



**TECHNICAL AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE**  
**Fifth Regular Session**  
1-6 October 2009  
Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia

---

**ROP-IWG3 SUMMARY REPORT AND ATTACHMENTS**

---

**WCPFC-TCC5-2009/IP-03**  
**5 September 2009**



**Regional Observer Programme  
Third Intersessional Working Group**

**17-20 March 2009  
Guam, USA**

---

**SUMMARY REPORT**

---

**Opening of the Meeting**

1. The Chair of the Inter-sessional Working Group for the Regional Observer Programme (ROP-IWG), Dr Charles Karnella (USA), welcomed participants to the group's third meeting (ROP-IWG3).
2. Participants included representatives from Australia, European Union (EU), Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Japan, Republic of Korea, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Tuvalu, United States of America and Vanuatu. The Secretariat of the Pacific Community Oceanic Fisheries Programme (SPC-OFP) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) participated as observers. The WCPFC Secretariat also attended. A list of meeting participants is appended at **Attachment A**.

**Appointment of Rapporteurs**

3. The Secretariat, assisted by the FFA Secretariat, provided rapporteur services.

**Adoption of Agenda**

4. The agenda adopted by the ROP-IWG3 to guide discussions is appended at **Attachment B**.

**Chair's Overview of ROP-IWG2/TCC4/WCPFC5 Decisions**

5. The Chair reviewed activities that had been undertaken during 2008 to support the work of the ROP-IWG, including the group's second meeting held at Nadi, Fiji (ROP-IWG2), the Fourth Regular Session of the Technical and Compliance Committee (TCC4), and the Fifth Regular Session of the Commission (WCPFC5).

**Status Report from the Secretariat on Work Undertaken since ROP-IWG2**

6. The Secretariat presented WCPFC/ROP-IWG3/2009-IP02 summarizing the ROP work it has undertaken since the ROP-IWG2 Meeting at Nadi, Fiji in July 2008. It noted that four CCMs have applied for interim authorization of their observer programmes, namely Papua New Guinea, United States of America, Federated States of Micronesia and Marshall Islands. The two former programmes have been granted interim authorization since they have provided the materials required and have each nominated a National WCPFC ROP Coordinator.

## **Status Reports from CCMs on their Preparation to Engage in the ROP and Issues Arising**

7. Status reports were provided by Australia, the EC, Fiji, Federated States of Micronesia, Japan, Korea, Palau, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Tuvalu, United States of America, Vanuatu and the FFA Secretariat. These status reports are appended at **Attachment C**.

8. The Executive Director noted the poor response by CCMs to their collective commitment to provide information to the WCPFC Secretariat about their respective national observer programmes by 11 August 2008. CCMs were urged, in accordance with this earlier commitment, to provide to the WCPFC Secretariat with the national observer coordinator's contact details no later than 1 June 2009.

## **ROP-IWG2, TCC4 AND WCPFC5 Priorities**

### **ROP Implications**

#### *FAD Closure and Catch Retention*

9. The Executive Director referred to the sections of Conservation and Management Measure 2008-01 (CMM 2008-01) describing the closure of purse seine fishing on Fish Aggregating Devices (FADs) and the retention on board purse seiners of bigeye, skipjack and yellowfin tuna. He described the implications of these requirements on the ROP.

10. One CCM proposed that the focus of the ROP-IWG3's efforts should be on the FAD Closure requirements. This CCM noted that catch retention was a measure that was implemented in 2010; whereas the FAD closure was to be implemented commencing August 2009 so should be considered a higher priority. The meeting proceeded on this basis.

11. The ROP-IWG agreed that in relation to CMM 2008-01, ROP observers on board purse seiners will carry out their usual functions with the additional roles of monitoring FAD closure and catch retention. Since the focus will be on FAD closure, the Secretariat was requested to provide the ROP-IWG with a definition of "FAD Set", based on the definitions used by other RFMOs and the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA).

12. The Secretariat presented WCPFC/ROP-IWG3/2009-IP02 (Rev.1) that includes definitions of "FAD Set" from the IATTC and the PNA 3<sup>rd</sup> Implementing Agreement draft regulations.

13. The ROP-IWG discussed various options for a definition of "FAD Set", taking into account issues such as the distance of a fishing vessel from a FAD and the need for consistency with terminology used in CMM 2008-01.

14. The ROP-IWG agreed that a "FAD Set" for the period August-September 2009, be defined as "a set on a FAD is a set with a purse seine net made by a fishing vessel that is a distance of one nautical mile or less from a FAD at the moment in which the skiff is released into the water for the purposes of that set."

15. A small group considered the "FAD Information Record" containing fields for observers to collect during August-September 2009.

16. The ROP-IWG agreed that the "FAD Information Record" (**Attachment D**) could be used during the period August-September 2009 for the ROP

17. The ROP-IWG recommended that data fields contained in the Form WCPFC PS-CM4 be included in the ROP minimum data standards for ROP observer data collection.

#### *High Seas Pocket Closures*

18. There was no discussion on this issue.

## **Vessel Safety Checklist (VSC)**

19. The Secretariat clarified that the Vessel Safety Checklist (VSC) presented in WCPFC/ROP-IWG2/IP-10 addresses the issue of whether an observer feels that a vessel is safe to board not the sea-worthiness of the vessel. It further clarified that the VSC is proposed as a guideline for observers, not a mandatory requirement.

20. The ROP-IWG expressed general support for the use of the VSC as a guideline for observer programmes prior to placement of an observer on a vessel.

21. The Secretariat was requested to revise the VSC in accordance with comments from the ROP-IWG. The revised VSC is appended at **Attachment E**.

22. The ROP-IWG3 recommends that the interim minimum standard for a Vessel Safety Checklist (VSC) will be that a CCM should have a VSC in place, and to be used prior to an observer boarding a vessel; and if not in place, CCMs may use, as a guideline, the VSC developed at the ROP-IWG3. CCMs should submit copies of their VSC to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

## **Cost Issues**

### *a. ROP Observer Data Management*

23. The Secretariat presented information regarding the estimated cost of managing the data generated by the ROP, referring to Attachment B of WCPFC5-2008/16. It advised that these cost estimates were prepared prior to the Commission's agreement on CMM 2008-01.

24. The Secretariat noted that the three data management options presented in Attachment B of WCPFC5-2008/16 are:

- 1) use of existing national and sub-regional observer programme's data management arrangements;
- 2) out-sourcing of Secretariat functions to SPC-OFP under the existing contract for data services; and
- 3) data management centralized in the WCPFC Secretariat.

25. The Secretariat advised that WCPFC5 had allocated \$US40,000 for ROP data entry in 2009 that has been provided to the SPC-OFP.

26. In relation to the options presented at Busan, the ROP-IWG expressed its support for Option 2 in the short-term, noting the longer-term relationship between the WCPFC Secretariat and the SPC-OFP is subject to the outcome of the Independent Review of Science Structure and Function. Some CCMs noted their preference for the WCPFC Secretariat to develop its own data-handling capability in the future. Noting these, the ROP-IWG noted the desirability of either Option 2 or Option 3 for the long-term.

27. Noting that the decisions at Busan had numerous implications for the ROP, the Secretariat, in consultation with its Data Services Provider (SPF-OFP), revised the data processing options and costs for the ROP which were originally provided in WCPFC5-2008/16, Attachment B. The provisional revised costings, providing for data processing options at the SPC headquarters, Noumea, at the WCPFC Secretariat, Pohnpei and at the SPC Office in Fiji, were provided to the ROP-IWG for information and advice (WCPFC/ROP-IWG3/2009-IP03). The Secretariat explained that it would undertake additional work on these estimates and table revisions for the consideration of CCMs at the Fifth Regular Session of the Technical and Compliance Committee (TCC5) at Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia, 1-6 October 2009.

28. While commenting on potential additional needs concerning establishment costs and management oversight for both the Pohnpei and Fiji options, the ROP-IWG3 considered more

time was required to consider the information provided by the Secretariat. It encouraged the Secretariat to further explore hosting and costing options for consideration at TCC5.

29. Some CCMs, noting the Independent Review of Science Structure and Functions will be considered in 2009 and the stock assessment needs for observer data, requested the WCPFC Secretariat make available to SC5 and the Statistics Specialist Working Group the observer data management hosting and costing options, for their information.

*b. ROP Observer Placements*

30. The Secretariat presented WCPFC/ROP-IWG3/2009-07 summarising the various operational costs for observer deployment and possible funding sources for each. It noted that there are primarily two funding options for observer placements: (i) bilateral agreements concluded between the observer provider and the flag State for the defrayment of costs, and (ii) the cost of observer placements coming from the Commission budget.

31. The ROP-IWG recommended that it is the responsibility of the observer provider to administer observer placement costs, which may be recovered by various means. The cost of Secretariat responsibilities as articulated in CMM 2007-01, such as for audits and oversight of the ROP, will be part of the Commission's annual budget.

**Vessel Size Limitations**

32. Japan presented the environment of small scale longline vessels which mainly operate in the area south of 20°N, and explained the difficulty to place an observer for some vessels with capacity limitation subject to the domestic regulation - the number of capacity designated by regulation is the same as the number of crew. However, Japan further explained that, in such a case, an alternative vessel of similar size which has a space for an observer will be provided to ensure five per cent observer coverage for the longliners in the area.

33. Marshall Islands, on behalf of the FFA, stated that the FFA position on this issue is clear – “size doesn't matter”. It invited other delegations that have exceptions to this position, and the FFA position on the Hybrid Approach, to clearly state their respective positions.

34. With the concerns of vessel space, observer safety and economical feasibility, Chinese Taipei emphasized the difficulties of placement of observers onboard tuna longliners smaller than 100GT, hence, the implementation of ROP for these small vessels should be deferred in accordance with paragraph 10, Annex C of CMM 2007-01.

**Definitions**

35. All FFA members present at IWG-ROP3 stated their understanding that the Hybrid Approach had been adopted by the Commission at WCPFC2, and reaffirmed their support for the implementation of the Hybrid Approach as an integral feature of the WCPFC ROP. FFA members noted that the matter of "Independent and impartial", "principally", "occasionally", and "adjacent", were related to the matter of "sourcing of observers for the ROP". Solomon Islands, on behalf of FFA members stated that: “In accordance with the Hybrid Approach, the Commission has already determined that ROP observers are sourced from either the national observer programs of other Members or from the existing sub-regional programs, except where vessels operate principally in coastal waters, but occasionally venture on to the adjacent high seas or into the waters under the jurisdiction of a neighbouring State, if they so agree. For this exception, and with the necessary approval of the neighbouring State, the vessels may carry observers of their own nationality provided those observers have been authorized by the Secretariat.”

36. The Philippines understands the words *principally* as “greater than 50 per cent”, *occasionally* as “less than 50 per cent”, adjacent as “next to”. The need for an *independent and impartial observer* will be determined by the code of conduct. An *observer trip* means a trip where an observer will be needed.

37. Recalling that the terms “Principally”, “Occasional”, “Adjacent”, and “Independent and Impartial” had been discussed at ROP-IWG2, the ROP-IWG again considered definitions that would apply under the ROP. Following considerable discussion it was apparent that consensus agreement on a definition for each of these terms was not possible at this time.

#### *Observer Trip*

38. The Chair referred to WCPFC/IWG-ROP2/2008-07 that presents background information on the issue of “Observer Trip”, noting that discussion at the ROP-IWG3 should be focused on longline vessels taking fresh fish.

39. The ROP-IWG’s recommendation on this matter is accommodated under paragraph 44.

### **Additional Elements of the ROP**

#### **Fisheries to be Monitored**

40. The Secretariat introduced WCPFC/ROP-IWG3/2009-08 that presents preliminary estimates of fisheries to be monitored, prepared by the SPC-OFP using data received from CCMs.

41. Several CCMs provided additional information to the Observer Programme Coordinator (OPC).

42. It was acknowledged that the tables in WCPFC/ROP-IWG3/2009-08 represented the best available data to SPC-OFP. However, some CCMs noted that the tables could be misleading in regard to the ROP coverage levels required for different fleets and fisheries. For example, the ROP primarily covers vessels fishing beyond the areas under national jurisdiction of the flag State, but the tables include coverage by national observer programmes for vessels operating in their national waters. These CCMs also noted the tables fail to acknowledge the significant contribution that coastal States’ national observer programmes and bilateral licence conditions have made to achieve the described coverage levels for foreign flags.

43. The updated table indicating the preliminary estimate of fisheries to be monitored is appended at **Attachment F**.

#### **Coverage Levels**

44. The ROP-IWG recommended that all CCMs will include in Part 2 of their Annual Report to the Commission a description of how they will achieve five (5) per cent observer coverage in each of their fisheries under the jurisdiction of the Commission, other than purse seine fisheries. This description shall include how the effort in each fishery is determined and how observers will be placed to ensure that the five (5) per cent coverage is obtained. If there are issues regarding the placement of observers, e.g. vessel size, seasonal or geographic coverage, etc., these and any adjustments or actions to be taken to overcome these issues also should be described. The ROP – IWG recommended that appropriate changes be made to the format of the Annual Report Part 2 to accommodate this new information. CCMs present at ROP-IWG3 agreed to voluntarily provide this information in 2009.

#### **Source of Observers**

45. The ROP-IWG noted that CMM 2008-01 places significant demands on the ROP in respect of meeting the needs of flag States to source observers from national and sub-regional programmes that have received interim authorisation from the Secretariat in advance of the purse seine FAD closure commencing on August 1, 2009. Some CCMs considered that their purse seine vessels may use observers from their own national observer programmes to meet this need, particularly in relation to high seas fishing operations. Other CCMs considered that the Hybrid Approach, which has been adopted by the Commission, requires the use of observers from the programmes of other CCMs or from existing sub-regional programmes except

where vessels operate principally in coastal waters, but occasionally venture onto the adjacent high seas or into the waters under the jurisdiction of a neighboring State, if they so agree.

46. Even as the Philippines is preparing to train its national observers, it will also source some of its observers from observer programs from other member countries for so long as these observers are willing to board vessels with less than ideal accommodations which are shared by the crew, with strict water discipline and toilet facilities which are acceptable to its Filipino crew. In any case, the food on board is adequate and, as we were told by non-Filipino observers who perform observer functions on board Philippine vessels, more than acceptable as regards taste.

47. The ROP-IWG was unable to reach consensus on the source of observers for longline fleets. Some CCMs maintained that the Hybrid Approach required that observers be sourced from the authorised programmes of other CCMs or from the existing sub-regional programs, except where vessels operate principally in coastal waters, but occasionally venture on to the adjacent high seas or into the waters under the jurisdiction of a neighbouring State, if they so agree. Other CCMs maintained that their national observer programmes will be the source of observers to meet the coverage requirements for these fleets as agreed to by the Commission.

### **Cadre of Observers**

48. The Executive Director presented WCPFC/ROP-IWG3/2009-09 and provided background for this issue. He invited CCMs to provide suggestions of circumstances when the cadre of observers could be used, noting that they may be employed in auditing National Observer Programmes. The Executive Director advised that the Commission has provided the Secretariat with \$US30,000 in 2009 for the cadre of observers.

49. The United States expressed concern that the issue of observer compensation for Commission-deployed observers not act as a barrier to the full participation called for in Article 28.6(b).

50. While there was support for the use by the Secretariat of a cadre of observers, several CCMs expressed the need for enhanced definition on how it will be developed.

51. The ROP-IWG:

- a) tasked the Secretariat to prepare a scoping document for the cadre of observers, including guidelines, for the consideration of TCC and the Commission; and
- b) agreed that the Secretariat should use the funds provided for this purpose in 2009 to backstop the Observer Programme Coordinator's work on interim authorizations.

### **Observer and Observer Trainer Qualifications**

52. The Secretariat introduced the issue of Observer and Observer Trainer Qualifications, and requested the ROP-IWG to propose minimum standards for Observer Trainers.

53. The ROP-IWG recommended that the Interim Standard for Observer Trainers is that CCMs will use existing national and sub-regional training standards. CCMs will develop trainer qualifications, available for review by the Secretariat.

54. The ROP shall, in collaboration with existing national and sub-regional observer programmes, produce guidelines for the qualifications of Observer Trainers, which may be used as a guide for national and sub-regional programmes training ROP observers.

### **Standardized Procedures for Deployment of ROP Observers**

55. The Secretariat presented WCPFC/ROP-IWG3/2009-10 that lists operational matters relating to observer deployment.

56. Some CCMs expressed support for the use of these standardized procedures as minimum standard guidelines for ROP observer deployment.

57. The ROP-IWG recommended that the Interim Standard for the deployment of ROP observers is that the CCMs shall use existing deployment procedures in place for their national and sub-regional programmes. CCMs will develop these procedures, available for review by the Secretariat.

58. The ROP, in collaboration with existing national and sub-regional observer programmes, shall produce guidelines for the placement of observers which may be used as a guide for national and sub-regional programmes placing ROP observers.

### **Authorization of Debriefers and Requirements of Debriefing**

59. The Secretariat advised that the ROP-IWG2 meeting had not adopted a minimum standard for observer debriefers.

60. The ROP-IWG recommended that the Interim Standard for qualification of observer debriefers is that debriefers will be experienced in observer matters and that CCMs will use existing national and sub-regional programme standards for debriefers. CCMs will prepare qualifications for a debriefer, available for review by the Secretariat.

61. The ROP, in collaboration with existing national and sub-regional observer programmes, shall produce guidelines for the qualifications of observer debriefers which may be used as a guide for national and sub-regional programmes training ROP observer debriefers.

### **Liability and Insurance**

62. The Secretariat referred to WCPFC/ROP-IWG2/2008-08 on the issue of liability and insurance, specifically Prof. Edgar Gold's legal analysis. It noted that the ROP-IWG2 meeting had not reached a conclusion on this issue, the intention of which is to develop a minimum standard of insurance for ROP observers.

63. The ROP-IWG recommended that the Interim Standard for Insurance of Observers for ROP duties is that CCMs will use existing national standards for health and safety insurance. CCM providers of observers will make sure an observer placed on a vessel for ROP duties, has health and safety insurance.

### **ROP Workbook (Forms and Harmonization)**

64. The Secretariat advised that the ROP Workbook is not a "manual" but a collection of forms for use by observers while on board a fishing vessel. The ROP Workbook could be used by the cadre of observers in 2009 but could also be used by National Observer Programmes as they see fit.

65. The ROP-IWG agreed that each CCM National Observer Programme and Sub-Regional Observer Programmes will provide copies of their respective Observer Workbooks to the Secretariat.

### **Consider other means for obtaining data collected by observers and explore developing technologies for monitoring vessel operations and sampling catch**

66. The Secretariat noted that this issue was first raised at TCC2 where the possible use of video cameras and other audio-visual equipment was suggested for use in situations where the deployment of observers is problematic. The Secretariat has re-introduced this topic to provide CCMs with an opportunity to provide new information for the ROP-IWG's consideration.

67. The ROP-IWG agreed that the ROP should keep under review technological and other developments relating to the collection of data and information that may supplement that collected by observers deployed under the ROP.



## **At-Sea Transshipment**

68. The Secretariat noted that the Commission has established a process for the development of a CMM on transshipment monitoring, in which observers may play a significant role. It also noted that because of the nature of transshipment operations, for practical reasons more than one observer will be required to monitor transshipment operations.

69. The Chair noted the need to closely follow the development of the CMM on transshipment monitoring and urged those involved in this process to keep in mind the proposed role of observers.

## **Special Requirements of Developing States**

70. The Executive Director advised that this issue was included in the ROP-IWG agenda to encourage discussion on how this area of the Commission's work may be operationalised, particularly in relation to ways in which the Commission can assist in developing the capacity of small island States to participate in the ROP.

71. The Chair encouraged CCMs to give due consideration to potential capacity-building initiatives to support the full participation of developing States and Participating Territories in the ROP, including through activities supported under the Special Requirements Fund.

## **Website**

72. The Executive Director presented WCPFC/ROP-IWG3/2009-11, noting that the WCPFC Secretariat has funding in 2009 for re-development of the entire WCPFC website, including an area for the ROP. The redeveloped website that will cater to a variety of stakeholders will be operational in May 2009.

73. The Executive Director advised that there will be opportunities for CCMs to comment on prototypes of the redeveloped website during its preparation. CCMs will be advised when and where these prototypes will be made available for viewing.

## **Other Matters**

74. In response to a question from the EU regarding cross-endorsement of observers between the WCPFC and IATTC, the Secretariat advised that it has commenced discussions with the IATTC Secretariat on this issue and will provide a report to TCC5.

## **Future of the ROP-IWG**

75. The ROP-IWG has assisted the Commission in developing and implementing the Commission's observer program. Its work has been done over three meetings, during which most of the major issues were addressed and resolved. As a result of this work the ROP has become operational in this calendar year.

76. The ROP-IWG was not able to reach agreement on; costs, vessel size limitations, source of observers, and related definitions. This was not for the lack of effort. The various CCMs have strongly held views on these matters and, although there was much discussion and debate on these at the three meetings, additional work needs to be done. In the view of the ROP-IWG this work does not require additional separate meetings and the ROP-IWG3 recommends that these matters be added to the agendas of both TCC5 and WCPFC6. If those discussions do not result in resolution of the matters, they should provide insight on the best way to proceed.

77. The ROP-IWG sees a need to provide the Commission's Observer Programme Coordinator (OPC) with continuing support in the continued development and implementation of the ROP and recommends that a Technical Advisory Group be established for this purpose. That group can assist the OPC in harmonizing the national and sub-regional programs authorized under the ROP. Additionally, the group can assist the OPC in resolving the many technical issues that are likely to arise, particularly in the early stages of the ROP.

78. The ROP-IWG3 acknowledged the considerable support provided by the Secretariat.
79. Finally, we thank the Commission for the opportunity to assist in the development and implementation of the ROP.
80. On behalf of the ROP-IWG the Executive Director thanked the ROP-IWG Chair for his invaluable leadership and guidance.

**Adoption of Summary Report and Recommendations for SC5, TCC5 and WCPFC6**

81. This summary report was adopted.

**Closing of the Meeting**

82. The ROP-IWG3 meeting closed on Friday 20 March 2009.



**Regional Observer Programme  
Third Intersessional Working Group**

**17-20 March 2009  
Guam, USA**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

***CHAIR***

**Dr Charles Karnella**  
International Fisheries Administrator  
NOAA Fisheries Service  
Pacific Islands Regional Office  
1601 Kapiolani Blvd., Suite 1110  
Honolulu, HI 96814  
Ph : (808) 944-2206  
charles.karnella@noaa.gov

***AUSTRALIA***

**Lara Santana**  
Senior Policy Officer  
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and  
Forestry  
GPO Box 858  
Canberra  
ACT 2600  
Ph: +61-2-6272-5715  
lara.santana@daff.gov.au

***EUROPEAN COMMISSION***

**Michael Quillinan**  
Official  
200 Rue de la loi  
1000 Bruxelles  
Belgium  
Ph: +3222962803  
Michael.Quillinan@ec.europa.eu

***FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA***

**Steven Retalmai**  
Observer Coordinator  
National Oceanic Resource Management  
Authority  
P.O Box PS 122  
Palikir  
Pohnpei 96941  
Ph: (691)320-2700  
[nevetslater@hotmail.com](mailto:nevetslater@hotmail.com)

***FIJI***

**Anare Raiwalui**  
Principal Fisheries Officer  
Fisheries Department  
P.O Box 2218, Government Buildings  
Suva  
Ph: (679) 330 1066  
anare.raiwalui@fisheries.gov.fj

**Timoci Tavusa Mataiyasi**  
Observer Coordinator  
Fiji Fisheries Department  
Box 2218, Government Building  
Suva  
Ph: (679) 330-1611  
jmataiyasi@yahoo.com.au

***GUAM***

Joseph D. Torres  
Deputy Director  
Department of Agriculture  
Ph: (671) 688 6643  
Fax: (671) 734 6569  
[Jdt4ag@yahoo.com](mailto:Jdt4ag@yahoo.com)

**JAPAN**

**Takashi Koya**

Director of Fisheries Negotiations  
Internacional Affairs Division,  
Fisheries Agency of Japan  
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo  
Ph: +81-3-3502-8459  
[takashi\\_koya@nm.maff.go.jp](mailto:takashi_koya@nm.maff.go.jp)

**Takumi Fukuda**

Assistant Director  
Internacional Affairs Division,  
Fisheries Agency of Japan  
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo  
Ph: +81-3-3502-8459  
[takumi\\_fukuda@nm.maff.go.jp](mailto:takumi_fukuda@nm.maff.go.jp)

**Masaaki Nakamura**

Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative Association  
2-31-1, Eitai, Koutou-Ku  
Tokyo  
Ph: +81-3-5646-2382  
[gyojo@japantuna.or.jp](mailto:gyojo@japantuna.or.jp)

**Akihiko Yatsuzuka**

National Offshore Tuna Fisheries Association of  
Japan  
Tohan No. 3 Bldg. 1-3-1 Uchikanda, Chiyoda-  
ku  
Tokyo  
Ph: 81-3-3295-3721  
[yatsuzuka@kinkatsukyo.or.jp](mailto:yatsuzuka@kinkatsukyo.or.jp)

**Takeshi Miwa**

Far Seas Fisheries Division  
Fisheries Agency of Japan  
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo  
Ph: +81-3-6744-2364  
[takeshi\\_miwa@nm.maff.go.jp](mailto:takeshi_miwa@nm.maff.go.jp)

**Haruo Tominaga**

International Affairs Division  
Fisheries Agency of Japan  
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo  
Ph: +81-3-3502-8459  
[haruo\\_tominaga@nm.maff.go.jp](mailto:haruo_tominaga@nm.maff.go.jp)

**Naozumi Miyabe**

National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries  
5-7-1 Shimizu-Orido  
Shizuoka  
Ph: +81-54-336-6032  
[miyabe@fra.affrc.go.jp](mailto:miyabe@fra.affrc.go.jp)

**Chihiro Kino**

Japan Far Seas Purse Seine fishing Association  
1-14-10 Gina, chuo-ku  
Tokyo  
Ph: +81-3-3564-2315  
[japan@kaimaki.or.jp](mailto:japan@kaimaki.or.jp)

**Hiroshi Hamada**

National Ocean Tuna Fishery Association  
Cope Bldg. 7F, 1-1-12 Uchikanda, Chiyoda-ku,  
Tokyo  
Ph: +81-3-3294-9634  
[h-hamada@zengyoren.jf-net.ne.jp](mailto:h-hamada@zengyoren.jf-net.ne.jp)

**KOREA**

**Chiguk Ahn**

Deputy Director  
International Fisheries Organization Division  
Ministry for Food, Agriculture, Forestry and  
Fisheries  
88 Gwanmu-ro, Gwacheon-Si  
Gyeonggi-do 427-719  
Ph: 82-2-500-2429  
[chiguka62@yahoo.com](mailto:chiguka62@yahoo.com)

**Doo-Hae AN**

Scientist  
National Fisheries Research and Development  
Institute  
152-1, Haeanro, Gijang-UP, Gijang-Gun  
Busan 619-705  
Ph: 82-51-720-2320  
[dhan@nfrdi.go.kr](mailto:dhan@nfrdi.go.kr)

**REPUBLIC OF THE  
MARSHALL ISLANDS**

**Glen Joseph**

Director  
Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority  
P.O Box 860  
Majuro  
Ph: (692) 625-8262

**Manasseh Avicks**

National Observer and Port Sampling  
Coordinator  
Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority  
P.O Box 860  
Majuro  
Ph: (692) 625-8262  
mavicks@mimra.com

**Doreen deBrum**

Policy and Planning Advisor  
Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority  
P.O Box 860  
Majuro  
Ph: (692) 625-8262

**REPUBLIC OF PALAU**

**Ellender Ngirameketii**

Chief  
Division of Marine Law Enforcement  
P.O Box 790  
Koror  
Ph: (680-488-5206  
cdmle@palaunet.com

**PAPUA NEW GUINEA**

**Noan Pakop**

Executive Manager-MCS  
National Fisheries Authority  
PO Box 2016  
Port Moresby, NCD  
Ph: (675)309-0436  
npakop@fisheries.gov.pg

**Ludwig Kumoru**

Fisheries Scientist-Tuna  
National Fisheries Authority  
P.O Box 2016  
Port Moresby, NCD  
Ph: (675)309-0444  
lkumoru@fisheries.gov.pg

**Justin Ilakini**

Economist  
National Fisheries Authority  
P.O Box 2016  
Port Moresby, NCD  
Ph: (675)309-0444  
jilakini@fisheries.gov.pg

**PHILIPPINES**

**Benjamin F. S. Tabios Jr.**

Asst. Director for Administrative Services  
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources  
3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, PCA Bldg., Elliptical Road  
Quezon City  
Ph: (632) 929-8390

**Noel C. Barut**

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources  
National Fisheries Research and Development  
Institute  
940 Kayumanggi Bldg. I, Quezon Avenue  
Quezon City  
Ph: (632) 372-5063  
noel\_c-barut@yahoo.com

**Alma C. Dickson, DFT**

Fisheries Technologist  
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources  
3/F PCA Main Building, Elliptical Road  
Dilliman, Quezon City  
Ph: (632)-917-835-0884  
alma\_dickson@yahoo.com

**SOLOMON ISLANDS**

**Derek Suimae**

Observer Coordinator  
Solomon Fisheries  
PO Box G13  
Honiara  
Ph: (677) 38730  
dsumimae@fisheries.gov.sb

**CHINESE TAIPEI**

**Chi-Chao Liu**

Section Chief  
No.1 Yugang North 1<sup>st</sup> Road, Chien Chen  
District  
Kaohsiung  
Ph : 886-7-823-9838  
chichao@msl.f.a.gov.tw

**Hong Yen Huang**

hangyen@msl.f.a.gov.tw

**Ding Rong Lin**

dingrong@msl.f.a.gov.tw

**Ke-Yang Chen**

Officer  
Fisheries Agency, Council of Agriculture  
2 ChaoChow Street  
Taipei  
Ph: 886-2-3343-6030  
ckeyang@msl.f.a.gov.tw

**Joseph, Chia-Chi Fu**

Secretary  
Overseas Fisheries Development Council  
19, Lane 113, Roosevelt Road, Sec.4  
Taipei  
Ph: 886-2-2738-1522 ext. 115  
[joseph@ofdc.org.tw](mailto:joseph@ofdc.org.tw)

**Erick HL Tsai**

Chairman  
Taiwan Tuna Purse Seiners Association  
Ph: +886-7-8131619  
eriktsai@gmail.com

**Charles CP Lee**

General Secretary  
Taiwan Tuna Purse Seiners Association  
Ph: +886-7-8131619  
charles@ttpsa.org.tw

**Chen-Hua Chuang**

Ph: +886-7-8113140 (ext. 313)  
chc@fongkuo.com.tw

**TUVALU**

**Falasese Tupau**

Fisheries Licensing officer  
Department of Fisheries  
Vaiaku  
Funafuti  
Ph: 688-20143  
ffavms@tuvalu.tv

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**Raymond Clarke**

Fisheries Biologist  
NOAA Fisheries Service  
Pacific Islands Regional Office  
1601 Kapiolani Blvd., Suite 1110  
Honolulu, HI 96814  
Ph : +808-944-2205  
Raymond.Clarke@noaa.gov

**Alexa Cole**

Senior Enforcement Attorney  
NOAA Office of General Counsel  
Pacific Islands Region  
1601 Kapiolani Blvd., Suite 1110  
Honolulu, HI 96814  
Ph: (808) 944-2167  
Fax (808) 973-2935  
alexa.cole@noaa.gov

**John Kelly**

Observer Program Manager  
NOAA/NMFS/PIR  
1601 Kapiolani Blvd, Suite 1110  
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96814  
Ph: (808) 944-2202  
john.kelly@noaa.gov

**Stuart "Joe" Arceneaux**

Observer Training Coordinator  
US Dept. Commerce, NOAA Fisheries Service  
Pacific Islands Regional Office  
1601 Kapiolani Blvd., Suite 1110  
Honolulu, HI 96814  
Ph: (808) 944-2216  
Fax: (808) 973-2934  
[stuart.arceneaux@noaa.gov](mailto:stuart.arceneaux@noaa.gov)

**Gordon Yamasaki**

Fisheries Biologist  
NOAA Fisheries Service  
Pacific Islands Regional Office  
American Samoa Field Office  
Pago Pago  
American Samoa  
Ph : (684) 633 5598  
Fax : (684) 633 1400  
[Gordon.yamasaki@noaa.gov](mailto:Gordon.yamasaki@noaa.gov)

**VANUATU**

**William Naviti**

Senior Resource Manager  
Fisheries Department  
VMB 9045  
Port Vila  
Ph: 678-23119  
Fax: 678-23641  
wnaviti@gmail.com

**OBSERVERS**

***PACIFIC ISLANDS FORUM FISHERIES  
AGENCY***

**Dr Transform Aqorau**

Deputy Director General

PO Box 629

Honiara

Solomon Islands

Ph: (677)-21124

Fax: (677) 23995

[Transform.aqorau@ffa.int](mailto:Transform.aqorau@ffa.int)

**Tim Park**

Observer Programme Manager

Tim.park@ffa.int

**Lara Manarangi-Trott**

WCPFC Liaison Officer

lara.manarangi-trott@ffa.int

**Apolosi Turaganivalu**

Compliance Policy Officer

apolosi.turaganivalu@ffa.int

***SECRETARIAT OF THE PACIFIC  
COMMUNITY***

**Peter Sharples**

OFP-SPC

B.P. D5, Noumea Cedex

New Caledonia

Ph: +687-262000

peterbs@spc.int

***WCPFC SECRETARIAT***

**Andrew Wright**

Executive Director

P.O Box 2356

Kolonia

Pohnpei 96941

Federated States of Micronesia

Ph: (691)320-1992

Fax: (691)320-1108

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

andrew.wright@wcpfc.int

**Andrew Richards**

Compliance Manager

andrew.richards@wcpfc.int

**Karl Staisch**

Observer Program Coordinator

karl.staisch@wcpfc.int



**Regional Observer Programme  
Third Intersessional Working Group  
Guam, USA  
17 - 20 March 2009**

---

**AGENDA**

---

- 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING**
- 2. APPOINTMENT OF RAPORTEURS**
- 3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
- 4. CHAIR'S OVERVIEW OF ROP-IWG2, TCC4 AND WCPFC5 DECISIONS**
- 5. STATUS REPORT FROM THE SECRETARIAT ON WORK UNDERTAKEN SINCE ROP-IWG2**
- 6. STATUS REPORTS FROM CCMS ON THEIR PREPARATION TO ENGAGE IN THE ROP AND ISSUES ARISING**
- 7. ROP-IWG2, TCC4 & WCPFC5 PRIORITIES**
  - 7.1 ROP implications:**
    - a. FAD closure**
    - b. Catch retention**
    - c. High Seas pocket closures**
  - 7.2 Vessel Safety Checklist (VSC)**
  - 7.3 Cost Issues**
    - a. ROP observer data management**
    - b. ROP observer placements**
  - 7.4 Vessel Size Limitation**
  - 7.5 Definitions**
    - a. Principally**
    - b. Occasional**
    - c. Adjacent**
    - d. Independent & Impartial**
    - e. Observer Trip**
- 8. ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS OF ROP**
  - 8.1 Fisheries to be monitored**
  - 8.2 Coverage levels**
  - 8.3 Source of observers**
  - 8.4 Cadre of observers**



- 8.5 Observer and observer trainer qualifications**
- 8.6 Standardized procedures for deployment of ROP observers**
- 8.7 Authorisation of debriefers and requirements of debriefing**
- 8.8 Liability and insurance**
- 8.9 ROP Workbook (Forms & Harmonisation)**
- 8.10 Consider other means for obtaining data collected by observers and explore developing technologies for monitoring vessel operations and sampling catch**
- 8.11 At sea transshipment**
- 8.12 Special requirements of developing States**
- 8.13 Website**
- 9. OTHER MATTERS**
- 10. FUTURE OF THE ROP-IWG**
- 11. ADOPTION OF SUMMARY REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SC5, TCC5 AND WCPFC6**
- 12. CLOSING OF THE MEETING**

## **Australia Status Report**

The Australian observer program applicable to our Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery (ETBF) is the AFMA Observer Program. The AFMA Observer Program has been in operation since 1979 for foreign long liners that were operating in the AFZ at the time. The program targets 850 sea days in the ETBF each year which represents about 35% of AFMA's overall observer program. AFMA has 25 casual observers who complete approximately 120 sea days each.

In 2008, we achieved observer coverage of 8% of hooks in the ETBF. Observer coverage rates are determined by taking into account considerations relating to requirements under the Threat Abatement Plan for seabirds and the ability to estimate fishery wide impacts with acceptable precision.

At present, the main purpose of the domestic observer coverage is to monitor interactions with protected species such as marine turtles and seabirds, record species and size composition of the catch (including discarded species) and collect biological samples

Australia is currently working through some of the challenges that we are expecting to face in the implementation of the ROP. These challenges related to the very small proportion of time our fleet spends in high seas areas and the opportunistic nature of their operations on the high seas. These characteristics will make it difficult to determine, prior to the vessel starting a trip, which vessels should carry an observer or how many observer trips should be undertaken each year to meet the required coverage rate as determined by the Commission. In fisheries where there are very low levels of fishing on the high seas and it's conducted on an opportunistic basis the level of observer coverage is likely to be somewhat "lumpy" with high levels in some years and low in others.

Given the limited degree of effort by Australian vessels on the high seas, we intend to utilise observers from the AFMA observer program except on occasions where definitions (principally, occasionally, adjacent) to be agreed by the Commission will require us to source non-national observers. In those cases we will source observers under bilateral arrangements.

## **EC Status Report**

The European Union is fully committed to the WCPFC ROP and has had a long experience of working in observer programmes of other RFMOs. The EU currently has a relatively small fleet of vessels fishing in the Pacific Ocean and has full observer coverage on its 4 purse seiners with observers provided under the Spanish national observer programme.

The EU has been participating in the long-running observer scheme in the Eastern Pacific under the auspices of the IATTC and we are fully prepared to participate in the cross-endorsement arrangement envisaged in accordance with paragraph 29 of CMM 2008-01.

## **FFA Status Report**

The FFA Observer Programme Manager spoke of its two sub-regional programmes. He noted that the sub-regional programmes were two upon which the hybrid approach was based. As such it was required to utilise observers from programmes other than that of the flag of the vessel. The two programmes have been operating under the US Multilateral Treaty (USMLT) and the FSM Arrangement (FSMA) for 20 years and 14 years respectively. The programmes utilised the

observers of national programmes of FFA Members. As such it called on a current pool of about 190 observers of which about half were used regularly. The USMLT and FSMA fleets were currently composed of 36 and 24 vessels respectively with 20 per cent coverage.

The FFA programme recently committed to assisting the USMLT fleet to meet its coverage obligations under CMM 2008-01.

The FFA Secretariat conducts observer training courses in collaboration with the SPC. Last year six (6) courses were run and in 2009 another six (6) courses were planned with additional Pacific courses being essentially run independently by Papua New Guinea. Last year FFA adopted the Pacific Island Regional Fisheries Observer (PIRFO) accreditation standards as the regional training and accreditation standard. Part of the training in 2008 included training additional observer trainers.

FFA is currently seeking additional funding for extra training to be held this year and to fund a second position of Observer Coordinator.

The FFA Observer Programme is still waiting for nomination by an FFA Member for it to be certified by the WCPFC Secretariat.

### **FSM Country Statement**

The Federated States of Micronesia National Observer Program is coming up to speed in meeting the ROP's requirements. Its Observer Program operates with fairly few fully trained fisheries observers, contributing to less than 5 per cent annual long line average coverage and less than 20 per cent purse seine observer coverage, both domestic and foreign.

We are currently working towards increasing the number of our observers by training and recruiting more, to at least have 50 in total towards the end of this month, March 2009. By then, our observer program will be running with its fullest during the FAD closure in August-September 2009, and just about ready for the PNA's 3IA by January 2010.

Our program is just a step away from being authorized by the ROP to engage in the ROP role, awaiting the final notification of the official liaison person from our national observer program to the ROP. So to conclude my short statement, the FSM's national observer program is just about ready.

### **Fiji Status Report**

Fiji's National Observer Programme was established in 2002 through assistance from the Forum Fisheries Agency and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community. Fiji's National Observer Programme comprises 13 trained observers and a coordinator. They are placed on board our licensed tuna long line vessels collecting data from within Fiji's national waters and also conduct port sampling at Fiji's designated fishing ports.

Apart from the National Observer Programme, Fiji's observers are also placed on board purse seiners that come under the U.S. Multilateral Treaty, coordinated by the Forum Fisheries Agency.

With regard to the Regional Observer Programme (ROP), Fiji fully supports the Hybrid Approach and is in the process of negotiating bilateral agreements with flag States whose vessels use Suva as their base. At the same time, Fiji will need an additional 15-20 observer to be trained in order to accommodate the anticipated demand from the ROP.

Once this has been established we will then go to the Commission Secretariat confirming our preparedness regarding the ROP.

## **Japan Status Report**

Japan stated that Japan has dispatched its national observers for long liners and purse seiners to the WCPO, and discussed CMM2008-01 implementation with PNA countries to achieve 20 per cent observer coverage. Japan will soon submit its national observer program to be authorized by the Secretariat.

## **Philippines Status Report**

For the Philippines, we consider that the function of an Observer is more on scientific data gathering, among others. After conducting a series of consultative meeting with the private sector, we have drawn up the standard requirements for observers.

These are the following:

- Bachelor's degree in natural sciences (preferably B.S. Fisheries and Marine Biology)
- One college level subject each in math and statistics
- Must be physically and mentally fit to work in any type of sea conditions.
- Adequate computer skills

They shall further undergo a 45 day training program.

We have drawn up a preliminary list of 25 employees from our national government agency, the Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources and shall recruit 17 more new graduates for this program. From these 42 initial batch of observers shall be drawn the next batch of trainers for our subsequent batch of observers.

## **Papua New Guinea Status Report**

Papua New Guinea (PNG) takes this opportunity to present the status on its preparations towards the implementation of the regional observer program (ROP), specifically highlighting major activities taking place in our National Observer Program (NOP) as well as a status report on the progress under taken to comply with the Commission Measure CMM 2008-01. As you will note, developments pertaining to the above reflects our response to our national requirements as well as our sub-regional and regional obligations.

Firstly, I wish to report that the size of our program has markedly increased with the current number at 127 observers. Our target is to reach 200 observers by the end of this year 2009, but depending on the demand for observers, we are prepared to further increase the numbers in order to fully and actively meet our national observer requirements, including the ROP.

With the increase in our NOP, we do not anticipate major constraints or setbacks in the implementation of the ROP, noting that PNG's 6 designated major ports would be well serviced by our observers, which normally see high level of purse seine activities in our EEZs throughout the year.

### *Coordination and working arrangements*

Mr. Chairman, having prepared ourselves to participate in the ROP, we are also well aware of the need to coordinate and ensure that there is a working arrangement in place to effectively expedite the responsibilities of our observer arrangements. As you are aware, the management and administrative functions are centrally based in Port Moresby at the National Fisheries Authority (NFA). We have Port Coordinators who are senior observers located at the designated ports around the country whose principal responsibilities entail coordinating observer placement on

vessels, facilitate briefing mainly between the observer and the captain, including debriefing following the completion of each trip.

*Addressing the priorities set by TCC4, ROP IWG2 and WCPFC5*

As highlighted so far, PNG is keenly aware of the priorities with regards priorities set by TCC4, ROP IWG2, and the WCPFC5. In response to these priorities, PNG continues to embark on training Program with the aim of reaching 200 observers under its NOP. We like to inform that for this year 2009, we have organised for 3 Observer training scheduled to be undertaken. The objective of these training programs is to have sufficient observers to cover:

- Domestic and coastal fisheries;
- Placements under the national program covering the tuna fisheries;
- Sub-regional (FFA) covering – US treaty and FSM arrangement , including the PNA Third Implementing Arrangement (3IA); and
- WCPFC Regional Observer Program (ROP) as and when required.

*Actions taken to implement WCPFC CMM 2008 – 01*

Mr. Chairman, as you may have noted, PNG has its National Observer Program authorised by the Commission last year and therefore have Observers available for deployment to cover fishing activities of vessels during the 2 month FAD closure in PNA EEZ and the High seas respectively in August and September this year (2009).

To further strengthen our national observer capacity, PNG has proceeded to undertake the recruitment of a new Observer Program Manager at the beginning of this year to take better control of the increasing administrative and managerial responsibility of the Program in the light of increasing observer numbers spread throughout the 6 designated ports as well as meeting the requirements of the ROP.

Mr. Chairman, we are in the process of designating a permanent Observer trainer position at our National Fisheries College to be able to conduct and coordinate observer training in the country. We are increasing our current observer training duration of 5 weeks to about 8 weeks to ensure observers are well trained and have a better understanding about the fundamental requirements and knowledge as an observer as well as their roles and responsibilities. Further, our trainers have been training alongside sub-regional trainers, towards certification at the sub-regional level based on the training standards endorsed by the FFC in 2008.

*Consultations with DWFN on issues related to the ROP*

Mr. Chairman, being mindful of our obligations towards the ROP, PNG has been closely consulting with distant water fishing nations on how best to operate to implement measures under the CMM 2008-01, including the PNA third implementing arrangement (PNA 3IA). As part of our effort, we have recently signed an MOU with our Japanese colleagues detailing the mechanisms for observer coverage on the Japanese fleet and I am glad to report that the first 25 observer are now getting ready to observe on Japanese Purse seiners under the MOU. The MOU among other things addresses the issues of Travel, Accommodation, Observer costs placements etc. In terms of the latter, the issue of Observer costs has always been addressed through our bilateral arrangements with DWFN partners.

*Data provision and management*

Mr. Chairman, in order to ensure timely and efficient flow of data that is required from the observers, PNG is undertaking a facelift to its existing database and is in the process of further developing and incorporating the use of e-forms into its data reporting and information management system. We will continue to work closely with regional partners like the SPC and

FFA with regards scientific data and compliance to dissemination of relevant information to assist with the effective implementation of the ROP.

*Conclusion*

Mr. Chairman, in concluding, PNG would like to reiterate that it is keenly aware of its obligations to actively participate in the ROP and it will therefore continue to make its best efforts to prepare itself well.

## **Tuvalu Status Report**

Tuvalu has no commercial domestic fleet but it has an artisanal fleet. However, it is committed to set up a national program and to participate in the ROP. It has therefore made preparations since the ROP-IWG2 Meeting in 2008.

Preparations involve:

- Secure funds from government budget, including diverting observer levy from licensed foreign fishing vessels into the observer fee project fund;
- Reformation of the fisheries MCS Section. The reform requires government process which is slowing our preparations. Approval of the new structure includes recruiting of an Observer Program Coordinator and several more full-time observers;
- Continue participation in the SPC/FFA Observer Training Courses. It is very crucial since they have been providing training to Tuvalu. Training attachments will be provided to the Coordinator in order to enhance his knowledge;
- Tuvalu would like to thank the Secretariat for the progress work undertaken and recent developments since the ROP-IWG2 Meeting in 2008.





# FISH AGGREGATING DEVICE (FAD) INFORMATION RECORD

WCPFC March 2009 - version 3

OBSERVER NAME	VESSEL NAME	VESSEL IRCS or WIN #	OBSERVER TRIP ID NUMBER	PAGE	OF
---------------	-------------	----------------------	-------------------------	------	----

Date	Time	Latitude		Longitude		How detected	FAD materials		Assoc. electronics		Origin of FAD	FAD Activity	ESTIMATED SIZE <i>(simple diagram if it helps)</i>
		DD°	MM.MMM'	N/S	DDD°		MM.MMM'	E/W	code	anchor			
		°	'		°	'		Y / N					
Comment													

Date	Time	Latitude		Longitude		How detected	FAD materials		Assoc. electronics		Origin of FAD	FAD Activity	ESTIMATED SIZE <i>(simple diagram if it helps)</i>
		DD°	MM.MMM'	N/S	DDD°		MM.MMM'	E/W	code	anchor			
		°	'		°	'		Y / N					
Comment													

Date	Time	Latitude		Longitude		How detected	FAD materials		Assoc. electronics		Origin of FAD	FAD Activity	ESTIMATED SIZE <i>(simple diagram if it helps)</i>
		DD°	MM.MMM'	N/S	DDD°		MM.MMM'	E/W	code	anchor			
		°	'		°	'		Y / N					
Comment													

<p><b><u>How FAD is Detected</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Seen from vessel by crew</li> <li>2 Helicopter report</li> <li>3 Found using vessel radio buoy</li> <li>4 Bird radar</li> <li>5 Sonar / depth sounder</li> <li>6 Information from other vessel</li> <li>7 Anchored (GPS)</li> <li>8 Marked with GPS buoy</li> <li>9 Navigation Radar</li> <li>10 Lights</li> <li>11 Flock of Birds sighted from vessel</li> <li>12 Discovered in pursued net</li> <li>13 Being deployed (so not detected)</li> <li>14 Other ( please specify in comments)</li> </ol> <p>20 Unknown</p>	<p><b><u>FAD Main Materials</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Logs / trees / branches</li> <li>2 Timber / planks / pallets / spools</li> <li>3 PVC or plastic tubing</li> <li>4 Plastic drums</li> <li>5 Plastic sheeting</li> <li>6 Metal drums (i.e 44gal)</li> <li>7 Philippines design drum FAD</li> <li>8 Bamboo / cane</li> <li>9 Floats / corks</li> <li>10 Floating animal (dead)</li> <li>11 Floating animal (alive)</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;">(circle "Y" for Yes or "N" for No to show if FAD is anchored or not)</p> <p>20 Unknown (describe in comments)</p>	<p><b><u>Electronics associated with FAD</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Radio buoy (with identification)</li> <li>2 Radio buoy - unidentified</li> <li>3 GPS buoy (with identification)</li> <li>4 GPS buoy - unidentified</li> <li>5 Sounder buoy (with identification)</li> <li>6 Sounder buoy - unidentified</li> <li>7 Light buoy</li> <li>8 Other (describe)</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;">(record all available identification characters)</p> <p>20 Unknown (describe in comments)</p>	<p><b><u>Origin of FAD</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Your vessel</li> <li>2 Other vessel's - with permission</li> <li>3 Other vessel's - without permission</li> <li>4 Drifting and found by your vessel</li> <li>5 Deployed by FAD auxillary vessel</li> <li>6 Other (describe in comments)</li> </ol> <p>20 Origin unknown</p>	<p><b><u>FAD Activity</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Setting on FAD</li> <li>2 Deploying FAD</li> <li>3 Servicing FAD</li> <li>4 Retrieving FAD</li> <li>5. Vessel drifting beside FAD attracting fish away from FAD before carrying out a Set.</li> <li>6. Vessel setting close to FAD - specify estimated distance in comments</li> </ol>
--	--	---	---	---



**FAD INFORMATION INFORMATION**

*These data fields are for collection of data on all purse seine observer trips that take in part or all of the period 01 August 2009 through to 30 September 2009 inclusive.*

<p><b>Observer Name, Vessel Name</b> - Print all names in full (e.g. observer name "John Smith", and a vessel name "Mahino no 8")</p>	<p><b>Electronics associated with FAD (assoc. Electronics) - codes</b> Use this column to record whether any electronics were associated with the floating object. Most electronic instruments used with floating objects are designed to find the floating object. More modern instruments may also be monitoring the aggregation of fish beneath the vessel.</p> <p><b>Electronics associated with FAD (assoc. Electronics) - identification</b> Also record any identification numbers (ID Nos) that can be seen on the instrument. If only parts of the ID No. can be seen record what can be seen, dashes for characters that are seen but not identifiable, and question marks if unsure that they are even there Example of poor ID sighting: Record 78Z<del>P</del>H1 [ ] as 78Z-H1???</p>
<p><b>Vessel IRCS or WIN #</b> Record radio signature vessel uses when contacting other vessel or shore based radios. If the vessel does not have an IRCS use the WIN # allocated by the WCPFC. The Int. Radio Call Sign (IRCS) should be the main number on hull or side of vessel. Try to confirm this before recording it.</p>	<p><b>Origin of FAD</b> (See more notes on <b>FAD origin codes</b> below) Try to find out the origin of the object - how did it get to be in the water to start with? Use the code that best describes the origins of the FAD. If unable to find out where the FAD came from use the code for "unknown". If there is no suitable code for the origin use "other" and describe in the comments area. Record any additional details of the origin of the object in comments.</p>
<p><b>Observer Trip ID Number:</b> - No. issued by the authority observer is working for.</p>	<p><b>Notes on FAD origin codes</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The object was set adrift by the host vessel during this or a previous fishing trip. This will be the 2nd of these forms for this FAD if the FAD was deployed this trip. If from a previous trip then this information is only likely to come from the crew.</li> <li>Other vessel's – with permission - location was given to host vessel by other owner.</li> <li>Other vessel's – without permission - object found by host vessel without consulting owner.</li> <li>Drifting object found - object not previously involved in fishing activity. If the object has signs of previous fishing activity, such as a flag or beeper attached, record it as: Other vessel's – without permission (origin of FAD code 3.).</li> <li>From the host vessel company's auxiliary FAD deployment vessel - set by a vessel used specifically to set FADs for other vessels in that company to fish on</li> <li>Other – check this box if the origin of the object can be determined but no other options apply. Record the origin code 6 in the space provided and note additional details in "Comments".</li> <li>Unknown You cannot determine the prior origin of the object. Note any extra details in the "Comments" section.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Page ___ of _____ :</b> Number "FAD Information Forms" throughout the trip as Page 1, Page 2, Page 3, etc. At end of trip record the last page number after "of" on every page (e.g. if there are 10 "FAD Information Form" pages filled out) then first page will be "Page 1 of 10", the fourth page, "Page 4 of 10" and the last page will be "Page 10 of 10").</p>	<p><b>FAD Activity</b> Choose the code that best describes the activity that the boat is involved in with the FAD If the code chosen doesn't fully describe the activity be sure to explain more in "Comments" Activity code 2 is to be used to cover both the situations where the object is either (a) being placed in the water for the first time or (b) is being returned to the water after being taken aboard the vessel then moved to another area.</p>
<p><b>Date &amp; Time.</b> Record the time when the vessel is close enough to the object to begin collecting data. Use same date/time formats and protocols as used on other data forms for this trip. Most observer programmes record the Ship's Date and Ship's Time as used by crew. Normally observers set watches to this date and time as soon as they board the vessel.</p>	<p><b>Comments</b> Write any information that may help understand the interaction with this FAD better. If a drawing or other info. is in an obs. trip journal record journal and page reference in "comments"</p>
<p><b>Latitude &amp; Longitude:</b> Record position of FAD using Latitude and Longitude obtained by GPS. Record to 3 decimal places if possible. If not possible record 000 for decimal minutes.</p>	
<p><b>How Detected</b> - Record the primary method used to locate the object. If object is a FAD being deployed use code 13 to show it was not located</p>	
<p><b>FAD materials - code</b> - to record main components that make up the floating object. The most common materials used to construct the majority of floating objects are listed in the FAD material codes column on the front of this form. If there are more than one main component record the most abundant in the code field and describe the other components in the "Comments" field. If main component is not in the list use code for other and describe in "Comments". If not sure of the material, use the code for unknown and describe it if you are able.</p>	
<p><b>FAD materials - anchor</b> - to indicate whether the floating object is an anchored object or not circle "Y" for yes or "N" for no in the FAD materials - anchor column</p>	
<p><b>Estimated size</b> Record the width breadth and depth of the main body of the object as found or deployed. If the object has an irregular shape or is made up of multiple components, draw an imaginary box around the object and record the dimensions of the imaginary box. Use a simple diagram to help show the dimensions if this is easier to do</p>	



**WESTERN CENTRAL PACIFIC FISHERIES COMMISSION  
REGIONAL OBSERVER PROGRAMME  
VESSEL SAFETY CHECK GUIDELINES**

ROP-IWG3 21/03/09		<b>VESSEL INFORMATION</b>						
<b>TYPE OF VESSEL</b>	<b>PS</b>		<b>LL</b>		<b>P&amp;L</b>		<b>OTHER</b>	
NAME OF VESSEL							<b>Vessel Size (Length)</b>	
FLAG STATE							< 16 metres	<input type="checkbox"/>
CALL SIGN OR WCPFC WIN NUMBER							16-25 metres	<input type="checkbox"/>
FLAG STATE							26 -39 metres	<input type="checkbox"/>
REGISTRATION NUMBER							40-65 metres	<input type="checkbox"/>
OWNER/OPERATOR							> 65 metres	<input type="checkbox"/>
MASTER /CAPTAIN								

**VESSEL SAFETY CHECK (VSC)**

ESSENTIAL ITEMS TO BE CHECKED	YES	NO	N/A	COMMENTS
1. VESSEL SURVEY DOCUMENTATION (CURRENT)				
2. CORRECT SIZE PERSONAL FLOATATION DEVICES AVAILABLE				
3. APPROVED LIFE RAFT OR LIFE BOATS UNDER CURRENT SURVEY AND ADEQUATE FOR NUMBER OF CREW				
4. EPIRBS (CURRENT SURVEY)				
5. DISTRESS SIGNALS AND FLARES				
6. FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT IN GOOD ORDER				
7. FIRE EXTINGUISHERS (CURRENT CHECKED)				
8. MARINE RADIO HF SSB OR SUBSTITUTE COMMUNICATIONS				
9. NAVIGATION LIGHTS / VESSEL LIGHTS (WORKING ORDER)				
10. SOUND PRODUCING DEVICES OR BELL				
<b>ADDITIONAL ITEMS TO BE CHECKED</b>				
11. REGISTRATION DOCUMENTATION IN ORDER				
12. OTHER WORK RELATED VESSELS ON BOARD THAT COULD BE UTILISED IN CASE OF EMERGENCY				
13. NAUTICAL CHARTS AND NAVIGATION AIDS (GPS/RADAR)				
14. FIRST AID EQUIPMENT				
15. SANITATION				
16. PHONE				
17. EMAIL/FAX				
18. INSURANCE FOR OBSERVER WHILST ON BOARD				
19. VESSEL INSURANCE				
20. ROOM FOR CREW AND OBSERVER TO WORK SAFELY				

VESSEL AT THE TIME OF CHECKING IS CONSIDERED TO BE NOT SUITABLE FOR AN OBSERVER BOARDING

VESSEL AT THE TIME OF CHECKING MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS FOR AN OBSERVER BOARDING

NAME OF CHECKER \_\_\_\_\_ POSITION \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNED \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

## EXPLANATION ON VSC REQUIREMENTS

The fields in this form are to be used as a guide when developing a Vessel Safety Checklist (VSC) for National Observer Programmes. If a National programme has a VSC in place then that should be used, however the fields in this form may be used to check safety, on whether an observer is safe to board the vessel.

1. VESSEL SURVEY DOCUMENTATION CURRENT Fishing Vessels and support vessels operating in the WCPFC must comply with their Flag State regulations and/or the Code of Practice for Safety. Ship surveys including condition, safety and security aspects of hull, machinery and on board safety equipment must be available to be viewed
2. CORRECT SIZE PERSONAL FLOATATION DEVICE AVAILABLE Life Jackets must be approved types and in good serviceable condition, Life Jackets of suitable sizes must be readily accessible for the observer and all crew. Life jackets will not be stored away or locked in cupboards or rooms.
3. APPROVED LIFE -Life rafts must be currently in survey and be adequate to carry the amount of crew including the observer on board the vessel.
4. EPIRBS International Standard 406 MHz EPIRB. The signal frequency (406 MHz) has been designated internationally for use only for distress. Check to see the frequency number and position of these EPIRBS, a few vessels may have the older relatively common type of 121.5/243 MHz emergency beacons, these became obsolete in late 2008
5. DISTRESS SIGNAL AND FLARES. Vessels should have on board appropriate pyrotechnics devices that will suitably operate in both day and night emergency situations
6. FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT Fire fighting must be readily available, be able to work and be currently serviceable. Note that some small vessels may only have fire extinguishers on board.
7. MOUNTED FIRE EXTINGUISHER, Fire extinguishers must be readily available and be of the correct type. Portable extinguishers require periodic maintenance therefore the last inspection date when last tested or refilled should be available. All must be currently serviceable and if possible should be checked to ensure extinguishes have not been fully or partially discharged.
8. MARINE RADIO HF SSB(WORKING ORDER) Marine SSB (Single Side Band) is a means of communications for many fishing vessels. The radio must be capable of transmitting and receiving frequencies used for emergency marine communications as agreed by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) or by the Flag State of the vessel.
9. NAVIGATION LIGHTS AND VESSEL LIGHTS Vessels must be able to display international standard navigation lights between sunset and sunrise and in conditions of reduced visibility. Internal and external vessel lighting must be fully operational. In the case of power failure, battery operated safety lights must be appropriately placed to ensure a safe exit from the vessel
10. SOUND PRODUCING SIGNALS OR BELLS Vessels must carry a sound producing device (whistle, horn, siren or bell) capable of a prolonged blast or ringing for distress signaling purposes.
11. REGISTRATION DOCUMENTATION IN ORDER Flag State Registration documentation papers must be on board and available to be viewed and must show registration number, boats name, country and port of registration.
12. OTHER WORK RELATED VESSELS Many vessels have auxiliary vessels that can be used in emergency situations. Note these.
13. .NAUTICAL CHARTS AND NAVIGATION AIDS Vessel must have a set of appropriate, up to date nautical charts. Check to ensure that the Radar, GPS and any other navigational equipment is in good order and functioning.
14. FIRST AID EQUIPMENT The vessel must have adequate first aid facilities with current “use by dates” on all apparatus, drugs, dressings and other first aid paraphernalia.
15. SANITATION The vessel should have clean, well maintained sanitation and bathing facilities. Depending on the size of the vessel, observers may experience a lack of these facilities on board.
16. PHONE if the vessel has a satellite phone note the number for future reference.
17. EMAIL/FAX If the vessel has Fax or Email system note the numbers for future reference or emergencies.
18. INSURANCE FOR OBSERVERS ON BOARD - Observers must be covered by insurance before making a boarding
19. VESSEL INSURANCE – Check if vessel has insurance
20. ROOM FOR OBSERVER AND CREW TO WORK SAFELY . There must be adequate room on board the deck for the Observer and Crew to work in such a manner, so as to not hinder each other in their respective work duties.

**Table 1. Preliminary Estimate of Fisheries to be monitored**

Gear Type	Flag and Sector	Catch		Observer Coverage		Implementation
		Year	Tonnes	Year	%	
Longline	Australia	2007	4,662	2008	8.2%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	China	2007	14,855	2007	1.7%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	Cook Islands	2007	2,572	2007	0.0%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	Federated States of Micronesia	2007	1,943	2007	1.0%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	Fiji	2007	9,472	2006	1.9%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	French Polynesia	2007	4,992	2007	17.3%	Current 5%+ coverage to be maintained
	Japan, Coastal/Japan Offshore	2006	32,591	2007	0.0%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	Distant-Water	2006	33,244	2007	0.0%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	Korea (Republic of)	2007	20,305	2007	0.1%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	New Caledonia	2007	1,770	2007	2.2%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	New Zealand	2007	598	2006	2.5%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	Papua New Guinea	2007	2,987	2007	0.9%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	Samoa	2007	3,559	2006	0.3%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	Solomon Islands	2007	267	2007	0.0%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	Chinese Taipei, Offshore	2007	24,988	2007	0.0%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	Chinese Taipei, Distant-Water	2007	17,440	2007	0.0%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	Tonga	2007	861	2006	4.6%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
	United States (Hawaii)	2007	6,585	2004	20/100%	Current 5%+ coverage to be maintained
	United States (American Samoa)	2007	6,317	2007	12.0%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012
Vanuatu	2007	8,572	2007	0.0%	Coverage to increase to 5% by end of 2012	

Pole and Line	Japan, Offshore and Distant-Water	2006	142,209	2007	0.0%	Exploratory coverage by end of 2010
	Solomon Islands	2007	3,937	2007	0.0%	Exploratory coverage by end of 2010
Purse Seine	China	2007	54,941	2007	4.8%	Coverage 20% in 2009, 100% in 2010.
	European Union (Spain)	2007	19,747	2007	100.0%	Coverage 20% in 2009, 100% in 2010.
	Federated States of Micronesia	2007	13,497	2007	12.3%	Coverage 20% in 2009, 100% in 2010.
	Japan, Offshore and Distant-Water	2007	244,919	2007	0.0%	Coverage 20% in 2009, 100% in 2010.
	Kiribati	2007	5,450	2007	0.0%	Coverage 20% in 2009, 100% in 2010.
	Korea (Republic of)	2007	258,177	2007	1.6%	Coverage 20% in 2009, 100% in 2010.
	Marshall Islands	2007	59,404	2007	27.6%	Current 20% + coverage to be maintained in 2009, 100% in 2010
	New Zealand	2007	30,562	2007	0.6%	Coverage 20% in 2009, 100% in 2010.
	Papua New Guinea	2007	219,637	2007	17.0%	Coverage 20% in 2009, 100% in 2010.
	Philippines, Distant-Water	2007	13,720	2007	34.6%	Current 20%+ coverage to be maintained in 2009, 100% coverage in 2010
	Solomon Islands	2007	17,307	2007	4.2%	Coverage 20% in 2009, 100% in 2010.
	Chinese Taipei	2007	232,535	2007	4.0%	Coverage 20% in 2009, 100% in 2010.
	United States	2007	72,204	2005	20.6%	Current 20%+ coverage to be maintained in 2009, 100% coverage in 2010
Vanuatu	2007	67,010	2007	9.1%	Coverage 20% in 2009, 100% in 2010.	
Troll	New Zealand	2007	1,734	2007	0.0%	Exploratory coverage by end of 2010
	United States	2007	1,425	2007	0.0%	Exploratory coverage by end of 2010

