



TECHNICAL COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE
Eleventh Regular Session
23 - 29 September 2015
Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia

7th ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE REGIONAL OBSERVER PROGRAMME

WCPFC-TCC11-2015-RP02
3 September 2015

1. Purpose

1.1 The Regional Observer Programme (ROP) has been established pursuant to Article 28 of the Convention. The purpose of the ROP is stated in Article 28 (1) which is “to collect verified catch data, other scientific data and additional information related to the fishery from the Convention Area and to monitor the implementation of the conservation and management measures adopted by the Commission.” In addition, paragraph 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.” The Conservation and Management Measure that operationalized Article 28 of the Convention is CMM 2007-01 *Regional Observer Programme*. Paragraph 12 of CMM 2007-01 “Role of the Secretariat” lists a number of ROP activities that the Secretariat is required to carry out.

1.2 This paper reports on the different aspects of the ROP as required by the Convention, CMM 2007-01 and the outcomes of WCPFC11. 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.” The paper also provides a report, in response to a requirement for the Secretariat to report on the implementation of a range of non-target conservation and management measures based on observer reports, as part of the Annual Report on the Regional Observer Programme.

2. General

2.1 The Secretariat continues to support observer and debriefer training sessions at the WCPFC training centre in FSM; assistance was also given on request to help the Philippines with observer and debriefing training. The Secretariat also continues to assist national and sub-regional observer programmes on matters regarding provider and observer roles in relation to CMMS, Commission requirements, data collection and data entry requirements, monitoring of transshipment and other important observer issues. The Secretariat has participated in observer related meetings and workshops, such as the Regional Observer Coordinators Workshop (ROCW), the 4th Intersessional Working Group for the Regional Observer Programmes, (IWG4 ROP) Electronic Reporting and Electronic Monitoring working group and the Joint Tuna RFMO Bycatch Technical Working Group. During the period a number of WCPFC authorised Regional Observer Programmes have been reviewed in the second round of observer programme audits.

3. Continuation of Regional Observer Programme Audits:

3.1 The initial audits of national and sub-regional observer programmes for the implementation of the Regional Observer Programme (ROP) were completed by June 2012. A second phase of audits was agreed by

WCPFC10 to commence in 2014. The Secretariat commenced the audits and the Philippines, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, and FFA were reviewed in 2014. In 2015 those audited were Nauru, Fiji, Tonga, Kiribati, and the United States, Hawaii based, Pacific Island Regional Observer program; Korea is still to be reviewed later in 2015. Programmes so far reviewed in 2015 were maintaining Commission minimum standards as required for Regional Observer Programmes, and where some problems were identified, these have been rectified; The schedule for 2016 is FSM, Palau, Marshall Islands, Papua New Guinea however if any other observer programmes wish to bring forward their review it can be accommodated.

3.2 A small budget each year to accommodate these reviews is required however when possible the reviews are combined with other travel and or meetings, the current budget granted (\$15000) by the Commission for ROP audits should be sufficient to carry out the reviews of the programmes scheduled for reviews in 2016.

4 Available Observer Data.

4.1 The paper “*Status of ROP Data Management*” WCPFC-TCC11-2015-IP05, which was also presented at the Science Committee, on data management indicates the amount of data that has been entered and also highlights possible data gaps and other problems in receiving the data for entry. This paper is one of the papers that was drawn on in the preparation of draft Compliance Monitoring reports covering 2014 activities by the Secretariat.

4.2 It is noted that the number of trips undertaken by purse seine vessels is determined by VMS but that it may not be totally accurate, because of other non-fishing activities that the vessel may be involved in, being counted as a trip, such as transiting to shipyards for maintenance, etc. as of the end of July 2015 there was 845 trips purse seine and Longline (71%) data processed for 2014. Members are reminded that, it was agreed at WCPFC10, that a time frame for submission of observer collected data to the Secretariat or the Commission data provider (SPC) should normally occur within 100 days for purse seiners and 120 days for long liners. Data collected from fish carriers is to be sent within 120 days to the Commission Secretariat.

5 Data Entry Staff “Pohnpei”

5.1 The Secretariat has four data entry personnel based in the Pohnpei office, In addition to these data entry personnel the ROP Coordinator and the Data Quality Officer are involved regularly in offering advice and assistance to some of the data entry problems and data issues that are detected from time to time.

5.2 A new system to improve the time available for entry was introduced as a trial, and it has worked well, with an increase in data being entered during the period of the trial; e.g. April to June 2014, the Pohnpei team entered an average of 38,400 data entries per month, where as in the same period in 2015 which included a week of no data entry because of typhoon “Dolphin,” an average of 44750 data entries per month was achieved.

6 Data and monitoring requirements by the ROP of the Commission’s CMM 2012-04 on the protection of Whale Sharks from Purse Seine operations;

6.1 Whale shark interactions between vessels in the WCPO have been monitored by Pacific observer programmes since the late 90’s. In recent years the collected observer data on whale sharks has been expanded to give a more detailed account of the interactions.

6.2 Table 1 shows available data entered from 2014 observer reports, including the number of whale sharks encounters and their fate and condition as monitored by observers for the different fleets, reported as directed by paragraph 7 of CMM 2012-04. The sizes of the whale sharks observed varied from relatively small juveniles to fully grown adult whale sharks.

6.3 There were 84 reported whale sharks landings on deck from 247 reported interactions, a number of these reports indicated whale sharks were being lifted from the nets and landing them on deck or removing them from the nets by lifting them by the tail and dropping them outside the nets. A method that has been proven to damage or kill the larger whale sharks because of their size and weight. Observers in a few reports where this occurred noted that whale sharks were distressed, injured or dead when returned to the water. Other

reports by observers indicate that some smaller whale sharks were bought on deck, and left there until after the set was finished and then dumped overboard deceased, one observer reported a whale shark was gaffed in the eye socket and dragged out of the net. It is clear from observer reports that some vessel captains and crew are not using the voluntary WCPFC guidelines for the removal of whale sharks from a set;

6.4 Many observers did report that numerous vessels made valid attempts to remove the whale shark from the net in an appropriate manner; therefore causing as little harm to the whale shark as possible. The Commission Secretariat had received a number of reports direct from vessel captains explaining that accidental sets were made on whale sharks and describing how the shark was removed and its condition on release.

Table 1- Whale Shark Encounters by Purse-seine Vessels in the WCPF Convention Area 2014/2013

Landed		Released		**Interaction with Vessel Gear Not Landed	Sighted from vessel No Interaction with Vessel Gear	Total landings Interaction Sightings for 2014 (845 Trip Data entered)	Total landings Interaction Sightings for 2013 (1235 Trip Data Entered)	
Number	Cond*	Number	Cond*					
24	A0	24	A0	149	14	247	381	
0	A0	0	A1					
1	A0	1	A2					
4	A0	4	A3					
8	A0	8	D					
12	A1	12	A1					
3	A1	3	A2					
2	A1	2	A3					
0	A1	0	D					
6	A2	6	A2					
12	A2	12	A3					
3	A2	3	D					
2	A3	2	A3					
1	A3	1	D					
1	A5	1	A3					
4	D	4	D					
Totals		84		149	14	247	381	
*Description of Condition Codes used by observer								
A0		Alive Unable to describe condition		A1	Alive and healthy		A2	Alive but injured or distressed
A3		Alive but unlikely to live		A4	Entangled but ok		A5	Entangled Injured
							D	Dead
** Interaction with vessel gear indicates whale shark was not landed and was usually caught in the net and then subsequently released from net without bringing the whale shark on board. (2014 data 845 trips as entered by 1st August 2015)								

7. Turtle landings; recorded by observers for 2014.

7.1 Available 2014 observer data indicates there were 133 turtle interactions or catches recorded by observers with 67 landings on board the vessels. Table 2 shows the number of reported landings by species and the condition and fate of turtle on and after being caught. It is noted that turtles caught by purse seining were released in reasonable condition; whereas the few long line caught turtles reported had a higher percentage of badly injured or deceased turtles when released.

Table 2 Turtle catches by gear and release condition

Gear type	Species	No	Landed Cond	No	Released Cond	**Interaction with Vessel Gear Not Landed	Sighted from vessel No Interaction with Gear
PS	DKK	1	A0	1	A1	0	0
PS	DKK	1	A2	1	A2		
PS	FBT	1	A2	1	A2	0	0
LL	FBT	2	D	2	D		
PS	LKV	15	A1	15	A1	12	5
PS	LKV	4	A2	4	A2		
PS	LKV	1	A4	1	A0		
PS	LKV	3	D	3	D		
PS	LKV	1	D1	1	D		

PS	TTH	2	A0	2	A0	13	4
PS	TTH	8	A1	8	A1		
PS	TTH	2	A2	2	A2		
PS	TTH	1	D	1	D		
LL	TTL	1	A1	11	A1		
PS	TTL	2	A0	2	A0	7	5
PS	TTL	2	A2	2	A2		
PS	TTL	1	A4	1	A2		
PS	TTX	1	A1	1	A1	0	0
PS	TUG	15	A1	15	A1	15	5
PS	TUG	1	A2	1	A2		
PS	TUG	1	A3	1	A3		
LL	TUG	1	D	1	D		
Total		67				47	19
Species Codes							
DKK	Leatherback Turtle	FBT	Flatback Turtle	LKV	Olive Ridley		
TTH	Hawksbill Turtle	TTL	Loggerhead Turtle	TTX	Unidentified Turtle	TUG	Green Turtle

8. Bird landing data recorded by observers for 2014

8.1 Available 2014 observer collected data indicates there were 14 bird interactions reported with purse seiners, long line data for the same period showed no interactions with seabirds reported by observers. The small number of birds sighted is expected given that the purse seiners fish mainly in the equatorial areas and a few of the reported sightings are from purse seiners fishing on the outer fringes of this area, As can be seen by the table most sea birds remained unidentified, indicating that observer training in this area needs to be improved and that more comprehensive manuals for sea birds need to be available to observers. The issue of bird identifications will become important as observers are to be deployed on the albacore targeting vessels fishing in the southern waters of the Convention area.

Table 3 - Bird landings and Interactions 2014

(2014 data 845 trips as entered by 1st August 2015)

Gear type	Species*	Landed		Released		**Interaction Vessel Gear Not Landed	Sighted from Vessel No Interaction	Landings Interaction Sightings 2014
		No & Cond	No & Cond	No & Cond	No & Cond			
PS	Unknown	1	A1	1	A1			1
PS	Unknown					1		2
PS	Unknown						6	6
PS	Unknown Petrel						1	1
PS	Black footed Alb.	1	A1	1	A1		1	1
PS	Black footed Alb						1	1
PS	Southern Royal Alb.						1	1
PS	Laysan Albatross					1	1	1
Total							14	

9. Cetaceans Interactions for 2014

9.1 Table 4 shows the different species of whales/dolphins that interacted or where sighted and identified by observers, it also includes a few landings during brailing, and the fate of the Cetacean if landed. Most of the sightings and interactions are an individual event recorded by the observer; however some recorded sighting where 1 is indicated by the observer for the interaction where the cetacean was not landed, this may be recorded as one sighting but involve larger numbers of animals in the pods sighted. There were approximately 34 dead cetaceans reported which included 3 larger whales with the rest being dolphins, the large whales may have been set on when they were already dead, but this is not indicated. Observers generally reported that early morning sets on Fads, were the main source of cetacean captures with vessels in some cases not seeing the cetaceans until after the net has been set around the FAD.

Table 4 Cetaceans catch for 2014*(2014 data 845 trips as entered by 1st August 2015)*

Species	Landed		Released		Interaction with Vessel Gear Not Landed	Sightings from vessel No Interaction Vessel Gear	Total landings Interaction Sightings for 2014
	Number & Condition*	Number & Condition*	Number & Condition*	Number & Condition*			
Baleen Whales	1	D	1	D	11	4	15
Beaked Whale					3		3
Blue Whale						1	1
Brides Whale					16	10	26
False Killer Whale	1 4	A1 D	1 4	A1 D	190	131	326
Humpback whale	1	D	1	D	2	2	5
Killer whale	1	A2	1	A2	2	3	6
Melon Head Whale	1	A2	1	A2	12	3	16
Minke Whale					5	1	6
Pygmy Killer Whale					1		1
Pygmy Minke					2		2
Pygmy Sperm					7	7	14
Sei whale	1	A0	1	D	42	16	59
Short Fin Pilot whale	2	A2	2	A2	38	65	105
Sperm whale					4	12	16
Unidentified Whales						14	14
Bottlenose Dolphin	1 6	AO D	1 6	A0 D	12	8	27
Common Dolphin					7	11	18
Spotted Dolphin					1		1
Frasers Dolphin						1	1
Long Beaked Dolphin	2	A1	2	A1			2
Rissos Dolphin	1 22 7	A1 A2 D	1 22 D	A1 A2 D	3	4	37
Routh Tooth Dolphin	1 1 6	A0 A2 D	1 1 6	A0 A2 D	10	1	19
Spinner Dolphin	1 1 1 1	A2 A3 A5 D	1 1 1 1	A2 A3 D D	10	11	25
Striped Dolphin	1	A1	1	A1	0	4	5
	63				378	309	750

10. Sharks

10.1 Stock assessment on “Silky Sharks” and “Ocean White Tip Sharks” caught in the Convention Area indicate declining catch rates in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean, indications are that the stock of this low productivity species is overfished, and that overfishing is occurring. Two CMM’s have been agreed by the Commission CMM 2013-08(Silky Sharks) and entered into force from 1 July 2014 and CMM 2011-04 (Oceanic White Tip Sharks) and entered into force from 1st Jan 2013. Table 5 Silky Sharks and Table 6 Ocean White Tip sharks shows LL and PS catches recorded by observers for the 2014 period and entered in the ROP data base and reports supplied to the WCPFC Secretariat. Despite the CMM requirements, the reporting by observers appears to demonstrate that some vessels are still finning silky sharks and oceanic whitetip sharks and the bodies are being discarded. These indications do warrant some further investigation by the Secretariat and flag CCMs; the Secretariat has been liaising with the relevant flag CCMs prior to TCC11 and through the secure CCM portals will continue to provide flag CCMs with updated lists of the relevant vessel trip details so that further investigations of the observer reported alleged incidents may commence.

Table 5 Silky Sharks*(2014 data 1151 trips as entered by 29th August 2015)*

2014 Period	Number Caught	Discarded Body, Fins Retained	Body and Fins Retained	Condition Discarded					
				A0	A1	A2	A3	D	NR*
Jan 1 –June 30 Purse seine	18029	604	207	3	2	0	0	1104	16917
Jan 1 –June 30 Long line	703	87	244	34	24	14	9	593	29
July 1–Dec 31 Purse seine	9516	185	26	1	2	0	14	1741	7750
July 1 – Dec 31 Long line	190	20	5	8	45	19	3	87	11
Total	28438	896	492	43	73	64	26	3525	24707

*Condition Not Recorded

Silky Shark; CMM 2013-08 came into force July 1st 2014**Table 6 Ocean White Tipped Sharks***(2014 data 1151 trips as entered by 29th August 2015)*

2014 Period	Number Caught	Discarded Body, Fins Retained	Body and Fins Retained	Condition Discarded					
				A0	A1	A2	A3	D	NR*
Jan 1 –Dec 31 Purse seine	326	9	0	0	0	0	0	38	288
Jan 1 – Dec 31 Long line	137	0	0	0	49	10	4	72	2
Total	463	9	0	0	49	10	4	110	290

*Condition Not Recorded

Ocean White Tip Shark; CMM 2011-04 came into force 1st Jan 2013

11 ROP Minimum Standard Data Fields and subsequent observer training requirements

11.1 CMMs or formats approved by WCPFC11, IWG ROP4, SC11 that require additional data fields to be added to Commission “Observer Minimum Standard Data Fields” collected by observers.

11.2 Two recommended field additions to the Observer Trip Monitoring Summary known as Gen-3 from the IWG-ROP4 refer *WCPFC-TCC11-2015-17* are;

- Start of trip and End of trip
- Debriefing status i.e. debriefed, pre debriefed, not debriefed.

11.3 The Science Committee made recommendation for additional fields, and adjustment in instructions to a few fields already listed as Minimum Standards Data Fields of the WCPFC. (*Refer WCPFC-TCC11-2015-19*) Fields are improved to collect information on species of special interest including key shark and bird species catches. Many of the fields are already being collected by FFA/SPC observers however are not available as Commission ROP Minimum Standard Data Fields (MSDF). *WCPFC-TCC11-2015-19* provides the list of the suggested additional fields and instructional changes to current Minimum Standard Data Fields recommended by SC11. An extra column has been added by the ROP section of the Secretariat to better describe the field in a format that is already being collected by FFA/SPC Observer programmes, and has suggested similar formats for the few new fields observers are asked to collect as requested by the SC11.

12. Observer Coverage Purse-Seine 2014

12.1 CMM 2007-01 Para iii gives the task of the Secretariat to receive communications and providing reports on the ROP’s operation to the Commission (and its subsidiary bodies); including target and achieved coverage levels. This relies heavily on communications between providers, flag states to inform the Secretariat on their observer coverage levels, and many programmes do report often and correctly, however due to a small number of providers that did not provide information on their observer placements, data received from flag State and some providers had to be cross-referenced to try and work out placements, the Secretariat was able to verify most but not all placements, while the Secretariat ROP Section is reasonably sure 100% coverage of purse seiners occurred, the ROP section is unable to confirm positively that every purse seine vessel carried an observer during 2014. During the compilation of this table it was noted that in a couple of occasions, the same observers was on the same vessel for the whole period of 2014, this is against the directions of the Regional Observer Coordinators Workshop (ROCW) where a maximum of two trips on

the same vessel is recommended and only in special circumstances should an observer do 3 trips in a row on the same purse-seiner.

12.2 Table 7 indicates the known reported observer coverage as supplied by providers and flag States for purse seine vessels for period Jan 1st to Dec 31st 2014.

Table 7 – Available Observer Coverage for Purse Seine Vessels Jan –Dec 2014

Flag	Number of Vessels	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
China	20	19	19	18	18	18	18	15	15	17	18	17	18
Ecuador	11	5	5	7	6	6	7	5	4	3	3	3	3
El Salvador	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	4	3
Federated States of Micronesia	11	7	7	10	11	11	10	7	9	9	9	9	10
Japan	30	22	22	23	26	27	24	18	16	17	18	16	18
Kiribati	14	9	10	11	11	12	12	12	10	11	11	11	11
Korea (Republic of)	29	23	23	24	24	25	23	24	24	25	26	26	25
Marshall Islands	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	8	8	6	10	10
New Zealand	4	1	1			1	3	3	2	2	1	1	1
Papua New Guinea	35	17	18	21	21	18	14	8	6	4	4	5	6
Philippines	35	27	28	32	31	33	33	0	0	0	24	29	30
Solomon Islands	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chinese Taipei	36	28	28	30	29	30	32	31	30	26	24	26	26
Tuvalu	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
United States of America	40	39	39	40	40	39	38	38	37	37	38	39	39
Vanuatu	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	0	1	1	1
Spain	4	4	4	3	2	2	2	1	2	3	3	3	4
Total	290	217	220	235	235	238	242	174	165	165	189	201	206

Notes on Coverage

- A few vessels fished domestically during the period and their trips are not included in the ROP coverage table;
- Total vessel numbers taken from RFV (Dec 2014) some vessels may not have been active in some of or all the Convention Area during 2014;
- Vessels reflagged during the period of the tables, however the tables indicate the flag of the vessel as of Dec 2014.
- The FAD closure period saw a drop in vessel activity for some fleets due to vessels shifting from the WCPO to the EPO. The FAD closure period also saw an increase in vessels going to shipyards for/maintenance and repairs.

13 Observer Coverage - Long Line 2014

13.1 Coverage rates for long liners is set at 5% and this was to be achieved by 30 June 2012, (CMM 2007-01 Annex C Para 6); long line data being received by the WCPFC data provider (SPC) indicates that data for many fleets has not been made available and ROP coverage rate is yet to be achieved for some fleets.

13.2 The long line coverage was initially based on trips as per CMM 2007-01 Para 6 Attachment K, Annex C. however other mechanisms to allow 5% coverage have been agreed, the “*Status of ROP Data Management*” paper (WCPFC-TCC11-2015-IP05) that includes domestic-based longline fleets (not bound by ROP coverage rates) are achieving coverage better than 5%, but that some of the major longline fleets require a significant number of observer trips to achieve the ROP target coverage of 5% of effort. As was agreed by WCPFC11, four different metrics are now available to be used for reporting observer longline observer coverage;

- number of hooks deployed (comparing hooks observed to hooks deployed by fleet)
- number of days fished (number of days vessel fished compared to number of days observer on board during fishing days)
- number of days-at-sea (number of observer sea days compared to fleet sea days)
- number of trips (number of trips by observers compared to total trips by fleet)

13.3 Another metric used by a CMM that was not approved, is the number of vessels observed compared to the total fleet number of vessels. This is not 5% coverage of effort as is required, as each vessel can make many trips, set many hooks, etc. in a year; by saying 5 vessels boarded out of a hundred vessels is 5% coverage of effort would only be applicable if the observer stayed on board for the whole year covering every trip/hook set by those 5 vessels.

14 Transshipment 2014

14.1 Following recommendation by TCC and the Commission that the issue of carriers notifying the Secretariat of their intention when operating in the WCPO, the IWG ROP4 supported in principle a draft proposed amendment to CMM 2009-06; the proposal can be found as Attachment 5 of the IWG ROP4 Summary report refer *WCPFC-TCC11-22015-17*. The proposal was produced by the Secretariat for IWG-ROP's consideration, and IWG-ROP has recommended that TCC11 further consider this proposal for editorial amendments and as appropriate forward the proposal to the Commission for adoption.

14.2 Coverage and other details of transshipment are included in the annual report on high seas transshipment reporting refer *WCPFC- TCC11- 2015- RP04*

14.3 No real issues regarding observer coverage were detected during 2014 however in a few instances carrier agents were unable to get observers on short notice; it is recommended that carrier agents give as much notice as possible with at least 3 weeks' notice as a minimum. Carrier agents are also reminded that any travel costs are their responsibility, and must include a travelling allowance for hotels and food etc.

15 Cross Endorsement of Observers

15.1 There are approximately 25 observers available from FSM, Nauru, Kiribati and RMI with cross endorsement certification. These certified observers are able to carry out work in both Convention areas on the same trip. Training of 12 experienced observers by IATTC and WCPFC held in London, Kiritimati Island during August 2015; the location of these observers in Kiritimati will assist in reducing costs and increase convenience as the port (London) in Kiritimati is a popular port of call for vessels that intend to fish in both Convention areas. A further training in 2016 to increase numbers with Cross endorsement is proposed and a budget of \$28,000 is suggested.

16 Coordinators

16.1 A list of ROP authorised observer programmes and their coordinator contacts are available on the MSC - ROP section of the WCPFC website; website <http://www.wcpfc.int/regional-observer-programme> authorised programmes are reminded to send observer coordinator changes as soon as they are known to the Secretariat, to keep this list up to date. This list is used by many members and organisations to contact observer programmes when looking for observers to place on their vessels as well as enquiring on observer information.

17 CMM Booklet for Observers

17.1 As directed by WCPFC10 & WCPFC11 the Secretariat has compiled a booklet of the current Commission Conservation and Management Measures and Resolutions that are specifically relevant to observers that are in force. The booklet also highlights some of the issues that will assist observers in understanding the CMMs and the importance of the data they are collecting. Electronic versions were provided on the website for 2014 and 2015 and the Secretariat also understands that the observers using FIMS online reporting systems, are provided access to the electronic version of the booklet through their data-entry tablets.

17.2 The first hard-copy publication of this booklet (2015) has proven extremely popular and a wider audience other than observers has requested the booklet including vessel captains who have asked some observers to leave the book on board when they disembark. Following requests by programmes on how many they required for 2015; 1500 booklets were printed for 2015. However it is suggested that this may need to be increased by approximately 250 for 2016, as some countries ran out and asked for further copies. The distribution of the booklets in 2015 was a little later than expected, but following the first year of publication the Secretariat has determined the quickest and best methods for distribution after the publications are printed. It is expected that the CMM observer booklet for 2016 will be available a lot earlier than it was in 2015.

17.3 The budget allocated for printing this book and distributing this booklet was insufficient to cover the costs estimated for the budget in 2015: printing and distribution costs are likely to have been overspent by approximately \$4000 and the freight costs were under estimated. The total cost of printing and freight in 2015 was \$12,562 which represents a delivered cost of \$8.37 per booklet. An increased budget will be required for the extra printing for the suggested increase numbers of booklets for 2016 (1750), and extra for the costs of the freight of the 2016 Booklet. In 2016, an increased budget of \$14500 for the printing and distribution of the 2016 version is sought.

18. IWG-ROP

18.1 The IWG –ROP met in Fiji early July 2015 to discuss a number of issues that had been forwarded to the IWG-ROP from previous TCC and WCPFC meetings. The major areas discussed at IWG-ROP4 were misconduct of observers, ID cards, high seas transshipment pre notifications, facilitation of observer data and placement information, pre notification scheme for vessels on possible infringements, ROP long line observer coverage, data flow to the Commission, definitions and clarifications. The IWG4 summary report and recommendations on the issues mentioned above can be found in the “Report of the IWG4” (*refer WCPFC-TCC11 2015-17*) the summary report contains a few recommendations that may require further in put by TCC11.

19 Observer Trip Monitoring Summary

19.1 An “Observer Trip Monitoring Summary” is part of the minimum data standards of the Commission; many observer programmes use work books that contain a general form “GEN -3” that is used as a “Trip Monitoring Summary”. The form is not a written report but is an indicator of activities allegedly carried out by vessels and witnessed by the observer. The observer indicates by circling ‘YES or NO’ to the questions on the form. A response of ‘YES’ is an indicator only, and does not necessarily indicate that there has been any infringement by a vessel. The observers will include in their written report/diary the reasons “Yes” was circled.

19.2 Table 8 represents data entered for 775 observed trips for purse seiners, from across all fishing fleets and indicates the number of “Yes” answers to the questions asked in the “Observer Trip Monitoring Summary format”. This information is one of the sources that was drawn on in the preparation of draft Compliance Monitoring reports covering 2014 activities by the Secretariat. The highest reported “Yes’ was for bunkering with high incorrect target and by catch species reporting target in vessel logs..

Table 8 Observer Trip Monitoring Summary 2014

		Trips observers reported Yes	% of trips entered
Item reported	Total Number of Trips Entered		775
<i>Observer Rights and Social Behavior</i>			
RS -a	Did the operator or any crew member assault, obstruct, resist, delay, refuse boarding to, intimidate or interfere with observers in the performance of their duties	59	7.6
RS -b	Request that an event not be reported by the observer	50	6.5
RS -c	Mistreat other crew	28	3.6
RS -d	Did the operator fail to provide observer, while onboard, at no expense to observer or the observer's Government, with food, accommodation, access to safety gear and medical facilities of reasonable standard - equivalent to those normally available to an officer onboard the vessel	21	2.7
<i>National Regulations</i>			
NR -a	Fish in areas where the vessel is not permitted to fish	29	3.7
NR -b	Target species other than those they are licensed to target	11	1.4
NR -c	Use a fishing method other than the method the vessel was designed or licensed	8	1.0
NR -d	Not display or present a valid (and current) licence document onboard	31	4.0
NR -e	Transfer or transship fish from or to another vessel	61	7.9
NR -f	Was involved in bunkering activities	572	73.8

NR -g	Fail to stow fishing gear when entering areas where vessel is not authorised to fish	46	5.9
WCPFC CMMs			
WC -a	Fail to comply with any Commission Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs)	139	17.9
WC -b	High-grade the catch	40	5.2
WC -c	Fish on FAD during FAD Closure	65	8.4
Vessel Log Sheet information			
LP -a	Inaccurately record vessel position on vessel log sheets for sets, hauling and catch	15	1.9
LP -b	Fail to report vessel positions to countries where required when entering and leaving an EEZ (crossing to or from an EEZ into or out of the High Seas)	10	1.3
LC -a	Inaccurately record retained "Target Species" in the Vessel logs [or weekly reports]	287	37.0
LC -b	Inaccurately record "Target Species" Discards	450	58.1
LC -c	Record target species inaccurately [eg. combine bigeye/yellowfin/skipjack catch]	420	54.2
LC -d	Not record bycatch discards	440	56.8
LC -e	Inaccurately record retained bycatch Species	179	23.1
LC -f	Inaccurately record discarded bycatch species	227	29.3
Species of Special Interest -			
SI -a	Land on deck Species of Special Interest (SSIs)	172	22.2
SI -b	Interact (not land) with SSIs	335	43.2
Pollution			
PN -a	Dispose of any metals, plastics, chemicals or old fishing gear	402	51.9
PN -b	Discharge any oil	105	13.5
PN -c	Lose any fishing gear	6	0.8
PN -d	Abandon any fishing gear	74	9.5
PN -e	Fail to report any abandoned gear	22	2.8
Sea Safety			
SS -a	Fail to monitor international safety frequencies	11	1.4
SS -b	Carry out-of-date safety equipment	79	10.2

20 TCC11 is invited to provide support to the Secretariat proposed activities in 2016 with budgetary implications:

- a. Cross endorsement training of observers to be able to carry out duties in IATTC waters and the WCPFC waters on the same trip continues in 2016 (propose indicative budget for 2016 be increased from \$25,000 to \$28,000).
- b. The CMM Booklet relevant to observer roles and duties continues to be printed in 2016. (propose indicative budget for 2016 be increased from \$8,500 to \$14,500).

TCC11 is invited to recommend that the 7th annual ROP report is accepted.