



**Virtual Meeting 6 of ROP-IWG**  
20 June 2025 10:00h – 14:00h (Pohnpei time)

---

**Chair's Summary Report**

---

WCPFC-ROPIWG6-2025

**Issued:** 25 June 2025

---

**Agenda Item 1: Opening of Meeting**

1. The sixth meeting of the WCPFC Regional Observer Programme Intersessional Working Group (ROP-IWG6) was held virtually on 20 June 2025. The Chair, Mr. Lucas Tarapik, welcomed all participants and opened the meeting at 10:00am Pohnpei time. The delegate from Fiji offered an opening prayer.
2. The Chair expressed appreciation to all participants for their continued engagement and support of ROP-IWG's activities. He noted that this virtual meeting builds upon the productive discussions held during the April session. The papers prepared for this meeting, which were posted in early June, reflect those earlier discussions and are presented for participants' feedback and further deliberation.
3. The Chair introduced the agenda, and it was adopted without amendment (**Attachment 1**).
4. Participants in ROP-IWG6 included representatives from Canada, China, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Japan, Kiribati, Republic of Korea, Republic of Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Tuvalu and United States, Vanuatu, El Salvador, Pacific Community, Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency, Parties to the Nauru Agreement Office, Pew Charitable Trusts and the Secretariat. A list of participants is provided in Attachment 2.
5. Participants were invited to provide opening remarks. There were no opening remarks from participants. The Chair confirmed that a Chairs Summary Report would be prepared to record the key outcomes and next steps.

---

**Agenda Item 2: CCFS Process Flow from Observer Provider to WCPFC**

6. The Chair introduced [Working Paper 1](#) *Observer Provider – Commission CCFS process flow Discussion Paper (WCPFC-ROP-IWG06-2025-01, dated 4 June 2025)*, which builds on the discussions from ROP-IWG5 and responds to the Commission's tasking from WCPFC21 to review the pre-notification process under the Compliance Case File System (CCFS) adopted at WCPFC12. The Chair recalled that the purpose of the review is to support the development of a more effective and standardised approach for using ROP data within the CCFS, with particular emphasis on earlier and clearer notification of potential alleged infringements.

7. The Chair noted that *Working Paper 1* outlines three categories of potential infringements based on observer data: (i) Observer Obstruction and Safety Events, (ii) other potential infringements where modified Observer Trip Monitoring Summary data could support observer provider-led notification, and (iii) a residual group of cases that require Secretariat review due to data limitations. A schematic included in the paper illustrates a potential enhanced process flow. Participants were invited to consider whether observer providers could assume a greater role in triaging and notifying certain types of cases. The Chair further explained that *Working Paper 1* proposes amendments to the pre-notification process adopted at WCPFC12. It presents a revised process flow for the development of compliance case files based on ROP-sourced data.

8. **Points raised during the discussion included:**

- Support for the overall direction of the proposed revisions, particularly the incorporation of debriefing and national compliance evaluation into the pre-notification process, to improve the evidentiary basis of potential infringement notifications.
- The need for careful consideration of the application of Article 25(2) of the Convention. Some participants questioned whether all observer-sourced cases should be treated the same as cases arising from high seas boarding and inspection or port State measures, particularly given that observers may not be able to collect equivalent levels of evidence (e.g., photographic or video documentation).
- The importance of timely notification to flag States to allow meaningful investigations, and concern that current delays in the transmission of observer-derived data limit the effectiveness of follow-up actions.
- Support for integrating observer debriefing, data verification, and compliance evaluation into a unified step prior to the submission of information to the CCFS, as a way to streamline the process and avoid duplication.
- A proposal that early notification should encompass not only well-known categories such as obstruction or pollution, but also other issues such as potential infringements identified from set details, observer safety concerns, or incidents involving Species of Special Interest.
- Clarification was sought on whether the full observer report would be transmitted through the revised data flow. Participants noted that the observer report remains a key reference document for initiating investigations and requested that its role be clearly reflected in the process diagram.
- A suggestion to improve the readability and utility of observer evidence within the CCFS, including clearer formatting of observer records and linking the same evidence to all related case entries.
- The value of introducing feedback mechanisms within the CCFS, enabling observer providers to view or comment on the outcomes of flag State investigations and receive timely notifications on case developments.

9. The Secretariat welcomed the engagement on the working paper and noted that the schematic had not pre-determined which documents would be transmitted, including whether full observer reports would be shared. It was clarified that further discussion under Agenda Item 3—on minimum standard data fields and monitoring summaries—would help inform these decisions. The Secretariat also acknowledged the feedback relating to the need for training and financial support for observer providers to meet future expectations under a revised process.
10. The Chair thanked all participants for their contributions and noted that the views expressed would be considered in refining the process flow and supporting materials for future ROP-IWG discussions.

11. In summary, the Chair noted that ROP-IWG participants were invited to provide written feedback on the proposed observer CCFS process flow and category groupings of potential infringements during the intersessional period. This input will inform preparation of a revised draft proposal to be considered ahead of SC21, with the objective of developing a standardised CCFS notification process for recommendation to TCC21 and WCPFC22.

### Agenda Item 3. Improving the WCPFC Minimum Standard Data Fields (MSDFs) for observer monitoring on purse seine, longline and pole and line vessels

12. The Chair noted that the Regional Observer Programme (ROP) was established under Article 28 of the Convention to collect verified catch data, scientific data, and additional information from the Convention Area, and to monitor the implementation of conservation and management measures (CMMs) adopted by the Commission. The ROP had at its core the collection of independent, verified data at sea, which was critical not only for scientific purposes but also for supporting compliance monitoring.
13. Since 2016, ROP data had been used as an independently collected source within the Compliance Case File System (CCFS), and this is considered by TCC including as part of the WCPFC Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMS). The CCFS is maintained by the Secretariat as a secure, searchable platform designed to assist CCMs in tracking alleged violations by their flagged vessels, in accordance with CMM 2023-04.
14. The Chair noted that [Working Paper 2 Consolidated document presenting current suggested amendments to the MSDFs \(WCPFC-ROP-IWG06-2025-02, dated 4 June 2025\)](#) was tabled for reference, and was updated to take into account the discussions at ROP-IWG5 and the feedback from two CCMs during the intersessional period. The Chair explained that discussions of the MSDFs at ROP-IWG06 will be focused on the two supplementary papers which will be discussed under Agenda 3.1 and Agenda 3.2 respectively.

#### 3.1 Consider scope of refinements to the ROP MSDFs, including Observer Trip Monitoring Summary, to support identification of potential alleged infringements of CMM obligations

15. The Chair presented [Working Paper 2 Supplement 1 Scope of Potential Infringements for WCPFC CCFS Cases \(WCPFC-ROP-IWG06-2025-02\\_suppl1, dated 4 June 2025\)](#), which outlines a set of CMM-related obligations for which observers could collect data that may support

the identification of potential alleged infringements. The paper provided a structured table of grouped CMM obligations that could potentially be monitored by observers: observer obstruction, marine pollution, driftnet use, interactions with Species of Special Interest (e.g., cetaceans, whale sharks, seabirds, sea turtles, mobulid rays), and gear-specific closures (i.e. FAD closures). The table provides commentary on scientific monitoring needs and potential compliance issues that observer data could be used to support. Participants were invited to provide input on priority topics, data collection levels (trip-level vs. set-level), and specific refinements needed to the existing MSDFs or the Observer Trip Monitoring Summary.

16. The Chair invited members to review the existing ROP Minimum Standard Data Fields (MSDFs), and to consider suggestions of areas where refinements to the MSDFs and Observer Trip Monitoring Summary may be needed, to support the identification of potential alleged infringements of CMM obligations.

**17. Points raised during the discussion included:**

- Support for simplifying and prioritizing the Observer Trip Monitoring Summary by focusing on clearly verifiable infringements, while avoiding an overly lengthy checklist that might increase the burden on observers. It was suggested that yes/no indicators be considered as an initial step for certain obligations.
- Reservations about incorporating non-binding or “encouraged” provisions from CMMs into the MSDFs, with concerns that these may create implementation challenges for CCMs lacking domestic regulation in those areas. One participant proposed that CMM 2017-04 04-05 be excluded from the table.
- Questions were raised about the practicality of observers verifying technical obligations, such as tori line specifications or bycatch mitigation measures, noting that some determinations might be too complex for individual observers without additional tools or team-based inspection.
- Several participants indicated that questions related to observer obstruction, marine pollution, and fishing on data buoys should be retained or handled at the debriefing stage, rather than formalized as required fields in the Observer Trip Monitoring Summary.
- A suggestion was made to make key materials such as the FAD closure measure publicly available and distributed to observer providers in advance of observer placements, to improve awareness and reporting accuracy.
- It was noted that some fields already covered in other ROP forms (e.g., sighting time for Species of Special Interest in the PS-3 form) may not need duplication in the Observer Trip Monitoring Summary.
- Concern was expressed about placing too much emphasis on asking observers or debriefers to interpret obligations or to as subjective matters such as the intent of a vessels crew, and it was recommended that data fields be limited to those that observers are clearly trained to record or ‘monitor’ which do not require interpretation.

18. The Secretariat acknowledged the feedback and clarified that the ongoing review of the Minimum Standard Data Fields (MSDFs) is intended to address issues that have emerged in the use of ROP data within the Compliance Case File System (CCFS). It was noted that

several years have passed since the MSDFs were initially developed, and a table was prepared in recognition that a review of the alignment of observer data to CMM obligations is timely to support the ROP-IWGs consideration of where refinements to the MSDFs may be needed. The overarching objective is to ensure that observer data can effectively meet the purpose in Article 28 of the Convention, to support the monitoring of the implementation of the various Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs) adopted by the Commission.

19. The Chair welcomed the intervention and encouraged members to provide written submissions for any additional comments. He noted that further work on refining the MSDFs should ideally occur ahead of the Scientific Committee meeting to ensure alignment between science and compliance needs. The Chair confirmed that members' comments would be considered at the next stage of the review.

20. In summary, the Chair noted that participants were encouraged to consider the table and provide written feedback during the intersessional period. This input would support the development of proposed amendments to the MSDFs, with the aim of progressing refinements ahead of **SC21**, particularly to support improved use of observer data in the CCFS.

### 3.2 Review subset list of data fields that are recommended for removal from ROP MSDFs

21. The Chair handed over to the Secretariat's ROP Training and Audit Consultant, Mr Karl Staisch, who introduced [Working Paper 2 Supplement 2](#) *Current list of MSDF Data Fields that appear to have support for Removal (WCPFC-ROP-IWG06-02\_suppl2, dated 4 June 2025)*, presenting a subset of ROP Minimum Standard Data Fields (MSDFs) proposed for removal. These fields had been identified through prior ROP-IWG discussions and intersessional feedback as having limited compliance or scientific utility, particularly in light of increased use of electronic reporting. The Secretariat noted that the paper consolidated those fields for which no objections had been raised and where participants had previously expressed support for deletion. The aim was to streamline the MSDF list and remove outdated or redundant fields.

#### 22. Points raised during the discussion included:

- General support was expressed for the removal of many of the listed fields, noting that doing so would help simplify ongoing work on the MSDF review.
- An indication that there were other MSDFs where removal is also being considered, subject to additional information being provided on the scientific monitoring needs for the data, and a request that the overall list for removals is not finalised at this stage.
- Reservations were made regarding the removal of certain fields related to crew information, particularly those identifying the captain or person in charge. It was noted that these fields are considered important for compliance and observer safety purposes. In response the Secretariat clarified that key details, such as the captain's name and nationality, would continue to be collected. The proposed removal only related to requiring observers to verify such information using personal documents like passports.

- It was suggested that the intent of each field and its use in compliance or verification contexts should be clearly communicated in future revisions to avoid confusion.
  - It was recognised that some fields would require further consideration before a recommendation could be finalised.
23. The Chair acknowledged that while many of the proposed deletions had broad support, some fields required additional review. It was agreed that ROP-IWG would proceed with a preliminary recommendation to remove the subset of fields for which there was general agreement. The decision on the two crew-related data fields would be deferred. The Chair confirmed that in any case the full package of MSDF revisions will continue to be developed for review at a future ROP-IWG meeting, with the aim of finalising recommendations for SC21 and TCC21.
24. In summary, the Chair noted that at ROP-IWG6 participants preliminarily agreed to recommend that the list of data fields in Attachment 3 is removed from the list of WCPFC ROP Minimum Standard Data Fields.

### 3.3 Discuss the next steps for review and refinement of ROP MSDFs, including implementation considerations

25. The Chair opened a discussion on implementation considerations associated with proposed changes to the MSDFs. It was noted that adjustments to data collection systems, including observer forms and electronic reporting templates, would require sufficient lead time, resourcing, and coordination. Further considerations include observer training, updates to documentation, and the need for transitional support for observer programmes to align with revised data requirements.
26. The Secretariat emphasised that implementation of any revised MSDFs would require careful planning and potentially additional resourcing to support observer programmes and compliance teams. Linkages with ongoing updates to the Compliance Case File System (CCFS) and coordination with SPC were also noted as important.
27. No comments were received from participants during the meeting. The Chair acknowledged that participants had likely provided their main feedback during earlier agenda items and encouraged further intersessional input to inform finalisation of proposals.
28. The Chair confirmed that the Working Group would revisit this agenda item at its next meeting, with a view to refining recommendations for SC21 and TCC21 consideration as part of a consolidated MSDF and CCFS package.

29. In summary, the Chair noted that as a next step, ROP-IWG participants were encouraged to consider the implementation related matters arising from changes to the MSDFs and the observer-CCFS process flow, and to provide written feedback during the intersessional period.

Agenda Item 4: Consider whether new ROP minimum data fields related to non-fish transfers could support monitoring of at-sea transshipment activities

30. The Chair introduced [Working Paper 3 Consideration of Non-Fish Transfers \(WCPFC-ROP-IWG06-2025-03, dated 4 June 2025\)](#), which responds to a task from WCPFC21 for the ROP-IWG to consider whether observer reporting on non-fish transfers during at-sea transshipment activities could be supported through new minimum data fields. The Chair recalled that this topic had also been raised during previous reviews of the transshipment CMM ([CMM 2009-06](#)), where participants acknowledged challenges in detecting and verifying non-catch events such as fuel, bait, and supply transfers between vessels.
31. The WCPFC Deputy Compliance Manager, Eidre Sharp, provided an overview of the information previously submitted to the Transshipment IWG and WCPFC21, including examples of how other tuna RFMOs define and monitor such events (e.g. IOTC and ICCAT's use of "supply services" and NPFC's definition of "other transfer activities"). Participants were invited to consider the types of data fields and observer instructions that might be needed to support future reporting of non-fish transfers, should such reporting requirements be introduced by the Commission.
32. The Secretariat clarified that the objective of the paper presented was to gather feedback from members on the potential scope of such reporting and any related data fields that could be incorporated into the observer [MSDFs for monitoring transshipment activities](#). The paper included the outcomes of an RFMO survey and a summary of points raised during previous working group discussions. No specific recommendation was proposed, and members were invited to offer views to help shape a clearer proposal for future consideration.
33. **Points raised during the discussion included:**
- There was strong caution expressed about the potential reporting burden that could arise from requiring detailed observer reporting of non-fish transfers. Reference was made to the experience of the NPFC, where flag States and the Secretariat reportedly had to manage over 5,000 such records annually.
  - Some participants suggested that observer reporting should be limited to noting that a non-fish transfer event occurred, including identification of the two vessels involved, without recording further details about the type of supplies or personnel exchanged.
  - Clarification was sought and received from the Secretariat that the current discussion focused specifically on observer MSDFs. It was confirmed that under the minimalist approach adopted by NPFC, it would be sufficient for observers to identify that a non-fish transfer occurred, and which vessels were involved, without providing detailed inventory of items exchanged.
  - It was recommended that observers simply mark the occurrence of non-fish transfers during their deployments to distinguish such events from regular fish transshipments, thereby supporting compliance oversight without overburdening data collection.
  - A view was expressed that, in light of increasing trafficking and other illicit activities in Pacific fisheries, observers should be required to record all transfers taking

place—similar to current requirements during purse seine and longline observer trips. This would contribute to broader monitoring and enforcement objectives in the region.

34. The Chair thanked the Secretariat for its presentation and acknowledged the interventions made. Members were encouraged to provide any further written feedback to support the ongoing development of the working paper.

35. In summary, the Chair noted that as a next step, ROP-IWG participants were encouraged to provide written feedback during the intersessional period to support the ongoing development of the working paper.

## Agenda Item 5: Update of ROP-IWG workplan and confirmation of priorities for 2025

### Review of ROP-IWG workplan 2023 - 2025

36. The Chair introduced the agenda item by referring to the ROP-IWG workplan and emphasising the importance of continuing progress on the priority tasks identified for 2023–2025 ([Working Paper 4](#)). These include: the review of the CCFS pre-notification process; refinement of ROP Minimum Standard Data Fields (MSDFs); and development of implementation pathways to support improved use of observer data in the Compliance Case File System (CCFS).
37. The Chair noted that updates on the work of the ROP-IWG would be provided to SC21 and TCC21. A further virtual meeting is proposed for late July 2025, with the aim of finalising a proposal paper based on the discussions and feedback from ROP-IWG5 and ROP-IWG6. Participants were invited to comment on the timing of this meeting and propose any additions to the workplan for 2026.
38. The Chair summarised progress made across the current priority workstreams:
- **Integration of ROP data into the CCFS and CMS processes:** This remains a core priority following recommendations from TCC20. The working group reviewed relevant proposals and documentation at ROP-IWG5 and ROP-IWG6. Refinement of the pre-notification process is ongoing, with the aim of finalising recommendations ahead of SC21 and TCC21.
  - **Species of Special Interest (SSI) data fields:** Work on this item, carried forward from previous years, has progressed through review of relevant proposals and documentation. Final proposals are expected to be ready for SC21 and TCC21 consideration.
  - **Development of a standard and procedures for utilising ROP data:** This workstream is being developed alongside CCFS and SSI-related work, with a view to improving consistency in the application of observer data for both compliance and scientific processes.
  - **Removal of redundant ROP minimum standard data fields:** The working group reviewed data fields considered outdated or no longer necessary. A list of deletions



was proposed, and discussions indicated general support, though some fields may require further consideration. The revised list will be finalised for submission to SC21 and TCC21.

- **Observer reporting of non-fish transfers:** This tasking, introduced by the Commission, was discussed at ROP-IWG5 and further considered at this meeting. Feedback received will inform the development of a refined proposal paper for review by SC21 and TCC21.
39. The Chair also noted a potential tasking for 2026 concerning emerging technologies. It was proposed that work begin on developing a shared understanding of the application of ROP MSDFs in electronic monitoring, in coordination with the ER and EM-IWG.
40. No comments were raised during the discussion. The Chair interpreted this as general support for the summary that was presented on the progress made to date. It was noted that ROP-IWG would aim to finalise the workplan, and the matters discussed under Agenda 2 and Agenda 3 as much as possible prior to SC21.

#### Next steps in 2025

41. The Chair reviewed the upcoming timeline for ROP-IWG follow-up work, noting key milestones including:
- **24 June 2025:** Indicative deadline for abstract and title of papers to the Scientific Committee (SC21);
  - **14 July 2025:** indicative deadline for full paper submission to the Scientific Committee (SC21)
  - **Mid-August 2025:** Approximate paper deadline for TCC21;
  - **End of September 2025:** TCC21 hybrid meeting of ROP-IWG scheduled to be held in Pohnpei;
  - **November 2025:** Targeted timeframe for finalising the ROP-IWG update and recommendations for WCPFC21.
42. Participants discussed the possibility of holding a third ROP-IWG meeting prior to SC21. Members noted competing commitments, including the FFA/SPC Data Collection Committee (7–10 July), the IATTC and WCPFC-NC Joint Working Group on Pacific Bluefin Tuna (9–12 July), and the Northern Committee meeting (14–15 July), which constrained scheduling options.
43. Several members, highlighted the challenges of convening a meeting during this busy period and proposed progressing work via written correspondence. There was general agreement that members would submit written comments and feedback by a date to be confirmed in the Chair's Summary Report, **with 13 July 2025** suggested as a potential deadline.
44. It was agreed that the Secretariat would update working papers based on member input, and if a suitable date could be identified, a third virtual meeting could still be convened. Otherwise, the group would proceed intersessionally to finalise documents for submission to SC21 and TCC21.

45. Following the meeting the Chair confirmed that **Friday 11 July** would be the deadline for ROP-IWG participants to provide written feedback and to support the ongoing development of

- [Working Paper 1](#) *Observer Provider – Commission CCFS process flow Discussion Paper* (WCPFC-ROP-IWG06-2025-01, dated 4 June 2025),
- [Working Paper 2](#) *Consolidated document presenting current suggested amendments to the MSDFs* (WCPFC-ROP-IWG06-2025-02, dated 4 June 2025),
- [Working Paper 2 Supplement 1](#) *Scope of Potential Infringements for WCPFC CCFS Cases* (WCPFC-ROP-IWG06-2025-02\_suppl1, dated 4 June 2025),
- [Working Paper 3](#) *Consideration of Non-Fish Transfers* (WCPFC-ROP-IWG06-2025-03, dated 4 June 2025) and
- [Working Paper 4](#) *Draft ROP-IWG Workplan 2023 - 2025* (WCPFC-ROP-IWG06-2025-04, dated 4 June 2025)

#### Agenda Item 6: Closing

46. The Chair confirmed that the Chair's Summary of the ROP-IWG6 meeting would be circulated as soon as possible after the meeting. Participants were thanked for their engagement and contributions throughout the session.
47. The Chair further noted that the Chair's Summary Report would include the proposed deadline for written feedback from participants. Members were encouraged to review and respond promptly to support the timely finalisation of working papers for submission to SC21 and TCC21.
48. With appreciation for members' valuable time, constructive input, and continued commitment to progressing the work of the ROP-IWG, the Chair formally closed the meeting.
49. The ROP-IWG6 meeting closed at 1.48pm Pohnpei time.



**Virtual Meeting 6 of ROP-IWG**  
20 June 2025 10:00h – 14:00h (Pohnpei time)

---

Adopted Agenda

---

Agenda Item 1. Opening of Meeting

Agenda Item 2. CCFS Process Flow from Observer Provider to WCPFC

Agenda Item 3. Improving the WCPFC Minimum Standard Data Fields (MSDFs) for observer monitoring on purse seine, longline and pole and line vessels

- 3.1 Consider scope of refinements to the ROP MSDFs, including Observer Trip Monitoring Summary, to support identification of potential alleged infringements of CMM obligations
- 3.2 Review subset list of data fields that are recommended for removal from ROP MSDFs
- 3.3 Discuss the next steps for review and refinement of ROP MSDFs, including implementation considerations

Agenda Item 4. Consider whether new ROP minimum data fields related to non-fish transfers could support monitoring of at-sea transshipment activities

Agenda Item 5. Update of ROP-IWG workplan and confirmation of priorities for 2025

Agenda Item 6. Closing

**6TH REGIONAL OBSERVER PROGRAMME INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUP  
ONLINE**

20 June 2025

---

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

---

**CHAIR**

**Lucas Tarapik**

National Fisheries Authority  
Observer Debriefing Coordinator  
[ltarapik@gmail.com](mailto:ltarapik@gmail.com)

**CANADA**

**Felicia Cull**

Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
Senior Policy Advisor  
[felicia.cull@dfo-mpo.gc.ca](mailto:felicia.cull@dfo-mpo.gc.ca)

**CHINA**

**Li Yan**

China Overseas Fisheries Association  
Deputy Director of Highseas Fisheries  
[liyan@cofa.net.cn](mailto:liyan@cofa.net.cn)

**Liangyu Du**

Shanghai Ocean University  
China- Shanghai  
[lydu@shou.edu.cn](mailto:lydu@shou.edu.cn)

**Zhe Geng**

Shanghai Ocean University  
Stock Assessment Scientist  
[zgeng@shou.edu.cn](mailto:zgeng@shou.edu.cn)

**FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA**

**Nathaniel Nanpei**

National Oceanic Resource Management  
Authority (NORMA)  
Senior Fisheries Officer - Compliance  
Analyst  
[nathaniel.nanpei@norma.fm](mailto:nathaniel.nanpei@norma.fm)

**Tosuo Irons Jr**

FSM National Oceanic Resource  
Management Authority  
Observer Debriefing/Trainer  
[tosuojr.iron@norma.fm](mailto:tosuojr.iron@norma.fm)

**FIJI**

**Sevanaia Mawi**

Ministry of Fisheries  
Fisheries Assistant  
[sevamawi23@gmail.com](mailto:sevamawi23@gmail.com)

**JAPAN**

**Nobushige Shimizu**

Fisheries Agency of Japan  
Staff  
[nobushige\\_shimizu640@maff.go.jp](mailto:nobushige_shimizu640@maff.go.jp)

**KIRIBATI**

**Benaia Bauro**

Ministry of Fisheries and Ocean Resources  
(MFOR)  
KIOB Observer Coordinator  
[benaiab@mfor.gov.ki](mailto:benaiab@mfor.gov.ki)

**NEW ZEALAND**

**Jordan Owczarek**

Ministry for Primary Industries  
Compliance Adviser, International Fisheries  
[jordan.Owczarek@mpi.govt.nz](mailto:jordan.Owczarek@mpi.govt.nz)

## **PALAU**

### **Everson Sengebau**

Division of Oceanic Fisheries, Bureau of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries & the Environment  
Compliance Officer  
[ebs6ya@gmail.com](mailto:ebs6ya@gmail.com)

## **PAPUA NEW GUINEA**

### **Adrian J Nanguromo**

National Fisheries Authority  
Acting Observer Program Manager  
[ajnanguromo@gmail.com](mailto:ajnanguromo@gmail.com)

### **Glenda Barry**

PNG National Fisheries Authority  
Manager, Compliance & Enforcement  
[gbarry@fisheries.gov.pg](mailto:gbarry@fisheries.gov.pg)

## **PHILIPPINES**

### **Isidro Tanangonan**

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources  
Aquaculturist II  
[itanangonan@bfar.da.gov.ph](mailto:itanangonan@bfar.da.gov.ph)

### **Joem S. Moreno**

Department of Agriculture - Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources  
Aquaculturist I/VMS Analyst  
[jmoreno@bfar.da.gov.ph](mailto:jmoreno@bfar.da.gov.ph)

### **Marlo Demo-os**

DA-BFAR  
Aquaculturist II  
[mbdemoos@gmail.com](mailto:mbdemoos@gmail.com)

## **REPUBLIC OF KOREA**

### **Jae-geol Yang**

Korea Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Center  
Policy Analyst  
[jg718@kofci.org](mailto:jg718@kofci.org)

## **Kiwon Choi**

Korea Fisheries Resources Agency  
Analyst  
[kiuniya@fira.or.kr](mailto:kiuniya@fira.or.kr)

## **Mi Kyung Lee**

National Institute of Fisheries Science  
Distant Water Fisheries Resources Division  
[ccmkleee@korea.kr](mailto:ccmkleee@korea.kr)

## **REPUBLIC OF MARSHALL ISLANDS**

### **Beau Bigler**

Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority  
Chief Fisheries Officer  
[bbigler@mimra.com](mailto:bbigler@mimra.com)

### **Dike Poznanski**

Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority  
Oceanic Division  
[dpoznanski@mimra.com](mailto:dpoznanski@mimra.com)

### **Laurence E. Edwards, II**

Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority  
Legal Counsel  
[ledwards@mimra.com](mailto:ledwards@mimra.com)

## **SOLOMON ISLANDS**

### **Barnabas Houpassi**

Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources  
Compliance Officer  
[BHoupassi@fisheries.gov.sb](mailto:BHoupassi@fisheries.gov.sb)

### **Dan Suhara**

Solomon Islands National Observer Program  
Observer Coordinator  
[dsuhara@fisheries.gov.sb](mailto:dsuhara@fisheries.gov.sb)

## **CHINESE TAIPEI**

### **Alexa Chang**

Fisheries Agency, Ministry of Agriculture, Project Assistant  
[chechun1119@ms1.fa.gov.tw](mailto:chechun1119@ms1.fa.gov.tw)

**Tzu-Ching Yu**

Overseas Fisheries Development Council  
Secretary  
[evan@ofdc.org.tw](mailto:evan@ofdc.org.tw)

**Wen-Yu Chen**

Pacific Ocean Fisheries Management  
Section, Distant Water Fisheries Division,  
Fisheries Agency, Ministry of Agriculture  
Specialist  
[chenwenyu@ms1.fg.gov.tw](mailto:chenwenyu@ms1.fg.gov.tw)

**TUVALU****Gagati Falaima**

National Observer Coordinator  
Observer Coordinator  
[gfalaima@gmail.com](mailto:gfalaima@gmail.com)

**Teaunu Lopati**

Tuvalu Fisheries Department  
Assistant Compliance Officer  
[teaunul@tuvalufisheries.tv](mailto:teaunul@tuvalufisheries.tv)

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA****Alex Kahl**

NOAA Fisheries - Pacific Islands Regional  
Office  
International Fisheries  
[alex.kahl@noaa.gov](mailto:alex.kahl@noaa.gov)

**Valerie Post**

NOAA Fisheries  
Fishery Policy Analyst  
[valerie.post@noaa.gov](mailto:valerie.post@noaa.gov)

**VANUATU****Manu Nimoho**

Vanuatu Fisheries Department  
Observer Debriefing Assessor  
[mnimoho@fisheries.gov.vu](mailto:mnimoho@fisheries.gov.vu)

**FRENCH POLYNESIA****Taiana Raoulx**

French Polynesia Observer Program  
Coordinator  
[taiana.raoulx@moananuidev.com](mailto:taiana.raoulx@moananuidev.com)

**EL SALVADOR****Abilio Orellana**

CENDEPESCA  
Technical Assistant for Projects  
[jose.orellana@mag.gob.sv](mailto:jose.orellana@mag.gob.sv)

**PACIFIC COMMUNITY (SPC)****Malo Hosken**

Oceanic Fisheries Programme - Pacific  
Community  
Regional ER and EM Coordinator  
[maloh@spc.int](mailto:maloh@spc.int)

**Siosifa Fukofuka**

SPC  
Observer Programme Training Coordinator  
[siosifaf@spc.int](mailto:siosifaf@spc.int)

**Timothy Park**

Secretariat of the Pacific Community  
Senior Fisheries Advisor (Fisheries  
Monitoring)  
[timothyp@spc.int](mailto:timothyp@spc.int)

**PACIFIC ISLANDS FORUM FISHERIES  
AGENCY (FFA)****'Ana F. Taholo**

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency  
Compliance Policy Advisor  
[ana.taholo@ffa.int](mailto:ana.taholo@ffa.int)

**Jude Piruku**

Forum Fisheries Agency  
Observer Placement Officer  
[jude.piruku@ffa.int](mailto:jude.piruku@ffa.int)

**Philip Lens**

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)  
Manager Observer Program  
[philip.lens@ffa.int](mailto:philip.lens@ffa.int)

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

PNA Observer Agency  
Port Coordinator - Honiara  
[hvia@pnaobserver.com](mailto:hvia@pnaobserver.com)

**Joseph Kendou**

PNA Office  
Compliance Officer  
[joseph@pnatuna.com](mailto:joseph@pnatuna.com)

**Les Clark**

PNA  
Adviser  
[les@pnatuna.com](mailto:les@pnatuna.com)

**Sangalofa Clark**

PNAO  
Chief Executive Officer  
[sangaa@pnatuna.com](mailto:sangaa@pnatuna.com)

**PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS****Bubba Cook**

Sharks Pacific  
Policy Director  
[bubba@sharkspacific.org](mailto:bubba@sharkspacific.org)

**WCPFC SECRETARIAT****Eidre Sharp**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
Deputy Compliance Manager  
[Eidre.Sharp@wcpfc.int](mailto:Eidre.Sharp@wcpfc.int)

**Emma N. Mori**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
Project Management Assistant  
[emma.mori@wcpfc.int](mailto:emma.mori@wcpfc.int)

**Erlick Leopold**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
Data Entry and Reporting Technician  
[erlick.leopold@wcpfc.int](mailto:erlick.leopold@wcpfc.int)

**Hilary Ayrton**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
Fisheries Management and Compliance  
Adviser  
[hilary.ayrton@wcpfc.int](mailto:hilary.ayrton@wcpfc.int)

**Jeannie M. Nanpei**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
CCM Support Officer  
[jeannie.nanpei@wcpfc.int](mailto:jeannie.nanpei@wcpfc.int)

**Joseph Jack**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
Reporting Analyst Officer

**Justin Lemuel**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
Data and Support Technician  
[justin.lemuel@wcpfc.int](mailto:justin.lemuel@wcpfc.int)

**Karl Staisch**

WCPFC  
ROP Training and Audit Consultant  
[karl.staisch@wcpfc.int](mailto:karl.staisch@wcpfc.int)

**Kilafwasru Albert**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
Reporting Analyst Officer  
[Kilafwasru.Albert@wcpfc.int](mailto:Kilafwasru.Albert@wcpfc.int)

**Lara Manarangi-Trott**

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

**Tim Jones**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)

IT Manager

[tim.jones@wcpfc.int](mailto:tim.jones@wcpfc.int)

**Virginia Ezekias**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)

Vessel Monitoring Officer

[virginia.ezekias@wcpfc.int](mailto:virginia.ezekias@wcpfc.int)



### Attachment 3: List of Data Fields Recommended for Removal from the MSDFs

The table presented here is a preliminary list. It does not include all the fields that were proposed for removal in [ROP-IWG5 Working Paper 02](#). Instead, it is a list of fields where feedback to date indicates some support for the removal of these fields, and where no objections or requests for further consideration have been raised.

**At ROP\_IWG06 meeting, participants preliminarily agreed to recommend that the attached list of data fields are removed from the list of WCPFC ROP Minimum Standard Data Fields.**

WCPFC CURRENT FIELD	WCPFC AGREED NOTES	COMMENT ON HOW COLLECTED **	COMMENT ON ANY SUGGESTED CHANGES	ALTERNATIVE OR SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS	Row # from WP2
<b>VESSEL IDENTIFICATION</b>					
<b>Flag State Registration Number</b>	This number will be sourced from the vessel papers. You can normally get this information during the briefing.	<i>Observer asks to check vessel documentation.</i>	<i>Field that could be collected by other means and so suggest removal.</i>	<i>This information is available and collected in the RFV - could be removed.</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>Vessel Owner/Company</b>	Name and contact if possible, of the owner of the vessel, if owned by a company, then use the company name.	<i>Observer asks to check vessel documentation</i>	<i>Field that could be collected by other means and so suggest removal.</i>	<i>This information is available and collected in the RFV - could be removed.</i>	<b>4</b>

WCPFC CURRENT FIELD	WCPFC AGREED NOTES	COMMENT ON HOW COLLECTED **	COMMENT ON ANY SUGGESTED CHANGES	ALTERNATIVE OR SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS	Row # from WP2
<b>VESSEL ATTRIBUTES</b>					
<b>Vessel fish hold capacity</b>	The total maximum amounts in metric Tons (mT.) that the vessel freezers, wells and other fish storage areas on a vessel can hold.	<i>Observers have been collecting information in metric tonnes since 1994.</i>	<i>2024 PNA Comment: Could be also considered for removal, because this information is also available on the RFV, although we note that the units for this field in the RFV are volume or weight, whereas the units for the MSDF are weight.</i>	<i>RFV records Cubic Metres and can be accessed if needed</i>  <i>Japan supports removing this field since the information is available from the RFV.</i>  <i>USA supports Removal of this field</i>	<b>30</b>
<b>Length (specify unit)</b>	The “LOA” Length Over All can be taken from the vessel plans or from other paper work that indicates the LOA.	<i>Observer asks to check vessel documentation or the vessel plan. Observer cannot verify if length is correct.</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is available in the RFV and no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>	<i>This information is available and collected in the RFV - could be removed.</i>	<b>32</b>
<b>Tonnage (specify unit)</b>	The vessel may be registered using Gross Tonnage (GT) or in (GRT) this will be indicated on the vessel registration papers.	<i>Observer asks to check vessel documentation or the vessel plan. Observer cannot verify if tonnage is correct</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is available in the RFV and no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>	<i>This information is available and collected in the RFV - could be removed.</i>	<b>33</b>

WCPFC CURRENT FIELD	WCPFC AGREED NOTES	COMMENT ON HOW COLLECTED **	COMMENT ON ANY SUGGESTED CHANGES	ALTERNATIVE OR SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS	Row # from WP2
<b>Engine power (Specify unit)</b>	The engine power and the power units used on board can usually be found in the vessel plans or from other paper work of the vessel. If not sure where to look, ask the engineer.	<i>Observer can get this in several ways, can get it from engine model number info online if available. Most observers ask the engineer who will tell them the HP.</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is available in the RFV and no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>	<i>This information is available and collected in the RFV - could be removed.</i>	<b>34</b>
<b>VESSEL ELECTRONICS</b>					
<b>Radars</b>	Indicate Yes if on board No if not sighted	<i>Observer collects information on make and Model</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is available in the RFV and no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>		<b>35</b>
<b>Global Positioning System (GPS) (Yes/ No)</b>	Indicate Yes if on board No if not sighted	<i>Observer collects information if on board (yes no)</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>		<b>37</b>
<b>Track Plotter</b>	Indicate Yes if on board No if not sighted	<i>Observer collects information if on board (yes no)</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is no longer required to be collected by observers</i>		<b>38</b>
<b>Weather Facsimile</b>	Indicate Yes if on board No if not sighted	<i>Observer collects information if on board (yes no)</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>		<b>39</b>

WCPFC CURRENT FIELD	WCPFC AGREED NOTES	COMMENT ON HOW COLLECTED **	COMMENT ON ANY SUGGESTED CHANGES	ALTERNATIVE OR SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS	Row # from WP2
Sea Surface Temperature (SST) gauge	Indicate Yes if on board No if not sighted	Observer collects information if on board (yes no)	Field suggested for removal, as it is no longer required to be collected by observers		40
Vessel Monitoring System	Indicate the type of systems used on a vessel- The most popular and widely used system is the INMARSAT system, however some vessels may use the ARGOS system- some vessels may have both. There are also other systems if these are being used please record	Observers are asked to identify the system used and the make and model of the units on board	Field that could be collected by other means.	<i>USA comment: (as above for crew attributes and supports Removal of this field)</i>	47
<b>GENERAL GEAR ATTRIBUTES</b>					
Mainline length	What is the total length of the mainline when it is fully set usually recorded in miles or kilometer's (make sure the unit is clearly indicated)	Observer collects information from Captain or Deck Boss	There may be technological approaches that could streamline the estimation of mainline length by observers.	Eg Using a known Lat and long for start and end of set on a GPS/VMS tracks could be used to estimate the distances travelled and the shape of the set  <i>USA Supports Removal of this Field</i>	50

WCPFC CURRENT FIELD	WCPFC AGREED NOTES	COMMENT ON HOW COLLECTED **	COMMENT ON ANY SUGGESTED CHANGES	ALTERNATIVE OR SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS	Row # from WP2
<b>Mainline hauler</b>	Indicate Y or No - Most longline vessels will have an instrument that hauls the lines in after it has been set- some very small vessels may haul line by hand.	<i>Observer collects Yes, No information</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>		<b>54</b>
<b>Branch line hauler</b>	Indicate Y or No - Some long line vessels may use special haulers to coil the branch lines	<i>Observer collects Yes, No information</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>		<b>55</b>
<b>PURSE SEINE - INFORMATION ON DAILY ACTIVITIES</b>					
<b>Numbers of schools sighted per day</b>	How many free or associated schools of fish were sighted during the day? The vessel may not set on these because of size or amount in school	<i>Observer is asked to record every free school or floating object sighted during the day when searching, also record all activities involved with free schools and floating objects. For this to be accurate the observer would need to be on constant watch from 0430 to 1930 every day 15/16 hrs. a day</i>	<i>No change suggested</i>	<i>Difficulties in collecting this info as observer would need to be on watch all day to record accurately. As it is, observers generally only indicate what the vessel investigates</i>  <i>Japan supports removing this field</i>	<b>118</b>

WCPFC CURRENT FIELD	WCPFC AGREED NOTES	COMMENT ON HOW COLLECTED **	COMMENT ON ANY SUGGESTED CHANGES	ALTERNATIVE OR SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS	Row # from WP2
<b>OBSERVER TRIP MONITORING SUMMARY</b>					
<b>Vessel certificate of registration:</b>	Flag State Registration Number as in 'General Attributes'	<i>Observer asks to check vessel documentation.</i>	<i>Field that could be collected by other means – suggest removal.</i>	<i>This information is available and collected in the RFV – could be removed.</i>	<b>197</b>
<b>WCPFC Authorisation:</b>	WIN number if supplied	<i>Observer asks to check vessel documentation.</i>	<i>Field that could be collected by other means– suggest removal.</i>	<i>This information is available and collected in the RFV = could be removed.</i>	<b>199</b>