two-year terms at the end of CC10.
183. **The CC agreed to re-elect Mrs Meera Koonjul to serve as the CC Chairperson for another two-year term.**
184. **The CC agreed to re-elect Mr Patrick Sachs to serve as the CC Vice Chairperson for another two-year term.**

Agenda item 13 – Any other business

185. The EU noted that SIOFA has matured as an organisation, many CC processes have become firmly established and are running smoothly, and the CC's review of recommendations from the SC is expected to become more streamlined and focused going forward.
186. The EU also suggested that the review of proposals for amended or new CMMs could be streamlined and that proposals that do not have compliance aspects, such as the proposal for a new CMM for a SIOFA allocation framework, need not be reviewed by the CC and should be reviewed by the MoP.
187. The CC acknowledged that it may not be necessary for it to have substantive discussions about CMM proposals that have no compliance aspects, but believed that such CMM proposals could still be presented at the CC.
188. The CC noted that there has been a blurring of the division of functions between the CC and the MoP and that this may need to be reviewed and potentially clarified.
189. The Executive Secretary pointed out that any substantive change to the functions of the CC may require amendments to the CC's ToR.
190. **The CC recommended that the MoP consider reducing the default duration of CC meetings from three days to two days.**

Agenda item 14 – Adoption of the CC report

191. The report of the 10th meeting of the SIOFA CC was adopted.

Agenda item 15 – Close of the meeting

192. The CC thanked the Chairperson for her excellent leadership.
193. The CC also thanked the rapporteur and the Secretariat for organising and conducting the CC meeting.
194. The Chairperson thanked the Executive Secretary, the Compliance Officer, and all other members of the Secretariat, as well as the CC participants, the rapporteur, and the technicians for their support.
195. The Chairperson closed the meeting at 11:35 a.m., 3 July 2026.