



SEVENTH REGULAR SESSION

6-10 December 2010

Honolulu, Hawaii, USA

ANNUAL REPORT TO THE COMMISSION– REGIONAL OBSERVER PROGRAMME

WCPFC7-2010/26

1 November 2010

Introduction

1. Paragraph 2 of Article 28 of the WCPFC Convention states: “The observer programme shall be coordinated by the Secretariat of the Commission, and shall be organized in a flexible manner which takes into account the nature of the fishery and other relevant factors.”
2. Paragraph 3 of CMM 2007-01 states: “The Secretariat of the Commission shall provide an annual report to the Commission with regard to the Commission ROP and on other matters relevant to the efficient operation of the programme.”
3. The Secretariat compiled a reported on its first full year of operation for TCC6 and this was presented as part of the TCC report. A number of issues were raised at TCC6 resulting in this revised report to include those and intersessional issues since the TCC 6 meeting.
4. The WCPFC7 is invited to review the issues noted from Para 5 to 16 and provide guidance to the Secretariat and Commission on the proposed recommendations.

Issues

5. ROP Observers
 - a) Maintenance of proficient observers and the collection of quality data and reports in Pacific Island ROP programmes to ensure the Commission standards and observer coverage goals are maintained.
 - b) Complaints from captains and operators about the behavior and demands by observers on vessels and in ports, plus the complaints by observers on the failure of vessels to adhere to the standards agreed in CMM 2007-01.
6. Debriefing
 - c) CCM standards for debriefers are not uniform, with a shortage of available debriefers to ensure all ROP observers are fully debriefed after each trip including multiple trips on a vessel. If debriefing occurs, reports are not attached to observer trip data and reports.
7. Observer Reports
 - d) Captains wanting to view and sign copies for verification of the observer report before the observers depart the vessel.

8. Observers for Special Situations

- e) Funding and allocation of duties for observers to be used in special situations, which may not be known at the time of the annual budgeting exercise.

9. Definitions and Standards

- f) To ensure appropriate sourcing of ROP observers, operational requirements and vessels to be covered are harmonised across all programmes key words in the Convention Article 28 or CMM 2007-01 require definition.
- g) The following words require definitions: “principally”, “occasional”, “independent”, “impartial” “observer trip” (for different gear types) and vessel size.

10. Coordinating ROP activities with other RFMOs

- h) Requirement for cross-endorsement procedures and agreement for observers of both IATTC and WCPFC to work on approved vessels that fish in both Convention areas during a trip.

11. Audits of Observer Programmes for the ROP

- i) Direction on how the reporting of ROP Audits occurs. Three options were presented to TCC 6 and Option 3, ‘notification only to TCC and the Commission being recommended to the Commission.

12. ROP Collected Data

- j) The WCPFC Secretariat has received limited data from the Commission data provider (SPC). National and sub-regional programmes need to authorize the release of ROP data from the data provider.

13. Data Management & Costs

- k) Funding and location of data entry of ROP data collected in the WCPO Convention Area.

14. ROP Working Group

- l) WCPFC rejected the formation of an advisory observer operational group however during 2010 when 100% purse seine observer coverage was introduced, a number of observer and transshipment issues have arisen where no procedures or guidance are available to the Secretariat.

15. Detection of possible violations during ROP Trips particularly during FAD Closure

- m) During analysis and checking of ROP observer data there may be indications that a vessel may have breached the rules concerning the CMMs of the Commission. There are currently no procedures, in place to act on reported infringements detected by ROP observers for the high seas.

16. Data required by Vessel Flag States

- n) Vessel Flag States have requested copies of data collected by ROP observers, clarification on what data should be released by the Commission data provider is required by the Secretariat and SPC.

17. Transshipment Coverage- Non Member and member Carriers and Bunker Vessels

- o) A number of enquiries have come to the Secretariat from agents, flag States on the timing and placement of observers and the costs and responsibility involved for member and non member Carriers and Bunkers from January 2011.

Recommendations for issues para 5-16

WCPFC7 is invited to review and decide on the following advice and recommendations:

18. ROP Observers

- a) The WCPFC support the FFA/SPC Pacific Island Regional Fisheries Observer (PIRFO) criteria and standards for training of observers in the Pacific Island Observer Programmes
- b) The WCPFC support that SPC be used to assess the quality of data collected by individual observers and observer programmes, with the assessment being available to the ROP Secretariat for monitoring and auditing purposes.
- c) The WCPFC task the Secretariat to liaise with flag States of fishing vessels to compile a list of complaints from vessel captains and crew about ROP observer's behavior when on board vessels. The list will be used to prepare a report with the aim to improve efficiency of the ROP from both the observer and vessel perspective. The report will be presented to TCC7
- d) The WCPFC task the Secretariat to compile a list of complaints by observers about conditions onboard the vessel they are observing. The list will be used to prepare a report that will improve efficiency of the ROP from both the observer and vessel perspective. The report will be presented to TCC7
- e) The WCPFC recognizes that ROP observers are often over extended in the number of trips made in succession, and recommends the number of days an observer spends on a vessel should be between 50 days and no more than 90 days.

19 Debriefing

- f) WCPFC support the training of qualified debriefers so that observers can be properly and fully debriefed after each trip.
- g) WCPFC supports that debriefing reports must be completed, signed and dated by debriefers after each debriefing and copies of the debriefers report should be sent to the observer provider and the ROP secretariat in a timely manner.

20 Observer Reports

- h) WCPFC recognizes the rights of captains and operators to review and comment on the observer reports under CMM 2007-01, Attachment K, Annex B Para 1 (c), and unless otherwise advised by fisheries inspectors or enforcement officers, "captains are permitted to review and comment on observer reports and have the right to include additional information deemed relevant or a personal statement" after the observer has departed the vessel, and has been fully debriefed. The captain may submit such a request to the observer provider.

21 Observers for Special Situations

- i) That WCPFC supports the funding of observers for special situations on an annual basis, with any unused funding allocation to be deducted from the following year's budget.
- j) That WCPFC supports the role of the Executive Director in determining special situations that may arise during a year.

22 Definitions and Standards

- k) The WCPFC draw on the experience of the ROP coordinator in conducting the ROP audits and use these findings to assist in resolving the current, different interpretations of various terms

23 Coordinating ROP activities with other RFMOs

- l) TCC6 recommended to continue the intersessional work on the cross endorsement of observers with IATTC. The EU will take views electronically on an intersessional basis with comments to be received no later than 31 October 2010. On the basis of comments received the EU will submit a new draft MOC to WCPFC7 for consideration

24 Audits of Observer Programmes for the ROP

Recommendation from TCC6

- m) *Final Audit Report will be reported to Country involved with notification only relayed to the TCC and Commission when a programme fully complies with the Commission standards.*

25 ROP Collected Data

Note and recommendation from TCC6

- n) *TCC6 noted that FFA/SPC CCMs are working with SPC to approve the release of ROP minimum data standard fields collected by national and sub-regional observers on ROP duties to the Secretariat for analysis.*
- o) *TCC6 recommended that CCMs ensure timely provision of ROP observer data to the Commission Secretariat.*

26 Data Management & Costs

Noting and Recommendations

- p) It is noted that funding for ROP data entry of ROP Data (\$334,369) is included in the budget for 2011 to be considered by the FAC.
- q) Data entry option "Data entry by SPC in Noumea" will be supported for one year provided a financial contribution of \$115,000 ecu from New Caledonia is continued to be provided for 2011.

27 ROP Working Group

- r) A small Technical Operational Advisory Group (TOAG) be formed to deal with matters that arise as part of the operation of the ROP programme. The TOAG would meet electronically, or on the side of current Commission meetings and would make interim decisions until such time approval, guidance or clarification is made by the Commission through its subsidiary bodies.

28 Detection of possible violations during ROP Trips particularly during FAD Closure

- s) A set of guidelines and procedures to act on reported infringements detected by ROP observers for the high seas be developed for the Commission by the Secretariat for discussion at TCC7

29 Data required by Vessel Flag States

- t) A set of guidelines and procedures to release ROP Data to flag States of vessels be developed for the Commission by the Secretariat for discussion at TCC7

30 Transshipment Coverage Non Member and member Carriers and Bunker Vessels

- u) WCPFC agree that the same rules used for member carrier vessels for selection, placement and funding of ROP observers for 100% observer coverage on the high seas, is also applied to carrier vessels on the “Interim Register of Non-Member Carrier Vessels”.
- v) WCPFC agrees that the registration fee already collected for non member carriers is separate from ROP observer costs for the 100% observer coverage commencing on Jan 2011. Observer fees will be fully recovered by the nominating CCM’s of a non member carrier vessel in a similar procedure as for member carrier vessels.
- w) ROP Observers must be placed on board all carriers transshipping on the high seas from vessels as per CMM 2009-06 Para 13 at sea no later than 0000 hrs UTC 1st January 2011. (Noting, that this may require the carriers not wishing to come to port placing an observer aboard prior to this date.)

Back Ground

Background and discussion for the issues Para 5 - 16 and recommendations Para 17 to 29

31 ROP Observers

- a) During the 2009 period approximately 180 observers were used to attain the coverage of fleets during the year and the 100% coverage for August/Sept of 2009. These observers came from authorized ROP observer programmes and were sourced from Pacific Island countries. A survey of Pacific Island national observer programmes in July 2010 indicated that there are now 551 authorised observers available for ROP trips, the numbers of observers will continue to turn over and further training programme’s being organized by the FFA, SPC and CCMs will be important to maintain adequate numbers of observers to be available for observer trips. Because of the shortage of observers and cost cutting methods made early in the implementation of the ROP coverage, some providers asked their observers to extend their time at sea for up to 5-6 trips? This may have possible ramifications for the observer’s health, and the quality of data collected.

32 Debriefing

- a) With the large increase in observer placements expected with the 5% longline coverage, and the transshipment coverage as well as the continuing 100% purse seine observer coverage for vessels fishing 20N to 20S, a core of well trained debriefers will be required. The selection and further professional training of debriefers to maximize the usefulness of the information from observers is an important step that is being taken to overcome the extreme shortage of debriefers in most Pacific Island Programmes. Pacific Island Programmes surveyed indicated that approximately 90 debriefers across all programmes would be required, with a majority operating in the busy landing ports. The US has made funds available to the ROP to assist with the establishment of debriefers in the major unloading ports in the Pacific. The WCPFC ROP will work closely with FFA and SPC to ensure only qualified and competent debriefers are used when debriefing observers.
- b) The interim standard for “Briefing and De-briefing of observers” is that there is a system for briefing and de-briefing of observers in place and documentation describing briefing and de-briefing available to the Secretariat. 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 should prepare qualifications for debriefers and make this available for review by the Secretariat during the audit process.

33 Observer Reports

a) Unlike many science-only observer programmes, the ROP monitors both compliance and science issues and therefore the independence of the observer must be maintained. Requests for vessel captains to view and sign verifications that observer information is correct before they depart the vessels should be resisted on the grounds of independence and safety of the observer. However, once the observer has departed the vessel and has been properly debriefed, unless otherwise advised by fisheries inspectors or enforcement officers, the vessel captain may ask the observer provider to allow them a view of the observer's report on his/her trip on board the vessel.

b) CMM 2007-01 Attachment K, Annex B Para 1 (c) states

The rights of vessel operators and captains shall include:

“Timely notification from the observer provider on completion of the observer's trip of any comments regarding the vessel operations. The captain shall have the opportunity to review and comment on the observer's report, and shall have the right to include additional information deemed relevant or a personal statement”

c) In most circumstances, WCPFC ROP observer providers must ensure that all observers are debriefed and that there is a timely notification to the vessel/flag State of any problems detected by the observer regarding the vessel operations.

34 Observers for Special Situations

a) The scope of the observers for special situations was included in the 1st ROP report to TCC5 and WCPFC6. The Commission budget did not allocate any budget for this item in 2010; the budget of \$30,000 for 2009 was used for special trips that employed observers for development in the Spill/Grab sampling project discussed at SC5 & SC6. It is expected that experienced observers will be required to assist with audit procedures. (Recalling that all Interim authorised programmes seeking full authorization have to do so before June 2012) Observers for special situations may be required to conduct independent observer trips, as part of a review or audit of national and sub regional observer programmes to ensure that the Commission minimum standards are being maintained. In some instances, the need for a special situation requiring observers may not be known at the time of budgeting, but a need may arise following due to circumstances occurring during the year.

35 Definitions and Standards

a) The words “Principally, Occasional, Adjacent, Independent” and “Impartial” which appear in the record of the TCC2 and are repeated in the CMM 2007-01 remain undefined. The WCPFC4 requested these words be defined to assist CCMs to reach a common understanding of their meaning in the context of the ROP. The definitions for these words were discussed at the IWG-ROP2 and at many subsequent WCPFC TCC and Commission meetings where agreement on the definitions has been attempted. The discussion has always resulted in there being no consensus, this is because of the many different ways CCMs are applying their own interpretation to these words.

36 Coordinating ROP activities with other RFMOs

- a) The initiative to develop a cross-endorsement process of observers between IATTC and WCPFC comes from CMM 2008-01, Para 29 which directs the Secretariat to work with IATTC to develop procedures to allow observers from each regional fisheries management organization (RFMO) to work in one another's Convention Area. A draft agreement was presented by the Secretariat to TCC6 for comment where it was decided that a small working Group, chaired by the EU, would consider the Draft Agreement. Following a few changes proposed at the working Group, it was decided that member countries would be given a chance to make comments on the proposal and that the EU would work intersessional with interested parties to submit a draft Agreement to WCPFC7 for consideration.

37 ROP Collected Data

- a) Following discussion on the problems associated with the Commission Secretariat not receiving ROP data in a timely manner, CCMs were encouraged to give the Commission Data Provider (SPC) approval to release ROP Minimum Data standard fields collected by National and Sub regional Observers on ROP duties.
- b) The WCPFC Regional Observer Programme (ROP) provides coverage by ROP observers as per the WCPFC Convention Article 28 Para 4 and 5, This definition of the ROP observer trip was reinforced by the approval of CMM 2007-01 "Scope of the Commission ROP" Para 5.
- c) Member countries of the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) are obliged to provide data collected from ROP trips to the WCPFC Secretariat according to the requirements specified in the WCPFC Conservation and Management Measure (CMM) 2007-01 Attachment K, Annex C, which was approved by all Members of the Commission.
- d) Other reasons the Data Provider was having difficulty in supplying ROP Data to the Secretariat were discussed at the Science Committee meeting, where it was stated that the definition of an ROP trip and the requirement by CCMs to provide ROP data to the WCPFC Secretariat has been clearly stated in the Convention and in CMM 2007-01. However the overwhelming stress on the resources of national and regional observer programmes as a result of the CMM 2008-01 requirement for 100% coverage in the purse-seine fishery has meant that countries have been severely delayed in sending their data to SPC for processing; Also the backlog of hard-copy observer data received at SPC, because of the shortage of funding for staff for data entry will further delay data being available in an acceptable time frame.
- e) SPC holds observer data on behalf of their member countries, but because of prior arrangements with their member countries they are required to obtain authorization to release ROP-defined data to the WCPFC. Member countries have been formally requested by SPC and supported by TCC6 to work on providing the authorization as soon as possible to release their ROP-defined data to the WCPFC. The current status of these authorizations is included in Table 1. Member countries are urged to assist by sending ROP data to SPC or WCPFC Secretariat in a timely manner

Table 1 CCMs who have authorized release or are sending ROP data to the Secretariat

Observer Programme	ROP Prog.	Gear Type	Notification Date	Provided to	CCMs sending or have given Authorisation to release Data to WCPFC Secretariat
Australia	YES	LL			
China	YES	LL, PS			

Cook Islands	YES	LL	29 Sept 2010		Authorised Ministry of Marine Resources
Federated States of Micronesia	YES	LL, PS	17 Jun 2010	SPC/OFP	Authorised by FSM (NORMA)
Fiji Islands	YES	LL, PL			
French Polynesia	NO	LL, PL, TR			
Indonesia	NO	LL, PS			
Japan	YES	PS			
Japan	YES	LL, PL			
Kiribati	YES	PS, LL	8 th Oct 2010	SPC/OFP	Authorised by Kiribati Fisheries and Marine Resources
Republic of Korea	YES	LL, PS			
Marshall Islands	YES	LL, PS			
Nauru	YES	LL, PS	7 Jul 2010	SPC/OFP	Authorised by Nauru Fisheries
New Caledonia	YES	LL			
New Zealand	YES	LL	1 Jan 2009	MAF/NZ	Authorised by NZ MAF
New Zealand	YES	PS			
Niue	NO	LL			
Palau	YES	LL, PL			
Papua New Guinea	YES	LL, PS	2 Jun 2010	SPC/OFP	Authorised by PNG/NFA
Philippines	YES	PS			
Samoa	NO	LL			
Solomon Islands	YES	LL, PS, PL	24 Sept 2010		Authorised by Ministry of Fisheries
Chinese Taipei	YES	LL, PS			
Tonga	YES	LL			
United States	YES	LL, TR, PL			Data sent direct to Secretariat
	YES	PS			
Vanuatu	YES	LL, PS			
Forum Fisheries Agency					
US Treaty Obs. Prog.	YES	PS			
FSMA Observer Prog.	YES	PS			

38 Data Management & Costs

- a) The funding that was required in 2010 enabling the development of adequate infrastructure and staffing for all ROP data to be entered was not approved by the WCPFC6. For data to be made available from the ROP Commission for analysis and reporting, funds need to be allocated to enable the Data Provider to enter the backlog of data, and the current collected ROP data.
- b) Tables indicating costs of funding for the management and data punching for approximately 3000 purse seine and long line observer trips a year was presented as part of the WCPFC6 work programme and will be discussed at FAC.
- c) It should be noted that since the funding proposal presented at WCPFC6 there has been a change in the numbers of data punchers required to be funded for entering ROP data in 2011. The New Caledonia subsidy covers the cost of 3.5 Data Entry personnel at SPC. The FFA Secretariat observer programme will enter the UST and FSMA data which has lessened the requirements for data entry staff to be assessed against the ROP data entry at SPC. Some member countries that have the infrastructure to do so are entering their own data, with a few others wishing to commence entering their data collected by their observers. However, many of the observer

provider countries do not have the infrastructure to be able to enter the data and rely heavily on the Data Provider (SPC) to enter their ROP data. Taking into account the subsidy by New Caledonia and the other providers entering data there has been a reduction in data entry requirements for SPC to enter the ROP data. Therefore the establishment and staff requirement which has been recalculated to be 8 data entry persons to enter ROP data at SPC for 2011 will be at a cost of US\$334,769.

- d) The Secretariat was asked to compile a number of options with costs for the management of data collected by the ROP observers these options for data entry were reduced to two options by TCC5; option 5.1 Data entry in Noumea and option 5.3 Data entry in Pohnpei. Following a commitment of a financial contribution of \$115,000 ecu from New Caledonia at WCPFC6 for 2010, option 5.1 was accepted for one year. It is understood that New Caledonia will continue to offer this subsidy and therefore data entry at SPC in Noumea is being proposed once again.

39 ROP Working Group

- a) At the TCC5 meeting a proposal was made by the IWG-ROP to form a Technical Operational Advisory Group (TOAG) to deal with operational problems that arise with the ROP. Unfortunately some members opposed the formation of the TOAG and a decision was made not to form a TOAG. Since the implementation of the 100% observer coverage, a number of issues have arisen, where it would have been convenient to have the availability of a small group of operational experts to assist with clarifications and guidance to ensure that there is a harmonised understanding of the roles of the Secretariat, providers and flag States. ROP recommendations on operational issues by the group would be interim decisions until further clarified and cleared at a SC, TCC or WCPFC.

40 Detection of possible violations during ROP trips, particularly during FAD Closure

- a) Infringements occurring in the waters of CCMs, if detected, are reported and dealt with by the laws and rules of access to those waters. However any non-compliance with CMMs on the high seas, in most cases have no rules or procedures for follow up action..
- b) Infringements are normally detected/reported at the time of the observers debriefing, however not all observers disembarkation ports have qualified debriefers available, also the observers at the time of collecting the information may not be aware that there was an infringement of a CMM. These infringements will be revealed when ROP data has been analysed. If this infringement occurs in a member countries waters then the laws, rules of access, etc are used to determine the vessels future. There is no such sanction if committed on the high seas. It is noted that this is a similar concern for other WCPFC programmes on the high seas as well, e.g., VMS, RFV, Compliance reporting, etc.

41 Data required by Vessel Flag States

- a) A Vessel Flag State has asked for copies of data collected by ROP observers, there are rules of procedures although the Secretariat is not clear on what is to be given. The Secretariat has interpreted this to mean that flag States of vessels are entitled to ROP data collected on the high seas after it has been entered by our data provider SPC. In releasing this data no observer details are given however the flag State would be able to identify any observer by checking the data dates against vessel records and observer coverage information. Currently the Secretariat does not provide any raw data or the written reports and diary of the Observer. Data is only available after

it has been entered by the data provider. Questions on what data is permitted need to be resolved, e.g. should bad erroneous data collected by an observer be released, or should it only be data that is verified as being useable and is of the standard required by the Commission. There are other areas on this matter that need to be clarified and it would be prudent to allow the Secretariat to develop a paper on this issue for discussion at TCC7.

42 Transshipment Coverage for Non Member Carriers and Bunker Vessels and Member Carrier and Bunker Vessels.

- a) CMM 2009-01 Section D paragraph 30 states that as part of the condition of inclusion on the WCPFC Interim Register of non-Member country Carrier and Bunker Vessels is the requirement to undertake to agree to cover costs associated with complying with Commission decisions, such as costs of VMS registration and ROP Observer placement.
- b) Attachment 3 of the Application format for registration on the “Interim Register of non Member Carrier and Bunker Vessels” is signed by the applicant agreeing to these conditions.
- c) CMM 2009-06 Para 13 read with CMM 2007-01 indicate that the responsibility of placing the observer is with the CCM nominating the vessel for inclusion on the register for non member vessels, the procedures for placement and collecting fees would be similar to the current arrangements and procedures under the ROP.
- d) The registration fee collected for non member carriers would remain as an administrative fee collected by the Secretariat. All observer costs/travel and responsibility of placement for the 100% observer coverage on non member carrier vessels commencing on Jan 2011, will be fully recovered and administered by the responsible CCMs who nominated the non member carrier vessel. Observer costs/travel and placement responsibility of member flagged carriers will be the responsibility of the member state where the vessel is flagged.

43 2009 Observer Coverage Summary.

- a) Long line coverage across some fleets for 2009 is contained in Table 2. Some programmes have had a comprehensive coverage of their fleets whilst others have little or no coverage. Figures in the table have been taken from country part two reports submitted by the CCMs. The figures presented here are an update of the table presented at TCC6. It should be noted that the figures taken from Part 2 reports are difficult to interpret and it is recommended that countries should place actual vessel coverage figures against their fleets, so as the coverage of 100% for purse seiners and the 5% coverage of long liners by 2012 can be established.
- b) Purse seiner’s coverage for the multilateral programmes for 2009 was around 20% whereas other coverage for purse-seiners for national programmes data is difficult to determine. It also difficult to determine which trips apply to the ROP, as many SPC/ FFA member countries have not given the data provider (SPC) permission to release data collected by their observers for the ROP trips.

Table 2 Coverage of fleets as reported in Part 2 reports (Received by 30th October 2010)

Reported Observer Coverage 2009			
Country	Gear Type and set type	% Coverage	Data provided to Secretariat as per CMM 2007-01
USA Hawaii	Longline shallow set	100%	Data Direct to Secretariat
	Longline Deep Set	20.60%	Data Direct to Secretariat

USA American Samoa	Longline Deep Set	7.70%	Data Direct to Secretariat
	Albacore Troll	0	
	Purse Seine	20%	Data Direct to Secretariat
	Purse Seine FAD closure	100%	Data Direct to Secretariat
Belize	Longline	Not supplied	ROP data not received
China	Longline	Not supplied	ROP data not received National observers are dispatched on board of vessels for scientific purpose.
New Caledonia	Longline	Regular basis	ROP data not received
Canada	No Vessels fish for Tuna	0	ROP data not received
Indonesia	Longline	0	No Observer Programme
	Purse seine	0	No Observer Programme
Federated States of Micronesia	Purse Seine	63%	ROP Data authorised to be supplied
	Longline	< 5%	ROP Data authorised to be supplied
New Zealand	Longline	26%	ROP Data authorised to be supplied
	Purse Seine	35%	ROP Data authorised to be supplied
Korea	Longline	0%	ROP data not received
	Purse seine	100% FAD Closure	Some ROP data received
El Salvador	Purse seine	100% FAD Closure	Some ROP data received
Australia	LL	37% of hooks set	ROP data not received
Fiji	LL	12 trips	ROP data not received
	PS	Part of FFA UST 20%	ROP data not received
Nauru	PS	2 trips Part of FFA & FSMA UST 20%	ROP Data authorised to be supplied
Cook Islands	LL	10%	ROP Data authorised to be supplied
French Polynesia	LL	5%	Not part of ROP
Japan	LL	6 trips	ROP data not received
	PS	100% FAD Closure	Some ROP data received
Niue	No coverage	0	Not part of the ROP
PNG	LL	Domestic coverage ?	Not ROP Data
	PS	100% domestic 20% DWFN	ROP Data authorised to be supplied
Kiribati	PS	100% FAD Closure	ROP Data authorised to be supplied
Tuvalu	PS	1 trip Part of FFA & FSMA UST 20%	ROP data not received
France	Refer French Polynesia and New Caledonia		ROP data not received
Philippines	Domestic PS	0	Not ROP Data
Vanuatu	LL	0	No ROP Data
Solomon Islands	PS	21 Placements Some Part of FFA & FSMA UST 20%	ROP Data authorized to be supplied

44 Audits of Observer Programmes for the ROP

- a) During TCC 6, member countries with ROP's were asked to submit suggested suitable timings for the Secretariat to compile an indicative work programme to carry out the Audit of their ROP's which is required by June 2012. The Indicative work programme based on timings given as suitable, is contained in Table 3. The actual dates taking into accounts flights, etc. will be worked out closer to the times given in the table.
- b) The IWG-ROP put in place the Audit process, however once procedures were developed and applied: there was no direction on how the reporting of these Audits should occur, options were presented to TCC 6 and Option 3 “ *Final Audit Report will be reported to Country involved with notification only relayed to the TCC and Commission when a programme fully complies with the Commission standards*” was accepted.

Table 3 Indicative Work Programme for Auditing of ROP Programmes by the Secretariat

Country	Month Year	Est. Days Req. Inc travel time
Philippine	Completed May 2010	(K)
USA	Completed Oct 2010	(K)
FSM	Feb 2011	2x5 (D & K)
RMI	Feb 2011	2x7 (D & K)
Japan	Feb/March 2011	1x7 (K)
Korea	Mid March	1x7(K)
Fiji	March 2011	2 x7 (D K)
Tonga	March 2011	1x6 (D)
Tuvalu	March 2011	1x6 (K)
Kiribati	Early April 2011	1x6 (D)
Nauru	Early April 201	1x6 (K)
Vanuatu	June 2011	1x8 (D)
PNG	June 2011	1x6 (D)
Solomon's	June 2011	1x8 (K)
FFA Secretariat	June 2011	1x6 (K)
Chinese Taipei	July 2011	1x7(K)
China	No Response	1x9 (D)
Palau	Aug 2011	1x7 (K)
Australia	Feb 2012	1 x 21 (K)
New Zealand	Feb 2012	
Cook Islands	Feb 2012	
New Caledonia	Will do when visiting SPC	1x5
Samoa	Not currently interim authorised	
Niue	Not currently interim authorised	
French Polynesia	Not currently interim authorised	

K= ROP Coordinator D = ROP Data Quality Officer

45 Catch Retention

Noted

- a) WCPFC7 is asked to note Table 4 which is an indication of discard reports the Executive Director has received from 39 purse seine vessel fishing 20N to 20s. The report of discards is for the period 09 Feb 10 to 26 OCT 2010

46 Back Ground

- a) Para 13 of CMM 2009-02 “*The operator of the vessel shall also provide a hard copy of the information described in Para 12 to the WCPFC Observer on board*”. To date, the discards from 39 vessels have been reported. ROP observer data is still to be processed and made available for verification to the Secretariat for these trips.
- b) Table 5 indicates that the majority of discard reports were due to insufficient well space on the final set, a small amount discarded were reported as “unfit for human consumption and damaged by gear failure.

Table 4 Vessels Reports of Discards as required by CMM 2009-02

Vessel Flag	¹ Number of Vessels	Tonnage Discards (Mt)				
		Reports	Vessels Reporting	SKJ	YFT	BET
China	12					
China Taipei	32	22	13	301.99	6.53	7.00
Ecuador	8					
El Salvador	2					
FSM	7	1	1	5.00	0.00	0.00
Japan	35	41	20	964.00	126.00	17.00
Kiribati	4					
Korea	26	9	5	370.00	45.00	0.00
Marshall Islands	6					
New Zealand	4					
Papua New Guinea	3					
Philippines	17					
Spain	4					
Tuvalu	1					
United States	36					
Vanuatu	17					
Total	214		39	1,640.99	207.53	24.00

¹ Not all vessels are active at the same time

Table 5 Discards

REASON OF DISCARD	SKJ	YFT	BET	Total	Percentage
Not fit for human consumption	32	0.50	0	32.50	1.8%
Gear and Catch Damaged	58.99	1.03	1	61.02	3.3%
Last Set Insufficient Well Capacity	1,550	176	23	1,749.00	94.9%
Total	1,640.99	177.53	24	1842.52	100%

47 Problems associated with the Catch Retention reports:

- a) Some vessel reports are not reporting the amount retained, from the same set, that discards have been recorded.
- b) Reports received in language other than English.
- c) Only one position and time reported for both set and discard CMM2009-02 Paragraph 12 e and f requires two different reporting entries.
- d) Late submission of reports, in one case a report was submitted 3 weeks after the event.

48 Observer training courses,

- a) During the period the ROP Coordinator assisted in training sessions in the Philippines and the FSM and continues to offer advice to many CCMS on different aspects of observer training and the requirements of the WCPFC. Although funding is being made available from some sources, the funding of observer training remains a problem for some observer providers.

49 Support staff

- a) The ROP employed a Data Quality Officer, Mr Donald David from FSM in June 2010, the position will be involved in all aspects of the ROP and will ensure that reports on coverage, catch retention, transshipment and other data areas will be reported in a timely manner.

50 Travel/Meetings

- a) The ROP Coordinator was involved in TCC5, (Pohnpei), WCPFC6 (Papeete Tahiti), SC6 (Tonga), Pacific Island Debriefers Training and Coordinators Meeting (Cairns), Data Consultative Committee (SPC Noumea) FFA MCS Annual Meeting (Honiara). The ROP Coordinator made contributions to each of these meetings on ROP matters and issues as well as facilitating general administration for most of these meetings. Assistance in observer training where CCMS requested assistance on explaining aspects of the Commission and the relevant CMMs to the observer trainees were presented and explained to courses in the Philippines (Manila)

51 Authorized observer providers to the ROP

- a) Programmes that have qualified to be authorized on an interim basis to be part of the ROP are listed in Table 6. These programmes have interim authorization until June 2012. The programmes on invitation will be audited before 2012

TABLE 6 Interim Authorised Providers For The ROP.

Observer Programme	Authorization Date	Observer Coordinator Contact details
Australia	28 Sep 2009	Mike Yates Mike.Yates@afma.gov.au
China	19 Jun. 2009	Chen Xuejian admin@tuna.org.cn
Federated States of Micronesia	01 May 2009	Steven Retalmai nevetlater@hotmail.com
FSM Arrangement & Multilateral Treaties on Fisheries	01 Jul. 2009	FFA Secretariat timothy.park@ffa.int or ambrose.orianihaa@ffa.int
Japan	30 Jun. 2009	Takeshi Miwa takeshi_miwa@nm.maff.go.jp Wataru Tanoue Wataru_tanoue@nm.maff.go.jp
Kiribati	12 Jun. 2009	Tekirua Riinga tekiruar@mfmrd.gov.ki
Korea	14 Jul. 2009	Dr. Zang Geun Kim zgkim@nfrdi.go.kr

Marshall Islands	01 May 2009	Dike Poznanski	dikep@mimra.com
Nauru	27 Sep 2010	Ace Capelle	nrvms@ccnpac.net.nr
New Caledonia	13 Nov 2009	Hugues Gossuin	hugues.gossuin@gouv.nc HuguesG@spc.int
New Zealand	26 Jun. 2009	Alan Martin	alan.martin@fish.govt.nz
Palau	14 Jul. 2009		To be advised
Papua New Guinea	01 Feb. 2009	Philip Lens	plens@fisheries.gov.pg
Philippines	29 Jul. 2009	Alma C. Dickson	alma_dickson@yahoo.com
Solomon Islands	01May 2009	Derrick Suimae	dsuimae@fisheries.gov.sb
Tonga	11Aug 2010	Viliami Mo'ale	vmoale@tongafish.gov.to
Chinese Taipei	15 Jun. 2009	Ke-Yang Chen	ckeyang@msl.gov.tw
Tuvalu	23 Jul. 2009	Falasese Tupau	falasese@yahoo.com
USA	07 Mar.2009	Joe Arceneaux	stuart.arceneaux@noaa.gov
Vanuatu	14 Jul. 2009	John Mahit	jmahit@gmail.com