# Report of the 10th IOTC Technical Committee on Management Procedures

Male, Maldives, 9 May 2026

| DISTRIBUTION: | BIBLIOGRAPHIC ENTRY |
|---|---|
| Participants in the Session<br>Members of the Commission<br>Other interested Nations and International Organisations<br>FAO Fisheries Department<br>FAO Regional Fishery Officers | IOTC-TCMP10 2026. Report of the 10th IOTC Technical Committee on Management Procedures. Maldives 9 May 2026. IOTC-2026-TCMP10-R[E]: 22 pp. |

Contact details:

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
Blend Seychelles
PO Box 1011
Providence, Mahé, Seychelles
Ph: +248 4225 494
Fax: +248 4224 364
Email: IOTC-secretariat@fao.org
Website: http://www.iotc.org

# ACRONYMS

| | |
|---|---|
| BET | Bigeye Tuna |
| BMSY | Biomass that achieves maximum sustainable yield |
| CMM | Conservation and Management Measure (of the IOTC; Resolutions and Recommendations) |
| CPCs | Contracting parties and cooperating non-contracting parties |
| EU | European Union |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations |
| IOTC | Indian Ocean Tuna Commission |
| MP | Management Procedure |
| MPD | Management Procedures Dialogue |
| MSE | Management Strategy Evaluation |
| MSY | Maximum Sustainable Yield |
| SC | Scientific Committee, of the IOTC |
| SSB | Spawning stock biomass |
| SPC | Secretariat of the Pacific Community |
| tRFMO | tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organization |
| TAC | Total Allowable Catch |
| TCMP | Technical Committee on Management Procedures |
| WP | Working Party of the IOTC |
| WPB | Working Party on Billfish of the IOTC |
| WPEB | Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch of the IOTC |
| WPM | Working Party on Methods of the IOTC |
| WPNT | Working Party on Neritic Tunas of the IOTC |
| WPDCS | Working Party on Data Collection and Statistics of the IOTC |
| WPTmT | Working Party on Temperate Tunas of the IOTC |
| WPTT | Working Party on Tropical Tunas of the IOTC |
| YFT | Yellowfin Tuna |

# STANDARDISATION OF IOTC WORKING PARTY AND SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE REPORT TERMINOLOGY

SC16.07 (para. 23) The SC **ADOPTED** the reporting terminology contained in Appendix IV and **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission considers adopting the standardised IOTC Report terminology, to further improve the clarity of information sharing from, and among its subsidiary bodies.

**How to interpret terminology contained in this report**

***Level 1: From a subsidiary body of the Commission to the next level in the structure of the Commission:***

**RECOMMENDED, RECOMMENDATION**: Any conclusion or request for an action to be undertaken, from a subsidiary body of the Commission (Committee or Working Party), which is to be formally provided to the next level in the structure of the Commission for its consideration/endorsement (e.g. from a Working Party to the Scientific Committee; from a Committee to the Commission). The intention is that the higher body will consider the recommended action for endorsement under its own mandate if the subsidiary body does not already have the required mandate. Ideally this should be task specific and contain a timeframe for completion.

***Level 2: From a subsidiary body of the Commission to a CPC, the Secretariat, or other body (not the Commission) to carry out a specified task:***

**REQUESTED**: This term should only be used by a subsidiary body of the Commission if it does not wish to have the request formally adopted/endorsed by the next level in the structure of the Commission. For example, if a committee wishes to seek additional input from a CPC on a particular topic but does not wish to formalise the request beyond the mandate of the Committee, it may request that a set action be undertaken. Ideally this should be task specific and contain a timeframe for the completion.

***Level 3: General terms to be used for consistency:***

**AGREED**: Any point of discussion from a meeting which the IOTC body considers to be an agreed course of action covered by its mandate, which has not already been dealt with under Level 1 or level 2 above; a general point of agreement among delegations/participants of a meeting which does not need to be considered/adopted by the next level in the Commission's structure.

**NOTED/NOTING**: Any point of discussion from a meeting which the IOTC body considers to be important enough to record in a meeting report for future reference.

***Any other term:*** Any other term may be used in addition to the Level 3 terms to highlight to the readers of IOTC reports the importance of the relevant paragraph. However, other terms used are considered for explanatory/informational purposes only and shall have no higher rating within the reporting terminology hierarchy than Level 3, described above (e.g. **CONSIDERED**; **URGED**; **ACKNOWLEDGED**).

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The tenth Technical Committee on Management Procedures meeting was held on the 9 May 2026 in Male, Maldives. The meeting was held in a hybrid format, with delegations present physically in the meeting room, and some participants attending by videoconference. The meeting was co-chaired by Mr Adam Ziyad (Commission Chair) and Dr Sylvain Bonhommeau (chair of the IOTC Scientific Committee). The Chair welcomed 104 delegates from 27 Contracting Parties of the Commission and 11 Observers (including the invited experts) to the session.

**General discussions of IOTC MSE**

**TCMP Rec.01** (Para 18)

Reflecting on the significant progress made in the adoption of MPs for several IOTC species over recent years, the TCMP **ACKNOWLEDGED** the importance of capacity building in helping managers better understand the MSE process and build buy-in from stakeholders for MP development. It was highlighted that a very useful exercise was conducted during the capacity-building workshop held in 2024 in the Maldives, which helped managers work through five years of MSE results. The exercise explained how results are presented, how the TAC is generated, and how the MP helps achieve the long-term objectives agreed by the Commission. The TCMP **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission mobilise resources to support the continuation of such MSE capacity building workshops in the future.

**Yellowfin tuna MSE**

**TCMP Rec 02** (Para. 44).

The TCMP **NOTED** that evidence suggested there are potentially substantial catches of yellowfin tuna from non-IOTC members (or non-IOTC vessels) in the Indian Ocean as well as bycatch in fisheries targeting other species, and **AGREED** that it is important to consider these catches in the MSE as well as in stock assessments. The TCMP **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission task the Scientific Committee evaluate the extent of yellowfin catches from non-members and in fisheries not targeting species under the purview of the IOTC, particularly those not already included in the IOTC database, and ensure all sources of mortality and associated uncertainty are included in the evaluation and development of the MP.

**MSE Workplan.**

**TCMP Rec 03 (**Para 53**)**

The **TCMP RECOGNIZED** that the continued development of Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) for IOTC species, particularly for yellowfin and albacore tuna, is essential to support robust, science-based, precautionary, and sustainable fisheries management procedures. The **TCMP NOTED** that the MSE work represents one of the key achievements and areas of progress within the IOTC. Therefore, the **TCMP RECOMMENDED** the Commission to secure adequate, stable, and long-term funding to ensure the continuity of technical work, maintain scientific progress, and deliver reliable management procedures for albacore and yellowfin in a timely manner.

# 1. Opening of the meeting

1. The tenth Technical Committee on Management Procedures meeting was held on the 9 May 2026 in Male, Maldives. The meeting was held in a hybrid format, with delegations present physically in the meeting room, and some participants attending online. The meeting was co-chaired by Mr Adam Ziyad (Commission Chair) and Dr Sylvain Bonhommeau (chair of the IOTC Scientific Committee) who welcomed attendees and opened the meeting.

2. The Chair (Dr Bonhommeau) highlighted the critical importance of developing Management Procedures to guide IOTC members in governing key species under the Commission's purview. He acknowledged the significant progress achieved in Management Strategy Evaluation and the development of Management Procedures through collaborative efforts among members. This progress has led to the successful adoption of Management Procedures for several major IOTC species in recent years. The Chair further stressed the need to maintain this momentum and continue advancing MSE through open dialogue and collaboration.

3. The Chair welcomed 104 delegates from 27 Contracting Parties of the Commission and 11 Observers (including the invited experts) to the session. The list of participants is provided in Appendix I

# 2. Adoption of the agenda and arrangements for the session

4. The Chair **NOTED** that TCMP was established to improve the mutual understanding and effective communication between science and management, as well as to facilitate the commission's decision-making process on issues pertaining to management procedures. To this end, scientists reported on their progress in developing and assessing management procedures for the major Indian Ocean tuna stocks, following the guidelines outlined in Resolution 15/10 and the related workplan that the Commission approved.

5. The adopted agenda for the meeting is presented in Appendix II. The documents presented to the TCMP are listed in Appendix III.

# 3. Admission of observers

6. Pursuant to Article VII of the Agreement establishing the IOTC, the TCMP10 admitted the following observers, as defined in Rule XIV of the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2023):

*Non-governmental Organisations (NGO)*

- BLOOM
- Bangladesh Marine Fisheries Association (BMFA)
- DSM-Deutsche Stiftung Meeresschutz
- Global Fishing Watch
- International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL)
- International Pole and Line Foundation (IPNLF)
- International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF)
- Maldives Seafood Processors & Exporters Association (MSPEA)
- Sustainable Fisheries and Communities Trust (SFACT)

- The PEW Charitable Trusts

*Invited Experts*

- Taiwan, Province of China

# 4. Decisions of the Commission related to the work of the TCMP

## *4.1. Outcomes of the 9th Session of the TCMP*

7. The TCMP were informed of the main outcomes of the 9th Technical Committee on Management Procedures (IOTC-2026-TCMP10-03), included in the paragraphs below:

> (Para. 34) The TCMP **NOTED** that the application of the bigeye management procedure generated an unconstrained estimated TAC of 175,005 t which is more than 15% higher than the TAC set for 2024 and 2025. The TCMP **NOTED** that by applying the maximum 15% increase in the TAC as per Resolution 22/03, the MP recommended an annual TAC of 92,670 t for 2026-2028. Therefore, the TCMP **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt the TAC advice for Bigeye tuna of 92,670 t resulting from the MP.
>
> (Para. 46) The TCMP **RECOMMENDED** adopting Australia's proposal (IOTC-2025-S29-PropU) to amend the swordfish MP (as specified in Resolution 24/08), to ensure the current objective of at least 60% probability of being in Kobe green zone is met during 2034-2038. This involves a minor amendment to the Target CPUE in Annex I of Res 24/08, changing it from 0.7125 to 0.75. Further, the TCMP **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission establish a TAC (30,527 t) for swordfish for 2026-2028 based on the revised MP NOTING that this TAC is the same as that from the original MP..

8. The TCMP **NOTED** that these recommendations were subsequently endorsed by the Commission in 2025. Additionally, the proposal for the amendment of the swordfish Management Procedures was adopted as binding resolution 25/07.

9. The TCMP also **NOTED** the information document IOTC-2026-TCMP10-INF02, which summarises the outcome of the MSE Task Force meeting held from March 2026. The meeting discussed progress on Albacore, Yellowfin tuna, and blue shark management procedure in accordance with requests from SC28.

# 5. Introduction to MSE and General discussions of IOTC MSE

10. The TCMP **NOTED** a presentation from the former SC Chair, Dr Toshi Kitakado, on the core principles of the MSE process. Focusing on practical applications of MPs adopted for IOTC species (bigeye tuna, skipjack tuna, and swordfish), the presentation introduced the MSE simulation framework that incorporates uncertainty, performance indicators that quantify the risk of attaining management objectives, and the timeline for MP development and decision-making at IOTC. Dr Kitakado explained the distinction between model-based and data-based management approaches, how tuning criteria are linked to management objectives, the need for regular review of exceptional circumstances, and the process for running the MP to generate catch advice. He emphasized that the impacts of climate change and environmental effects can be addressed through robustness trials. The presentation triggered productive discussion on a wide range of topics related to IOTC MSE and MP applications. Key discussion points are summarised below.

11. The TCMP **RECALLED** that the bigeye tuna MP includes a stability clause that forms part of the MP itself and has been tested accordingly. To avoid confusion, the latest TAC advice generated from the bigeye tuna MP should be considered as a result of implementing the full MP rather than the application of the catch change constraint. Nevertheless, the TCMP pointed out that if the MP is shown to be too sensitive to the input CPUE (i.e., triggering the stability clause too frequently), the MP may require re-examination. The TCMP **NOTED** that the bigeye tuna CPUE method has changed between MP runs, which was considered to constitute an exceptional circumstance. However, it was not considered that this affected the integrity of the MP.

12. The TCMP **RECALLED** that the skipjack MPs are based on CPUE indices, and the MSE has investigated trade-offs between MPs that on average generate higher and less variable catch, and MPs that are more responsive to the CPUE. The adopted MP ("stable") is not highly sensitive to CPUE trends and shall recommend a relatively stable TAC. In all cases, the MSE has already accounted for the variability and uncertainty of the abundance index. There is also a process to examine whether fluctuations in future CPUE would exceed the tolerance threshold, which would trigger exceptional circumstances. This is important to ensure that the MP is operating within the bounds of the uncertainty that has been tested.

13. The TCMP **NOTED** that the review of exceptional circumstances with application of the Skipjack MP in 2025 as specified in the resolution 24/07, identified no exceptional circumstances that requires change or suspension of TAC advice of 565,745 t per year 2027 - 2029.

14. The TCMP **DISCUSSED** the relationship between operating models (OMs) and stock assessment models, and **NOTED** that it is common practice to base MSE operating models on assessment models, which are considered to best represent fishery and population dynamics. The TCMP further **NOTED** that an alternative approach developed for the albacore tuna MSE (using an Approximate Bayesian Computation algorithm), which separates the OM from the assessment, can provide additional flexibility in OM construction and has been shown to overcome some limitations imposed by the assessment model itself.

15. The TCMP **DISCUSSED** the incorporation of environmental conditions into the MSE process and **NOTED** that while it is increasingly common for stock assessments to model the relationship between environmental variables and population processes, it is very rare for MSE to do so, and there have been few successful applications in RFMOs. One reason may be that MSE focuses more on predictive performance, and environmental conditions are often difficult to predict. The TCMP **NOTED** that IOTC MSE often tests sustained recruitment failure as part of robustness trials, although recruitment failure is not linked to specific environmental variables. The TCMP **AGREED** that it is important to conduct research on the ability to design robustness tests to capture effects of environmental conditions and to address climate change impacts within the MSE process, particularly for species such as skipjack, for which research indicates recruitment is likely to be strongly driven by oceanographic and environmental conditions.

16. The TCMP **DISCUSSED** the potential application of multi-species MSE/MP. The TCMP **NOTED** that some RFMOs (e.g., ICCAT, WCPFC) have undertaken the development of multi species MPs but progress has been slow so far due to the complexity of such approach. In that context, some MPs may focus on controlling effort rather than catch, to control fishing mortality. The TCMP further **NOTED** that in a multi-species context, management objectives may require careful consideration, as it is not possible to achieve them for all species simultaneously. In such cases, target reference points may set a minimum standard to achieve, rather than define a precise target.

17. The TCMP **DISCUSSED** whether MP development should start to be expanded to other species. The TCMP **REQUESTED** that a figure be produced that identifies the percentage of IOTC catch that is managed by MPs.

18. Reflecting on the significant progress made in the adoption of MPs for several IOTC species over recent years, the TCMP **ACKNOWLEDGED** the importance of capacity building in helping managers better understand the MSE process and build buy-in from stakeholders for MP development. It was highlighted that a very useful exercise was conducted during the capacity-building workshop held in 2024 in the Maldives, which helped managers work through five years of MSE results. The exercise explained how results are presented, how the TAC is generated, and how the MP helps achieve the long-term objectives agreed by the Commission. The TCMP **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission mobilise resources to support the continuation of such MSE capacity building workshops in the future.

19. The TCMP **NOTED** that Maldives is planning to organise another MSE training workshop, focusing on yellowfin tuna this time, with the aim of facilitating understanding of yellowfin MSE amongst managers at the early stage of MSE development, in association with the IOTC Secretariat. Both PEW and ISSF have pledged to contribute to this workshop.

20. The TCMP **NOTED** an informational document (IOTC-2026-TCMP10-INF01) containing educational tools developed for MSE capacity building, funded by an Australian grant, is available on the IOTC website. The TCMP further **NOTED** the FAO e-learning module on MSE is also available on-line.

## *5.1. Albacore tuna.*

21. The TCMP **NOTED** the presentation of paper IOTC-2026-TCMP10-04, which provides a summary of progress of MSE for Indian Ocean albacore tuna. The TCMP **NOTED** that the paper is complemented by IOTC-2026-TCMP10-INF04, a more detailed report of the current status of the Indian Ocean albacore MSE, which also outlined the proposed future steps, with regards to finalizing the MSE process.

22. The TCMP **NOTED** that the ALB MSE started in 2015, with early development focused on OM construction and subsequent iterations of assessment-based OM conditioning. However, changes in the structure of the SS3 assessment model rendered the OM unfit for projection or MP evaluation. Work in 2024 and 2025 (under contract between WMR and IOTC, with in-kind contribution from CSIRO) moved to a novel approach to OM construction and conditioning using Approximate Bayesian Computation (ABC), which offers advantages including prior-based stock status estimation and a structured framework for exploring uncertainties. The OM has been endorsed by the SC.

23. The TCMP also **NOTED** that the OM has been updated to incorporate recent historical data from WPTmT 2025. However, there have been further revisions to catches, and methods for standardising CPUE data have also changed since 2022. The WPM **AGREED** that the OM should be reconditioned using the new data (catch and CPUE) and that MPs using CPUE as input should be based on the new method. However, this has not yet been completed.

24. The TCMP further **NOTED** that the focus is now shifting to MP performance evaluation, with preliminary testing of empirical catch-based and model-based MPs under way. However, a full evaluation of candidate management procedures could not be completed for consideration at this meeting.

25. The TCMP had the following technical discussions on the ALB MSE:

- It was **NOTED** that CPUE from the NW and SW represent different population components (juveniles in the SW and adults in the NW). Careful consideration is given to combining them in the MP designs. The model-based MP combines the two CPUE series using area-based weighting, whereas the model-free MP combines the decisions derived separately from each CPUE series and can incorporate mean age time lag for each series.
- It was **NOTED** that the MSY range from the OM appears very narrow. This is because the ABC OM aggregates all size-frequency data, and does not model selectivity in the same way as the stock assessment. There is much greater uncertainty in the estimates of MSY from the stock assessment. This is a trade-off: the stock assessments are currently struggling to fit selectivity in the models, and the ABC OMs are more stable.
- The very high CPUE in 1982–1983 appears to be an outlier. It was **NOTED** that CPUE can exhibit very large variability, and typically not all indices can be well fitted by the OM. However, the aim is to fit the general trend to capture the main dynamics.
- The revision of data largely relates to countries revising their reported catches. While not desirable, this is unavoidable, and the stock assessment faces the same problem. The timing of data revisions often affects the OM conditioning process.
- The potential impacts of climate change are evaluated in robustness tests, mainly through changes in recruitment in model projections. Variables related to climate change have not been incorporated into the OM itself, which is conditioned on historical data. The direction and magnitude of changes are based on the literature, but it is important also to draw on expert judgement.
- Indonesia operates an important handline fishery for ALB. It was **SUGGESTED** that the WPTmT could discuss whether it is possible to develop a handline CPUE index for potential use in the MP.
- The MSE has evaluated different time lags, including various levels of time lag in either data or management to inform managers on the potential effects of these lags.

26. The TCMP **REQUESTED** that robustness tests consider testing the effects of over-catch (e.g., 10% consistent over-catch), as well as carry-forward of undercatch. It is also important to consider the effect of variability in

catches, as TAC cannot be expected to be caught precisely. The TCMP also **REQUESTED** that 50% probability in Kobe Green (PKG) tuning objectives be tested in addition to the 60% and 70% probability already considered.

## *5.2. Blue shark tuna.*

27. The TCMP **NOTED** the presentation of paper IOTC-2026-TCMP10-05, which provides a summary of progress of MSE for Indian Ocean blue shark. The TCMP **NOTED** that the paper is complemented by IOTC-2026-TCMP10-INF05, a detailed report of the preliminary scoping study for the Indian Ocean blue shark MSE, which also included the evaluation of the feasibility of different types of MP which may be applicable to the blue sharks.

28. The TCMP **RECALLED** that the Commission, at its 28th session, mandated the Scientific Committee to develop an MP for BSH using MSE. The TCMP **NOTED** that last year's preliminary scoping study assessed operating model options and candidate MPs for blue shark, and that upcoming work will build on those findings. The priority now is to develop an operating model for endorsement by the WPM and SC, and candidate MPs for consideration by the TCMP in 2027.

29. The scoping study suggested the blue shark assessment model is likely suitable as the basis for an Operating Model. The TCMP **NOTED** the study's conclusions that the main uncertainty is the catch and discard rates and therefore the size of the stock is uncertain. CPUE data show conflicting trends between fleets and may therefore be less informative and reliable. The TCMP further **NOTED** that the scoping study author considered length-frequency data to be among the most informative inputs for a Management Procedure.

30. The TCMP **NOTED** that while a catch limit is preferable for fleets that target blue shark, for fleets that take blue shark as bycatch, a catch limit alone may be less suitable because there is a risk that it will limit fishing on target species (e.g., tuna). As such, the scoping study recommended size-based management measures, which have the potential to limit fishing mortality without restricting target effort and should be used in conjunction with a TAC for target species. The size-based measure could also protect juveniles, which is beneficial to conserving the productivity of the stock and could lead to a higher TAC.

31. The TCMP **NOTED** that the proposed MP outputs from the scoping study are a fixed size limit and a TAC which is either fixed or set via feedback control using estimates of population status from length-frequency data. The TCMP **RECOGNISED** that there is a preference for a TAC, which is the most commonly used MP output, whereas a size-based measure may be difficult to monitor and implement.

32. The TCMP **DISCUSSED** the proposed MP outputs from a practical perspective. It was **NOTED** that in many fisheries there is no distinctive difference or definition between target and bycatch (even for clearly defined target fisheries, the targeting practice may change with season or market conditions). Thus, the TCMP **REQUESTED** the WPEB and SC to investigate whether fisheries targeting blue shark can be identified from those having blue shark as bycatch. Further, the TCMP **NOTED** that while it is possible to implement different TAC/size limits for different fisheries in the simulation framework, whether this is possible in practice is a management question requiring feedback from managers.

33. The TCMP **NOTED** that although evidence from the Pacific suggested that the post-release mortality for blue shark is considered to be low (survival rate is high after discarding), overall, the discard practice for blue shark is not well understood as there is not enough information or data from discards, and as such the effect of a size limit may not be clear. The TCMP **SUGGESTED** this be discussed further at the WPEB.

34. With regard to management objectives, it was **NOTED** that while yield optimisation (e.g., MSY) is preferable for a target fishery, a bycatch fishery is more suitable to be managed from a conservation perspective. The TCMP further **NOTED** that MSY for blue shark is difficult to determine due to the high uncertainties in the reported catch data, and as such depletion-based target and limit reference points should be considered. The TCMP **AGREED** that regardless of whether blue shark is target or bycatch, it is important to ensure that the fishery operates sustainably.

35. Synthesising these discussions, the TCMP **AGREED** that this is still the early stage of MSE development and therefore it is appropriate to investigate different options, including the proposed MP outputs that combine a TAC and size-based measures. Further, while depletion-based target and limit reference points are worth consideration, it is important to also consider MSY based-approaches such as those based on PGK (probability of being in Kobe Green) to ensure comparable performance metrics with MPs for other IOTC species. Concerns were expressed around the ability of CPCs and Commission to implement and monitor size based measures and

it was **AGREED** that it is important to seek guidance from the WPEB and CPCs involved in blue shark fisheries to provide feedback to the developers on the practicality of the proposed MP outputs (TAC vs. size limit). CPC approaches to management, targeting and discard survival could be discussed further at the WPEB.

## *5.3. Yellowfin tuna*

36. The TCMP **NOTED** the presentation of paper IOTC-2026-TCMP10-06, which provides a summary of progress of MSE for Indian Ocean yellowfin tuna. The TCMP **NOTED** that the paper is complemented by IOTC-2026-TCMP10-INF06, a more detailed report of the current status of the yellowfin tuna MSE, which also which outlines preliminary Operating Models, Candidate Management Procedures and a visualization tool.

37. The TCMP **NOTED** work on yellowfin tuna Management Procedures via MSE resumed in 2024, focusing on building a robust operating model. By 2025-2026, progress included development of OMs, calibrating models to updated CPUE time series and developing visualization tools, with several Candidate MPs now evaluated under a preliminary MSE framework. Results are documented in IOTC-2026-TCMP10-INF06 and were discussed at the MSE Task Force meeting.

38. The TCMP **NOTED** that The MSE timeline extends through 2026–2027 and involves expanding the simulation framework to include a broader set of Operating Models, an Observation Error Model, and Candidate MPs. This work may also feed into a new yellowfin stock assessment planned for 2027, with final CMP review expected by year-end. The goal is to advance sufficiently for the TCMP/Commission to adopt an MP for yellowfin in 2028.

39. The TCMP **NOTED** that ISSF provided initial funding for the new MSE development in 2025 and 2026, but additional resources will be required to complete the work in 2027 and 2028.

40. The TCMP **NOTED** that while progress of the MSE development for yellowfin tuna is a priority and has seen positive progress with the latest stock assessment, the anticipated schedule is very ambitious considering the time taken to complete the MSE for skipjack and bigeye tuna. The TCMP further **NOTED** that yellowfin tuna is an important stock for many CPCs and reasonable participation and understanding by the concerned CPCs in the MSE process is imperative.

41. The TCMP **CONGRATULATED** the development team for the good progress made and **AGREED** that the work be given high priority. The TCMP **NOTED** that some of the issues identified in the early yellowfin assessment (which limited the OM's ability to project forward) had been resolved, allowing the MSE to progress. Some of the uncertainty relating to the CPUE index identified in 2025 was also addressed, and overall the OM was considered suitable, providing a good basis for MP testing. TCMP **AGREED** other uncertainties identified in the assessment may need to be captured in the MSE process for yellowfin.

42. The TCMP **NOTED** that the work at this stage is preliminary and has yet to consider tuning of management objectives, but there is a plan to incorporate tuning at a later stage, with TCMP noting a preference that the approaches considered include the traditional probability of being in the Kobe green zone, presented alongside other approaches considered, for comparison. The TCMP further **NOTED** that adapting the OM based on the stock assessment that will be fully reviewed in 2027 will improve the buy-in from stakeholders. The TCMP **AGREED** it is important for all CPCs to have a good understanding of what the management system would involve early on, to facilitate active participation in discussions on MP selection at a later stage.

43. The TCMP **NOTED** that the other two tropical tuna species (bigeye and skipjack tuna) are already managed under MPs, and once the MP for yellowfin is in place, it will provide the opportunity to evaluate the performance of these MPs in relation to their respective management objectives from a multi-species fisheries perspective.

44. The TCMP **NOTED** that evidence suggested there are potentially substantial catches of yellowfin tuna from non-IOTC members (or non-IOTC vessels) in the Indian Ocean as well as bycatch in fisheries targeting other species, and **AGREED** that it is important to consider these catches in the MSE as well as in stock assessments. The TCMP **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission task the Scientific Committee evaluate the extent of yellowfin catches from non-members and in fisheries not targeting species under the purview of the IOTC, particularly those not already included in the IOTC database, and ensure all sources of mortality and associated uncertainty are included in the evaluation and development of the MP.

45. The TCMP **NOTED** that the visualisation tool developed as part of the project serves to illustrate the trade-offs of MPs between different management objectives and is intended for managers rather than scientists. The

TCMP **NOTED** that if the tool proves to be useful, it can be applied to the MSE for other species as well. The TCMP further **NOTED** that other organisations are also working on similar tools to improve the communication of MSE outcomes.

## *5.4. General issues*

### *5.4.1. MP implementation, actions and regular implementation review*

46. The TCMP **NOTED** that the WPM Chair summarized the status of adopted MPs for skipjack, swordfish, and bigeye. The SKJ MP, adopted in 2024, was run in 2025 and produced TAC advice of 565,745 t/year for 2027–2029 for Commission consideration; no exceptional circumstances were detected. The SWO MP was also adopted in 2024 (corrected in Res 25/7) and run in 2024, but the resulting TAC advice has not yet been implemented as catch limits for 2026–2028, and the SC has recommended this be resolved this year. The BET MP, adopted in 2022, has been run twice (2022 and 2025) to set TACs. The 2024 bigeye catches exceeded the TAC, and the SC has recommended the Commission ensure compliance with the resolution's provisions.

# 6. Future direction of the technical committee on management procedures

## *6.1. Workplan*

### *6.1.1. New Timelines*

47. The TCMP **AGREED** the MSE timeline put together and presented by the WPM Chair, including a detailed workplan on the ALB MSE, which outlines the final stages of the Indian Ocean albacore MSE project for selection and implementation of a Management Procedure.

48. The TCMP **NOTED** that the plan covers the final stages of the Indian Ocean albacore MSE project, envisaged to be split across two years of 2026 and 2027 (or 2027 and 2028 depending on availability of funding) . In 2026, the focus will be on reconditioning and updating the Operating Models with revised catch/CPUE data, completing the MP evaluation and tuning (including robustness tests), and delivering a shortlist of candidate MPs with performance trade-offs to the WPM and SC. In 2027, the focus will shift to selecting a MP for Commission adoption (via WPM(MSE) and TCMP processes) and then implementing it to provide TAC advice, with ongoing review of exceptional circumstances.

49. The TCMP **NOTED** that a WPM supervisory group was proposed to be established that provides feedback to the developers on a shorter cycle than that of the regular WPM meetings. The Technical Supervisory Group will meet regularly (for 1–2 hours) to review progress and advise at key decision points, with composition determined by the IOTC Science Manager and WPM Chair. The group can flag issues to IOTC and the funding agency, and contractual arrangements may be revisited if needed. The whole plan is contingent on 2026 funding being secured.

50. The TCMP **NOTED** that work on the MSE for blue shark has been included in the WPM workplan. The planned MSE need to be rescheduled to 2027 due to the time required for the recruitment of a consultant.

### *6.1.2. Budget and resources needed for technical development*

51. The TCMP **NOTED** that as the MPs for skipjack, swordfish and bigeye tuna have been adopted, there are no imminent funding needs to address outstanding issues.

52. The TCMP **NOTED** that the ongoing/new work on the blue shark and yellowfin MSE have been included in the WPM program of work, so funding needs to be allocated for these upcoming activities in 2027/2028. The TCMP further **NOTED** that the funding is also required in order to continue the activities for albacore in 2027.

53. The **TCMP RECOGNIZED** that the continued development of Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) for IOTC species, particularly for yellowfin and albacore tuna, is essential to support robust, science-based, precautionary, and sustainable fisheries management procedures. The **TCMP NOTED** that the MSE work represents one of the key achievements and areas of progress within the IOTC. Therefore, the **TCMP RECOMMENDED** the Commission to secure adequate, stable, and long-term funding to ensure the continuity of technical work, maintain scientific progress, and deliver reliable management procedures for albacore and yellowfin in a timely manner.

#### *6.1.3. External review*

54. The TCMP **NOTED** an external review of bigeye tuna was completed in 2025, with recommendations presented to the SC in 2025. An inconsistency in Resolution 22/03 on Bigeye MP was identified by the external review but requires no immediate amendment at this stage.

### *6.2. Priorities*

55. The TCMP **NOTED** the WPM work plan to priorities are to continue the MSE for blue shark, yellowfin tuna, and albacore. The WPM's focus for October 2026 will be MSE development for these species, review of exceptional circumstances for all MP-managed species, and two SKJ-related work requests from the Commission (paragraphs 16–17 of Res 25/03).

### *6.3. Process and future meetings of TCMP*

56. The TCMP **NOTED** that Resolution 25/10 provides an amendment to the Resolution 16/09 that would allow TCMP meetings to be held, when appropriate, intersessionally and online. Under that arrangement, TCMP considered that in any given year, the Commission would (under advice of the SC Chair) indicate its preferred date and nature (online or in person) of the following years TCMP. It would also allow for the SC (following the Commission) to request a change to the Commissions suggested approach if SC discussions identified subsequent circumstances associated with development and review of MPs that warranted such a change.

57. The TCMP further **NOTED** that a small working group under the Commission is considering possible changes to the arrangement of future TCMP meetings, which will be discussed at the upcoming Commission meeting.

## 7. Adoption of the Report

58. The report of the 10th IOTC Technical Committee on Management Procedures meeting (IOTC-2026-TCMP10-R) was **ADOPTED** on 11 May 2026

# APPENDIX I
# LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**Chairpersons**
Mr Sylvain Bonhommeau
IFREMER
sylvain.bonhommeau@ifremer.fr

Mr Adam Ziyad
Ministry of Fisheries, Agriculture and Ocean Resources
adam.ziyad@fishagriocean.gov.mv

**AUSTRALIA**
**Head of Delegation**
Mr Patrick Sachs
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
Patrick.Sachs@aff.gov.au

**Advisor(s)**
Ms Selina Stoute
Australian Fisheries Management Authority
Selina.stoute@afma.gov.au

Mr Don Bromhead
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
Don.bromhead@aff.gov.au

Ms Lakshmi Gudipati
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
Lakshmi.Gudipati@aff.gov.au

Dr Ashley Williams
Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation
Ashley.Williams@csiro.au

Ms Ann Preece
Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation
ann.preece@csiro.au

Mr Terry Romaro Oam
Ship Agencies Australia
terry@saa.com.au

Mr Kim Newbold
Hawkness Pty Ltd
knewbold@wn.com.au

Mr Alan Gray
Tasmanian Seafoods Pty Ltd
tankgray@bigpond.co

**BANGLADESH**
**Head of Delegation**
Mr Abdullah Al-Mamun
Department of Fisheries
mamunbau09@yahoo.com

**Advisor (s)**
Mr Tanvir Chowdhury
Department of Fisheries
tanvir_h1998@yahoo.com

**CHINA**
**Advisor(s)**
Mr Xiaobing Liu
Shanghai Ocean University
xiaobing.liu@hotmail.com

Mr Jiangfeng Zhu
Shanghai Ocean University
jfzhu@shou.edu.cn

Ms Na Zhang
Shanghai Ocean University
nazhang66@126.com
Mr Yan Li
Shanghai Ocean University
liyancnfj@outlook.com

Mr Ce Li
China Overseas Fisheries Association
liuce@cofa.net.cn

**COMOROS**
Absent

**EUROPEAN UNION**
**Head of the Delegation**
Marco Valletta DG MARE, B2
marco.valletta@ec.europa.eu

**Alternate**
Stamatis Varsamos
DG MARE, B2
Stamatios.VARSAMOS@ec.europa.eu

**Advisor(s)**
Benoît Marcoux
DG MARE, B2
benoit.marcoux@ec.europa.eu

Ms Jessica Demblon
DG MARE, B2
jessica.demblon@ec.europa.eu

Mr Gorka Merino
AZTI
gmerino@azti.es

Mr David Nordlund Sierra
Spanish Administration
dpnordlund@mapa.es

Mr José Carlos Baez
Spanish Scientific Institute
josecarlos.baez@ieo.csic.es

Ms Juliette HAZIZA
DGAMPA
juliette.haziza@mer.gouv.fr

**FRANCE(OT)**
**Head of Delegation**
Ms Lucie Orozco
Ministère de la Mer et de la Pêche
lucie.orozco@mer.gouv.fr

**Alternate**
Mr Francis Marsac
IRD
Francis.marsac@ird.fr

**INDIA**
Absent

**INDONESIA**
**Head of Delegation**
Ms Putuh Suadela
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
putuhsuadela@gmail.com

**Alternate**
Ms Riana Handayani
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
daya139@yahoo.co.id

**Advisor(s)**
Mr Indra Jaya
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
indrajaya123@gmail.com

Mr Irwan Jatmiko
National Research and Innovation Agency
irwan.jatmiko@gmail.com

**IRAN**
**Absent**

**JAPAN**
**Head of Delegation**
Mr Taaki Suzuki
Japan Fisheries Agency
takaaki_suzuki620@maff.go.jp

**Alternate**
Ms Chika Fukugama
Japan Fisheries Agency
chika_fukugama740@maff.go.jp

**Advisor(s)**
Ms Yuka Matsuzawa
Japan Fisheries Agency
yuka_matsuzawa450@maff.go.jp

Ms Saki Masunaka
Japan Fisheries Agency
saki_masunaka380@maff.go.jp

Mr Toshihide Kitakado
Tokyo University of Marine Science and Technology
kitakado@kaiyodai.ac.jp

Mr Kiyoshi Katsuyama
Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative Association
david.vilon@gmail.com

Mr Hiroyuki Yoshida
Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative Association
yoshida@japantuna.or.jp

**KENYA**
**Advisor(s)**
Mr Stephen Ndegwa
State Department for the Blue Economy and Fisheries
ndegwafish@gmail.com

**KOREA**
**Head of Delegation**
Mr Ilkang Na
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
ikna@korea.kr

**Alternate**
Mr Deokjin Kim
Fisheries Monitoring Center
fmc2014@korea.kr

**MADAGASCAR**
**Head of Delegation**
Mr Mahefa Randriamiarisoa
Ministère de la Pêche et de l'Economie Bleue
sgpt.dp.mrhp@gmail.com

**Alternate**
Mr Marolova Rasolomampionona
Ministère de la Pêche et de l'Economie Bleue
lovastat.mrhp@gmail.com

**MALAYSIA**
**Alternate**
Mr Muhammad Shakirin bin Suhaimi
Department of Fisheries
muhammadshakirin@dof.gov.my

**MALDIVES**
**Head of Delegation**
Mr Hussain Sinan
Ministry of Fisheries, Agriculture and Ocean Resources
hussain.sinan@fishagriocean.gov.mv

**Alternate**
Ms Maleeha Haleem
Ministry of Fisheries, Agriculture and Ocean Resources
maleeha.haleem@fishagriocean.gov.mv

**Advisor(s)**
Mr Mohamed Shimal
Maldives Marine Research Institute
mohamed.shimal@mmri.gov.mv

Mr Adam Ziyad
Ministry of Fisheries, Agriculture and Ocean Resources
adam.ziyad@fishagriocean.gov.mv

Ms Mariyam Midhfa Naeem
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
midhfa@foreign.gov.mv

Ms Munshidha Ibrahim
Ministry of Fisheries, Agriculture and Ocean Resources
munshidha.ibrahim@fishagriocean.gov.mv

Ms Hawwa Raufath Nizar
Ministry of Fisheries, Agriculture and Ocean Resources
hawwa.raufath@fishagriocean.gov.mv

Ms Aishath Sarah Hashim
Ministry of Fisheries, Agriculture and Ocean Resources
sarah.hashim@fishagriocean.gov.mv

Mr Mohamed Alif Arif
Ministry of Fisheries, Agriculture and Ocean Resources
mohamed.alif@fishagriocean.gov.mv

Ms Shifana Wafeer
Ministry of Fisheries, Agriculture and Ocean Resources
shifana.wafeer@fishagriocean.gov.mv

Ms Fathimath Mirusha Thaufeeq
Ministry of Fisheries, Agriculture and Ocean Resources
fathimath.mirusha@fishagriocean.gov.mv

Mr Ahmed Shifaz
Ministry of Fisheries, Agriculture and Ocean Resources
ahmed.shifaz@fishagriocean.gov.mv

**MAURITIUS**
**Advisor(s)**
Ms Hanista Jhummun-Foolhea
Ministry of Agro-Industry, Food Security Blue Economy and Fisheries
hanistajhumun@gmail.com

**MOZAMBIQUE**
**Head of Delegation**
Ms Lucinda Mangue
Ministry of Agriculture, Environment and Fisheries
lucindamangue@gmail.com

**Alternate**
Mr Rui Mutombene
Ministry of Agriculture, Environment and Fisheries
ruimutombene@gmail.com

**Advisor(s)**
Mr Avelino Munwane
Ministry of Agriculture, Environment and Fisheries
avelinomunwane@gmail.com

**OMAN**
**Head of Delegation**
Mr AbdulAziz Al Marzouqi
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Water Resources
aa.almarzouqi@ymail.com

**Advisor(s)**
Ms Ruwida Al Siabi
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Water Resources
ruwidaalsiyabi@gmail.com
Mr Jose Ramon Gallardo
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Water Resources
ramon@g-gallardolegal.eu

Mr Al-Muatasam Al-Habsi
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Water Resources
muatasim4@hotmail.com

**PAKISTAN**
**Advisor (s)**
Mr Syed Adeel Hassan
Ministry of Maritime Affairs
adeel.mfd@gmail.com

**PHILIPPINES**
**Head of Delegation**
Ms Jennifer G. Viron
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
jennyviron@bfar.da.gov.ph

**Advisor(s)**
Mr Benjamin Felipe S. Tabios Jr.
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
benjotabios@gmail.com

**SEYCHELLES**
**Head of Delegation**
Mr Vincent Lucas
Seychelles Fisheries Authority
vlucas@sfa.sc

**Advisor(s)**
Mr Yannick Roucou
Seychelles Fisheries Authority
Yroucou@sfa.sc

**SOMALIA**
Absent

**SOUTH AFRICA**
**Head of Delegation**
Mr Qayiso Mketsu
Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
QMketsu@dffe.gov.za

**Alternate**
Mr Sigam Sindisa
Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
ssigam@dffe.gov.za

**Advisor(s)**
Ms Mamaila Buyekezwa
Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment
BMamaila@dffe.gov.za

**SRI LANKA**
**Head of Delegation**
Mr B.D. Aberathne
Department of Fisheries & Aquatic Resources
buddhikamgt@gmail.com

**Alternate**
Mr T.M.D.T Peiris
Department of Fisheries & Aquatic Resources
dineshdfar@gmail.com

**Advisor(s)**
Mr H.N.N Wijethunga
Department of Fisheries & Aquatic Resources
hnnswijethunga@gmail.com

**SUDAN**
Absent

**TANZANIA (UNITED REP. OF)**
**Head of Delegation**
Mr Zahor El Kharousy
The Ministry of Blue Economy and Fisheries – Zanzibar
zahor1m@hotmail.com

**Advisor(s)**
Mr Mathew O. Silas
Deep Sea Fishing Authority
mathew.silas@dsfa.go.tz

Ms Tumu A. Mussa
Deep Sea Fishing Authority
tumu.mussa@dsfa.go.tz

Mr Peter S. Peter
Deep Sea Fishing Authority
peter.peter@dsfa.go.tz

**THAILAND**
**Head of Delegation**
Ms Sansanee Srichanngam
Department of Fisheries
srichanngams@yahoo.com

**Alternate**
Ms Chonticha Kumyoo
Department of Fisheries
chonticha.dof@gmail.com

**Advisor(s)**
Ms Prompan Hiranmongkolrat
Department of Fisheries
prompan.hiranmongkolrat@gmail.com

Mr Jirachai Leelarojana
Department of Fisheries
jirachai.dof@gmail.com

**UNITED KINGDOM**
**Advisor(s)**

Mr James Clark
MRAG
j.clark@mrag.co.uk

**YEMEN**
**Head of Delegation**
Mr Ghazi Lahmar
Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Fish Wealth
G.lahmer@yahoo.com

**Alternate**
Mr Mohammed Abdullah
Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Fish Wealth
mohammed.hitari@undp.org

**Advisor(s)**
Mr Mahmood Ba-Habib
Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Fish Wealth
mahudbahabeeb@maif-ye.com
Mr Shiham Adam
Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Fish Wealth
mshiham.adam@gmail.com

**COOPERATING NON-CONTRACTING PARTIES (CNCP)**

Absent

**INVITED EXPERTS**

Mr Yu Chen
chenyu@ms1.fa.gov.tw

Mr Ken Chien-Nan Lin
chiennan@ms1.fa.gov.tw

Mr Wen-Pei Tsai
wptsai@nkust.edu.tw

Mr Po-Hsiang Liao
liao.p.hsiang@gmail.com

Mr Sheng-Ping Wang
wsp@mail.ntou.edu.tw

**OBSERVERS**

**GLOBAL FISHING WATCH**
Ms Brianna Elliott
brianna.elliott@globalfishingwatch.org

**INTERNATIONAL SEAFOOD SUSTAINABILITY FOUNDATION (ISSF)**
Mr Hilario Murua
hmurua@iss-foundation.org

**SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES AND COMMUNITIES TRUST (SFACT)**

Mr Valentin Schatz
v.j.schatz@gmail.com

**THE PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS (PEW)**
Mr Glen Holmes
gholmes@pewtrusts.org

**IOTC CONSULTANT**

Mr Charles Edwards
cescapecs@gmail.com

Mr Quentin Hanich
hanich@uow.edu.au

Mr Iago Mosqueira
iago.mosqueira@wur.n

**IOTC SECRETARIAT**

Mr Paul De Bruyn
Paul.Debruyn@fao.org

Mr Dan Fu
Dan.Fu@fao.org

Mr Howard Whalley
Howard.Whalley@fao.org

Ms Mirose Govinden
Mirose.Govinden@fao.org

**INTERPRETERS**

Mr Guillaume Fleury
gfleury_sg@yahoo.com.sg

Ms Carol Isoux
carolisoux@yahoo.fr

Mr Mahigan Lepage
mahiganlepage@gmail.com

Ms Nathalie Pasquier
npasquier1@yahoo.com

# APPENDIX II
# AGENDA FOR THE 10TH IOTC TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ON MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE

**Date: 9 May 2026**

**Location: Male, Maldives (Hybrid)**

**Co-Chairs: Mr Adam Ziyad (Commission Chair) and Dr Sylvain Bonhommeau (SC Chair)**

1. **OPENING OF THE SESSION AND ARRANGEMENTS** (Co-Chairs)

2. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION** (Co-Chairs)

3. **ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS** (Co-Chairs)

4. **DECISIONS OF THE COMMISSION RELATED TO THE WORK OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ON MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES** (IOTC Secretariat)
   - 4.1 Outcomes of the 9th Session of TCMP

5. **INTRODUCTION TO MSE AND PRESENTATION OF MSE RESULTS**

6 **STATUS OF THE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY EVALUATION/MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES AND ACTIONS NEEDED FOR ADOPTION/IMPLEMENTATION** (Developers)
   - 6.1 Albacore tuna
   - 6.2 Blue shark
   - 6.3 Yellowfin tuna
   - 6.4 General Issues
     - 6.4.1 MP implementation, actions and regular implementation review

7 **FUTURE DIRECTION OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ON MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES** (Co-Chairs)
   - 7.1 Workplan
     - 7.1.1 New timelines
     - 7.1.2 Budget and resources needed for technical developments
     - 7.1.3 External review
   - 7.2 Priorities
   - 7.3 Process and future meetings of TCMP

8 **ADOPTION OF REPORT** (Co-chairs)

# APPENDIX III

## LIST OF DOCUMENTS

| Document | Title |
|---|---|
| IOTC-2026-TCMP10-01a | Draft: Agenda of the 10th Technical Committee on Management Procedure Meeting |
| IOTC-2026-TCMP10-01b | Draft: Annotated agenda of the 10th Technical Committee on Management Procedure Meeting |
| IOTC-2026-TCMP10-02 | Draft: List of documents of the 10th Technical Committee on Management Procedure Meeting |
| IOTC-2026-TCMP10-03 | Outcomes of the 9th Technical Committee on Management Procedure |
| IOTC-2026-TCMP10-04 | Progress of the Indian ocean albacore tuna MSE (IOTC Secretariat) |
| IOTC-2026-TCMP10-05 | Progress of the Indian ocean blue shark MSE (IOTC Secretariat) |
| IOTC-2026-TCMP10-06 | Progress of the Indian ocean yellowfin tuna MSE (Merino G) |
| IOTC-2026-TCMP10-INF01 | IOTC MSE Handout |
| IOTC-2026-TCMP10-INF02 | Report of the 17th Session of the IOTC Working Party on Methods (Management Strategy Evaluation Task Force) |
| IOTC-2026-TCMP10-INF04 | Technical development of Management Strategy Evaluation for Indian ocean albacore tuna: 2025 progress report and current status (Mosqueira I, Hillary R) |
| IOTC-2026-TCMP10-INF05 | Potential for a blue shark management procedure in the Indian Ocean (Edwards C) |
| IOTC-2026-TCMP10-INF06 | Management Strategy Evaluation for Indian Ocean yellowfin tuna: Operating Model and Candidate Management Procedures (Urtizberea A, Correa G, Merino G) |