

Prepared by the ROP-IWG Chair

I. Purpose

This paper reports on progress on WCPFC21 taskings to the ROP-IWG and proposes updates to the ROP Minimum Standard Data Fields (MSDF) to:

- i. add or revise fields to better monitor newer or updated CMMs, clarify data reporting for scientific versus compliance purposes, and improve how ROP data feeds into the WCPFC Case File System (CCFS);
- ii. remove fields that are no longer needed; and
- iii. consider including new data fields for monitoring and reporting non-fish transfers (e.g. provisions, fuel, bait, personnel) as part of transshipment reporting.

II. Background

Initial proposals to remove redundant MSDF were presented at SC20 ([SC20-ST-WP-04](#)) and TCC20 ([WCPFC-TCC20-2024-19](#)). [WCPFC21](#) appointed Mr Lucas Tarapik as Chair of the ROP-IWG and endorsed the approach set out in [WCPFC21-2024-16](#) to advance this and other ROP-IWG tasks in 2025 ([WCPFC21 Summary Report](#), paragraph 581).

TCC20	TCC20 expressed concern over the delay in including cases arising from ROP data in the CCFS and recommends to the Commission that the question of streamlining the inclusion of ROP data in the CCFS be a task for the ROP-IWG. (<i>ref: TCC20 Outcomes, paragraph 16</i>)
--------------	--

	TCC20 agreed in principle that many of the ROP Minimum Standard data fields were redundant, particularly those related to vessel details, and are better collected through existing processes, such as vessel registration or the RFV. <i>(ref: TCC20 Outcomes, paragraph 48)</i>
	TCC20 recommended that the Commission at WCPFC21 task the ROP-IWG to prioritize in 2025 the review of the ROP Minimum Standard data fields, the review of the pre-notification process adopted during WCPFC12, and to develop a standardized process for the use of ROP data in the CCFS. <i>(ref: TCC20 Outcomes, paragraph 50)</i>
	TCC20 recommended to the Commission that it appoint Mr Lucas Tarapik (Papua New Guinea) as ROP-IWG Chair. <i>(ref: TCC20 Outcomes, paragraph 77)</i>
	TCC20 recommended that the Commission at WCPFC21 schedules an in-person meeting of the ROP-IWG to be held adjacent with TCC21 in 2025. <i>(ref: TCC20 Outcomes, paragraph 51)</i>

In addition, the Commission tasked the ROP-IWG to consider adding non-fish transfers to the [minimum data fields for monitoring transshipments](#) ([WCPFC21 Summary Report](#), paragraph 513). This proposal was based on a CCM proposal submitted to the Transshipment-IWG held during WCPFC21 in 2024.

III. Progress on WCPFC21 taskings for ROP-IWG in 2025

In 2025, the ROP-IWG held two online intersessional meetings: [ROP-IWG05](#) on 11 April and [ROP-IWG06](#) on 20 June. Feedback received during these meetings has been used to revise the proposed MSDF updates, which are now submitted to SC21 and TCC21 for further input. Additional feedback will be considered from the FFA Data Coordination Committee, which met on 7–8 July.

It is intended to provide final recommendations to WCPFC22 on these matters after consideration by SC21 and TCC21 and any further review required intersessionally.

The list of all ROP MSDF including those proposed for changed is in **WCPFC-SC21-2025/ST-WP-10_suppl01** however, this supplementary paper is not intended to be reviewed at SC21. Instead, for ease of review, the specific proposals for change are presented Attachments 1 (new and amended ROP MSDF in i. above.) and 2 (removals to ROP MSDF in ii. above) to this paper.

Attachment 3 presents an additional proposal relating to potential additional transshipment minimum standard data fields. Recommendations are made in each of these 3 sessions.

Scope of monitoring for potential infringements for the WCPFC Compliance Case File System Cases (as discussed at ROP-IWG06)

The following table describes scientific monitoring needs for data collection by observers and potential compliance issues for data collection by observers and provides comments on any existing MSDF. It also shows track changes reflecting comments received during ROP-IWG meetings in 2025.

Please note: Discussion under SC21 Agenda 3.1.5.3 **Reporting requirements for cetacean interaction** on scientific data collection will potentially provide updates to these proposals covering current scientific purposes as well as for proposed monitoring of implementation.

Recommendations relating to Table in Attachment 1

SC21 is invited to:

- review the Table in Attachment 1 to identify priority obligations and issues where data collection by ROP observers would most effectively support monitoring of CMM implementation;
- recommend whether any listed items should be removed or added, the level of detail needed (e.g., trip-level vs. set-level), and whether refinements to the Minimum Standard Data Fields (MSDFs) or Observer Trip Monitoring Summary are necessary; and
- recommend the MSDF in the Table in Attachment 1, as amended by SC21, for discussion at TCC21.



Virtual Meeting 6 of ROP-IWG

20 June 2025 10:00h – 14:00h (Pohnpei time)

Scope of Potential Infringements for WCPFC CCFS Cases **with CCM comments**

WCPFC-ROP-IWG06-2025-WP02_suppl01

4 June 2025

The ROP was established pursuant to Article 28 of the Convention *“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.”* The ROP has at its core, the collection of independent, verified catch and scientific data at-sea which can also be used for compliance purposes in monitoring CCMs’ implementation of CMMs.

The Commission at WCPFC21, noted that TCC20 expressed concern over the delay in including cases arising from ROP data in the CCFS and tasked the ROP-IWG to consider the question of streamlining the inclusion of ROP data in the CCFS. The Commission also tasked the ROP-IWG to prioritize in 2025 the review of the ROP Minimum Standard data fields (MSDFs), the review of the pre-notification process adopted during WCPFC12, and to develop a standardized process for the use of ROP data in the CCFS.

At ROP-IWG05 several current issues with the MSDFs and their use in CCFS were identified. In addition, over the course of ROP-IWG and other meetings, we have reviewed and discussed suggested refinements to MSDF data fields, and in some cases the aim is to support monitoring implementation of CMMs.

The table presented here provides a list of the obligations in CMMs where observers could collect data that can be used to monitor implementation of CMMs, including potential infringements. For each obligation some notes have been prepared describing what scientific monitoring needs and potential compliance issues for data collection by observers might be. Notes have also been provided about where the current MSDFs include some data collection, where CCFS cases have been created, and/or where there are proposals in ROP-IWG06 Working Paper 2 that may be relevant to the monitoring of the obligation. The list of topics presented in the Table are the following:

- Observer Obstruction
- Driftnet Prohibition
- Fishing on data buoys prohibition
- Marine Pollution

- FAD Closure – Tropical Purse Seine
- Seabirds
- Sea Turtles
- Mobulid Rays
- Sharks
- Whale Sharks
- Cetaceans

ROP-IWG participants will be invited to share views, proposals and comments on the scope of potential infringements to be covered by ROP observer data collection for WCPFC CCFS Cases.

Some questions to support participants consideration of the Table include:

1. Which of the obligations and potential compliance issues listed in the Table should be a high priority for data collection by ROP observers to support monitoring implementation of CMMs?
2. Are there any obligations and potential compliance issues that should not be included in the Table (or are of low priority) for observers to support monitoring implementation of CMMs?
3. For each obligation and potential compliance issue which is a priority for monitoring by ROP observers, are refinements to the MSDFs needed? If so, should the data collection by ROP observers be achieved through refinements to the Observer Trip Monitoring Summary (at the trip level) and/or the data fields at the set-level?
4. Are there any additional obligations and potential compliance issues that should be added into the Table which are of high priority for data collection by ROP observers to support monitoring implementation of CMMs?
5. What are the specific refinements that are needed to the MSDFs for each obligation or potential compliance issue, or what would be the process and timeframes for proposals to be developed?

Obligation	Description of scientific monitoring needs for data collection by observers	Description of potential compliance issues for data collection by observers	Notes on current MSDFs and/or proposed edits	ALTERNATIVE OR SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS
OBSERVER OBSTRUCTION				
CMM 2018-05 15 (g) Observer Obstruction Incidents	n/a	<p>vessel operator or any crew member assaulted, obstructed, resisted, delayed, refused boarding to, intimidated or interfered with an observer in the performance of their duties</p> <p>vessel operator or any crew member requested that an event not be reported by the observer</p> <p>vessel operator failed to provide the observer, while on board the vessel, at no expense to the observer or the observer's government, with food, accommodation and medical facilities of a reasonable standard equivalent to those normally available and medical facilities of a reasonable standard equivalent to those</p>	<p>Current MSDF - Observer Trip Monitoring Summary Issue Code (RS-A, RS-B and RS-D);(Yes No) –</p> <p>Current CCFS OAI cases are created based on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary data</p>	<p>Secretariat comment: <i>No change to questions needed - could consider including some summary comment on the Observer Trip Monitoring Summary</i></p> <p>PNA supports suggestion for a summary comment</p>

		normally available to an officer on board the vessel		
DRIFTNET PROHIBITION				
CMM 2008-04 02 Prohibit use of large-scale driftnets on the high seas	n/a	vessel had on board and/or deployed large-scale driftnet in high seas of Convention Area	<i>Currently covered in training of Pacific Island Observer Programmes, with instructions to include in the observer diary/report</i>	Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary, with summary comment</i> <u><i>PNA comment: Suggest leaving it out and keep it for debriefing process as no high impact on it at the moment</i></u>
FISHING ON DATA BUOYS PROHIBITION				
CMM 2009-05 01, 03, 05 Prohibit their fishing vessels from fishing within 1 nautical mile of or interacting with a data buoy in the high seas, and implement requirements in the case of entanglement	n/a	vessel had a gear entanglement with a data buoy, or intentionally interacted with a data buoy, including intentional taking on board	<i>Currently covered in training of Pacific Island Observer Programmes, with instructions to include in the observer diary/report</i>	Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary, with summary comment</i> <u><i>PNA comment: Suggest leaving it out and keep it for debriefing process</i></u>
MARINE POLLUTION				
CMM 2017-04 02 Prohibit fishing vessels from discharging any plastics (including plastic packaging, items	n/a	vessel discharged plastics (including plastic	current MSDF - Observer Trip Monitoring Summary Issue Code (PN-A) dispose	Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a revised yes no question on Observer Trip</i>

containing plastic and polystyrene) but not including fishing gear		packaging, items containing plastic and polystyrene)	<p>of any metals, plastics, old fishing gear or chemicals;(Yes No)</p> <p>Current CCFS POL cases are created based on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary data</p> <p><i>Currently there are some additional data collection by Pacific Island Observer Programmes, with instructions to include in the observer diary/report</i></p>	<p><i>Monitoring Summary, and would be useful to also collect some data fields related to the scale and how the discharge occurred</i></p> <p><i><u>PNA comment: only PN-a MSDF is useful for CCFS</u></i></p>
CMM 2017-04 05 Encourage additional marine pollution measures and reporting gear loss	n/a	compliance issues would depend on national requirements	<p>Current MSDF - Observer Trip Monitoring Summary Issue Code (PN-C, D, E) lose any fishing gear; (Yes No) , abandon any gear; (Yes No), fail to report any abandoned gear; (Yes No)</p> <p>Current CCFS POL cases are created based on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary data</p>	<p>Secretariat comment: <i>Maybe potentially useful to collect information about how crew may attempt to retrieve abandoned, lost or discarded fishing gear (ALDFG) and retain the material on board, separate from other waste for discharge to port reception facilities.</i></p> <p><i><u>PNA comment: About the Secretariat comment to be useful for Observers to collect information about how crew may attempt to retrieve ALDFG is best left</u></i></p>

				<u>for CCMs reporting and not useful for CCFS purposes.</u>
FAD CLOSURE - TROPICAL PURSE SEINE				
CMM 2023-01 13 Setting on FADs in EEZ waters or high seas of Convention Area during the 1 1/2 month FAD Closure (previous CMMs had 3 Month FAD closure)	types of FAD sets - free school, logs or associated	was observed to have made an associated set in a location and during a period, when the said vessel was not expected through the provisions of the TT CMM to be permitted to set on FADs	<p>Current MSDF - Type of school association (row 143), Latitude and longitude of activity (row 136)</p> <p>Current CCFS FAI cases are created by Secretariat based on current MSDF fields referred to above, and taking into consideration CCMs notified information to the Secretariat</p>	<p>Secretariat comment: <i>No change - some closer review by the Secretariat of the ROP data and specific circumstances would still be necessary, because there is information that CCMs notify the Secretariat, which is reported annually in reports. This information shouldn't need to be made available to Observers before they depart on their trip or during debriefing. For example, the CMM 2023-01 13 footnote 1 notifications</i></p> <p><u>PNA comment: Suggest that it be made available publicly on the website and circulate widely to Observer providers so observer can be advised during placement</u></p>
CMM 2023-01 14 Setting on FADs in high seas of Convention Area during the one additional month FAD Closure	types of FAD sets - free school, logs or associated, and	was observed to have made an associated set in a location and during a	Current MSDF - Type of school association (row 143), Latitude and	Secretariat comment: <i>No change - some closer review by the Secretariat</i>

period that the Flag State has chosen (previous CMMs had two month choice)	location of set is high seas of Convention Area	period, when the said vessel was not expected through the provisions of the TT CMM to be permitted to set on FADs	longitude of activity (row 136) Current CCFS FAI cases are created by Secretariat based on current MSDF fields referred to above, and taking into consideration CCMs notified information to the Secretariat	<i>of the ROP data and specific circumstances would still be necessary, because there is information CCMs notify the Secretariat, which is reported annually in reports. This information shouldn't need to be made available to Observers before they depart on their trip or during debriefing. For example the selection of IATTC/WCPFC overlap choice, CNM participatory rights annual decision</i>
SEABIRDS				
CMM 2018-03 01, 02, 06 Required longline mitigation measures to reduce incidental catch of seabirds applying north of 23N or south of 25S. i. use at least two mitigation measures in paragraph 1(a) or hook shielding devices when fishing south of 30°S ii. use one of the mitigation measures in paragraph 2 when fishing in area 25°S-30°S iii. 24m or more in overall length, to use at least two mitigation measures in paragraph 6, Table 1 CMM 2018-03, including at least one from Column A when fishing north of 23°N iv. less than 24m in overall		Were mitigation measures used What mitigation measures were used Did mitigation measures meet the gear specification requirements (Observer may not know what combination of mitigation measures that the vessel is required to use by the flag CCM so would document observations of the mitigation measure use and whether they meet the requirements)	Current MSDF - tori line (row 62), deep setting line shooter (row 73), blue dyed baid (row 71), management of offal (row 74), strategic offal disposal (row 75) NZ suggested additional MSDFs - hook shielding devices (row 61), tori line condition (row 63), length of tori line (row 64), streamers on tori lines (row 65), tori line aerial extent (row 66), weighted branch lines (set level) (row 69),	Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary on whether mitigation measures were used Would be useful to also collect some data to inform whether any attempts were made to use mitigation devices. Some closer review by the Secretariat of the ROP data fields and specific circumstances might still be necessary, because</i>

length, to use at least one of the mitigation measures from Column A in Table 1, when fishing north of 23°N			time of nautical dawn - for night setting (row 77), night setting (row 78)	<i>there is information CCMs notify the Secretariat, which is reported annually in reports. This information shouldn't need to be made available to Observers before they depart on their trip or during debriefing.</i>
	Were there interactions with seabird and if so what seabirds, nature of interaction and fate of seabird		<p>Interactions Current MSDF - type of interaction (row 154), data and time of interaction (row 155), latitude and longitude of interaction (row 156), species code of marine reptile, marine mammal, or seabird (row 158), vessels activity during interaction (row 169), condition observed at start of interaction (row 170), condition observed at end of interaction (row 171), description of interaction (row 174), number of animals sighted (row 175)</p> <p>New proposed MSDF data fields - Time of SSI first sighting with time recorded before or after Set time</p>	

			(row 157), SSI is incidentally encircled in the purse seine net (row 172), if SSI is caught by longline, what is the length of line on released live animal (longline caught) (row 173)	
SEA TURTLES				
CMM 2018-04 04 CCMs to ensure fishermen use proper mitigation and handling techniques and foster the recovery of any turtles that are incidentally captured - fishers on its flagged vessels to bring aboard, if practicable, any captured hard-shell sea turtle that is comatose or inactive as soon as possible and foster its recovery, including giving it resuscitation, before returning it to the water, use proper mitigation and handling techniques as described in WCPFC guidelines	Were there interactions with sea turtles and if so what sea turtles, nature of interaction and fate of sea turtle	Were mitigation measures used What mitigation measures were used Did mitigation measures meet the gear specification requirements	Interactions Current MSDF - species code (row 127) and Fate Code (row 127) indicating retained, condition when caught (row 105), fate (row 106), condition when released (row 107), type of interaction (row 154), data and time of interaction (row 155), latitude and longitude of interaction (row 156), species code of marine reptile, marine mammal, or seabird (row 158), vessels activity during interaction (row 169), condition observed at start of interaction (row 170), condition observed at end of interaction (row 171), description of interaction (row 174), number of animals sighted (row 175)	Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary as to whether the vessel had any interactions with sea turtles that are documented. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently document observations related to specific mitigation measure use, and safe handling practices</i> <u>PNA comment: PS-3 already capture SSI sighting and encirclement data for purse seine and support that additional Yes/No question on the GEN3 maybe taken up</u>

			New proposed MSDF data fields - Time of SSI first sighting with time recorded before or after Set time (row 157), SSI is incidentally encircled in the purse seine net (row 172), if SSI is caught by longline, what is the length of line on released live animal (longline caught) (row 173)	<u>during debriefing to minimize at-sea workload</u>
CMM 2018-04 06 CCMs to require longline vessels to carry and use line cutters and de-hookers to handle and promptly release sea turtles, as well as dip-nets where appropriate		Were mitigation measures used What mitigation measures were used Did mitigation measures meet the gear specification requirements		Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary as to whether the vessel carries and uses line cutters and de-hookers for sea turtles, as well as dip-nets. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently document observations related to use of these mitigation measures during specific incidents</i>
CMM 2018-04 07 (a, b) Sea Turtle mitigation requirements for shallow-set longline vessels - LL vessels to employ at least one of the three mitigation methods listed in paragraph 7a of the CMM - i. Use only large circle hooks, which are fishing		Were mitigation measures used What mitigation measures were used Did mitigation measures meet the gear specification requirements	Current MSDF - hook type (row 59), hook size (row 60), bait species (row 92), target species (row 91)	Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary if vessel is fishing in shallow-set manner, whether mitigation measures were</i>

hooks that are generally circular or oval in shape and originally designed and manufactured so that the point is turned perpendicularly back to the shank. These hooks shall have an offset not to exceed 10 degrees. ii. Use only finfish for bait. or iii. other Commission approved mitigation measure/plan				<p><i>used. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently document observations related to specific mitigation measure use.</i></p> <p><i>Some closer review by the Secretariat of the ROP data fields and specific circumstances might still be necessary, because there is information CCMs notify the Secretariat, which is reported annually in reports. This information shouldn't need to be made available to Observers before they depart on their trip or during debriefing.</i></p>
MOBULID RAYS				
CMM 2019-05 (04-06, 08, 10) Prohibit retaining/transshipping/storing/landing mobulid rays		Were mobulids landed on board and retained, were mobulids transhipped	<i>Check that there are some observed fate codes that indicate retention in whole or in part for SSI</i>	<p>Secretariat comment:</p> <p><i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary related to whether retention or transshipping was observed. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently document observations</i></p>

				<p><i>related to specific incidents, including fate of SSIs</i></p> <p><u>PNA comment: PS-3 already capture SSI sighting and encirclement data for purse seine and support that additional Yes/No question on the GEN3 maybe taken up during debriefing to minimize at-sea workload</u></p>
<p><u>CMM 2019-05 03</u> Prohibit targeted fishing or intentional setting on mobulid rays</p>	<p>Were there interactions with mobulids - seen from the vessel and if so what mobulids, nature of interaction and fate of mobulids</p>	<p>Was purse seine gear deployed or continue to be deployed while one or more mobulids were in the vicinity of the gear being released</p>	<p>Interactions Current MSDF - species code (row 127) and Fate Code (row 127) indicating retained, condition when caught (row 105), fate (row 106), condition when released (row 107), type of interaction (row 154), data and time of interaction (row 155), latitude and longitude of interaction (row 156), species code of marine reptile, marine mammal, or seabird (row 158), vessels activity during interaction (row 169), condition observed at start of interaction (row 170), condition observed at end of interaction (row 171),</p>	<p>Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary related to whether intentional setting was observed. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently document observations related to specific incidents</i></p> <p><u>PNA comment: PS-3 already capture SSI sighting and encirclement data for purse seine and support that additional Yes/No question on the GEN3 maybe taken up</u></p>

			<p>description of interaction (row 174), number of animals sighted (row 175)</p> <p>New proposed MSDF data fields - Time of SSI first sighting with time recorded before or after Set time (row 157), SSI is incidentally encircled in the purse seine net (row 172)</p>	<p><i>during debriefing to minimize at-sea workload</i></p>
SHARKS				
<p>CMM 2024-05 07-09 Take measures to ensure full utilization of sharks and prohibition of finning</p>	<p>were there catches of sharks, and what species, what catches were released/retained, what was their condition if released</p>	<p>Did vessel follow requirements to store carcasses and corresponding fins correctly, so that inspectors and observers can verify</p>	<p>Current MSDF - species code (row 127) and Fate Code (row 127) indicating retained and fining activity, condition when caught (row 105), fate (row 106), indicating retained and fining activity, estimated shark fin weight by species (row 162), estimated carcass weight by species (row 163)</p> <p>New proposed MSDF - method used to store shark fins (row 164)</p> <p>Current CCFS SHK potential shark finning cases are created by Secretariat based on current MSDF fields referred to above</p>	<p>Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary related to whether vessel had in place measures to ensure individual shark carcasses and their corresponding fins can be easily identified onboard the vessel at any time. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently document observations related to specific incidents</i></p>

CMM 2024-05 14 Prevent fishing vessels from retaining on board (including for crew consumption), transshipping and landing any fins harvested in contravention				Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary related to whether crew consumed any shark fins. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently document observations related to specific incidents,</i>
CMM 2024-05 15 Ensure carcasses and corresponding fins are landed or transshipped together		Did vessel follow requirements to during transshipment and landing to ensure carcasses and corresponding fins were together		Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary related to whether vessel transshipped or landed any sharks. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently document observations related to specific incidents, including whether the carcasses and corresponding fins were landed or transshipped together</i>
CMM 2024-05 18 Minimize bycatch of sharks in longline fisheries between 20N and 20S i. prohibits its flagged longline vessels, between 20N and 20S, targeting tuna and billfish from		Were mitigation measures used What mitigation measures were used Did mitigation measures	Current MSDF - target species (row 91), shark lines (row 70), wire trace (row 53)	Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary if vessel is fishing for tuna</i>

using wire trace as branch lines or leaders, ii. requires its flagged longline vessels, between 20N and 20S, targeting tuna and billfish, if carrying wire trace as branch lines or leaders, to stow them, iii. prohibits its flagged longline vessels, between 20N and 20S, targeting tuna and billfish from using shark lines or branch lines running directly off of the longline floats or drop lines		meet the gear specification requirements		<p><i>and billfish, whether shark mitigation measures were used. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently document observations related to specific mitigation measure use</i></p> <p><i>Some closer review by the Secretariat of the ROP data fields and specific circumstances might still be necessary, because there is information CCMS notify the Secretariat, which is reported annually in reports. This information shouldn't need to be made available to Observers before they depart on their trip or during debriefing.</i></p>
CMM 2024-05 21 Haul non-retained sharks alongside for species identification when possible				<p>Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary related to whether vessel did not haul any sharks that are caught alongside the vessel before being cut free to facilitate species</i></p>

				<i>ID. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently document observations related to specific incidents, including fate of SSIs</i>
CMM 2024-05 24 (01-03) Specific requirements to protect oceanic whitetip and silky sharks	Were there interactions with oceanic whitetip sharks and silky sharks - if so what shark species, nature of interaction and fate of sharks	Were OCS or FAL landed on board and retained, were OCS or FAL transhipped	<p>Current MSDF - species code (row 127) and Fate Code (row 127) indicating retained, condition when caught (row 105), fate (row 106), condition when released (row 107)</p> <p>Current CCFS SHK cases related to potential retention of OCS and FAL are created by Secretariat based on current MSDF fields referred to above</p>	<p>Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary related to whether vessel caught any OCS or FAL, and whether the vessel retained any OCS or FAL. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently document observations related to specific incidents, including fate of SSIs</i></p>
WHALE SHARKS				
CMM 2024-05 25 (01-07) Prohibit purse seine setting on whale sharks and retention/transshipment	Report on interactions with whale sharks that were seen from the vessels -	<p>Was purse seine gear deployed or continue to be deployed while one or more whale sharks were in the vicinity of the gear being released</p> <p>Were whale sharks landed on board and retained</p>	<p>Interactions</p> <p>Current MSDF - species code (row 127) and Fate Code (row 127) indicating retained, condition when caught (row 105), fate (row 106), condition when released (row 107), type of interaction (row 154), data and time of interaction (row 155), latitude and</p>	<p>Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary related to whether intentional setting on whale sharks was observed. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently</i></p>

		<p>longitude of interaction (row 156), species code of marine reptile, marine mammal, or seabird (row 158), vessels activity during interaction (row 169), condition observed at start of interaction (row 170), condition observed at end of interaction (row 171), description of interaction (row 174), number of animals sighted (row 175)</p> <p>New proposed MSDF data fields - Time of SSI first sighting with time recorded before or after Set time (row 157), SSI is incidentally encircled in the purse seine net (row 172), if SSI is caught by longline, what is the length of line on released live animal (longline caught) (row 173)</p> <p><i>Check that there are some observed fate codes indicates retention in whole or in part for SSI</i></p> <p>Current CCFS CWS interactions with purse</p>	<p><i>document observations related to specific incidents, including fate of SSIs</i></p> <p><u><i>PNA comment: PS-3 already capture SSI sighting and encirclement data for purse seine and support that additional Yes/No question on the GEN3 maybe taken up during debriefing to minimize at-sea workload</i></u></p>
--	--	--	--

			seine and whale sharks are created by Secretariat based on current MSDF fields referred to above	
CETACEANS				
CMM 2024-07 01 Prohibit purse seine setting on cetaceans, if animal is sighted prior to commencement of the set	Report on interactions with cetaceans that were seen from the vessels -	Was purse seine gear deployed or continue to be deployed while one or more cetaceans were in the vicinity of the gear being released Were cetaceans landed on board and retained	<p>Interactions Current MSDF - species code (row 127) and Fate Code (row 127) indicating retained, condition when caught (row 105), fate (row 106), condition when released (row 107), type of interaction (row 154), data and time of interaction (row 155), latitude and longitude of interaction (row 156), species code of marine reptile, marine mammal, or seabird (row 158), vessels activity during interaction (row 169), condition observed at start of interaction (row 170), condition observed at end of interaction (row 171), description of interaction (row 174), number of animals sighted (row 175)</p> <p>New proposed MSDF data fields - Time of SSI first sighting with time recorded before or after Set time</p>	<p>Secretariat comment: Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary related to whether intentional setting on cetaceans was observed. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently document observations related to specific incidents</p> <p><i><u>PNA comment: PS-3 already capture SSI sighting and encirclement data for purse seine and support that additional Yes/No question on the GEN3 maybe taken up during debriefing to minimize at-sea workload</u></i></p>

			<p>(row 157), SSI is incidentally encircled in the purse seine net (row 172), if SSI is caught by longline, what is the length of line on released live animal (longline caught) (row 173)</p> <p><i>Check that there are some observed fate codes indicates retention in whole or in part for SSI</i></p> <p>Current CCFS CWS interactions with purse seine and cetaceans are created by Secretariat based on current MSDF fields referred to above</p>	
CMM 2024-07 02 Requirements in the event of unintentional encircling of cetaceans in the purse seine net, including incident reporting requirements	Report on interactions with cetaceans that were seen from the vessels -	Were efforts made to release cetaceans that were encircled in the purse seine net, and where cetaceans landed on board released	<p><i>Check that there are some observed fate codes indicates retention in whole or in part for SSI</i></p>	<p>Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary as to whether the vessel had any interactions with cetaceans that are documented. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently document observations related to safe handling practices</i></p>

<p>CMM 2024-07 03 CCMs shall prohibit all longline and purse seine vessels flying their flag from harvesting, retaining onboard, transshipping, or landing any cetacean, in whole or any part thereof, in the Convention Area</p>		<p>Did fishing vessel catch a cetacean, and was it retained onboard, or transhipped Was the capture/fate correctly recorded</p>	<p>Interactions Current MSDF - species code (row 127) and Fate Code (row 127) indicating retained, condition when caught (row 105), fate (row 106), condition when released (row 107), type of interaction (row 154), data and time of interaction (row 155), latitude and longitude of interaction (row 156), species code of marine reptile, marine mammal, or seabird (row 158), vessels activity during interaction (row 169), condition observed at start of interaction (row 170), condition observed at end of interaction (row 171), description of interaction (row 174), number of animals sighted (row 175) New proposed MSDF data fields - Time of SSI first sighting with time recorded before or after Set time (row 157), SSI is incidentally encircled in the purse seine net (row 172), if SSI is caught by longline, what is the length of line on</p>	<p>Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary related to whether retention of cetaceans was observed. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently document observations related to specific incidents involving retention and transshipping of cetaceans</i> <u>PNA comment: PS-3 already capture SSI sighting and encirclement data for purse seine and support that additional Yes/No question on the GEN3 maybe taken up during debriefing to minimize at-sea workload</u></p>
--	--	---	---	--

			released live animal (longline caught) (row 173)	
			<i>Check that there are some observed fate codes to indicate retention in whole or in part for SSI</i>	
CMM 2024-07 04 CCMs shall require all longline vessels flying their flag, including those fishing under charter arrangements, to release, taking into account the safety of the crew, any cetacean that is caught or entangled by its fishing gear in the Convention Area as soon as possible and in a manner that results in as little harm to the cetacean as possible and utilizing the Best Practices for the Safe Handling and Release of Cetaceans (suppl_CMM 2011-03-01), if possible	Report on interactions with cetaceans that were seen from the vessels	Were efforts made to release cetaceans that were entangled by fishing gear, and where cetaceans landed on board released	<p>Interactions Current MSDF - species code (row 127) and Fate Code (row 127) indicating retained, condition when caught (row 105), fate (row 106), condition when released (row 107), type of interaction (row 154), data and time of interaction (row 155), latitude and longitude of interaction (row 156), species code of marine reptile, marine mammal, or seabird (row 158), vessels activity during interaction (row 169), condition observed at start of interaction (row 170), condition observed at end of interaction (row 171), description of interaction (row 174), number of animals sighted (row 175)</p> <p>New proposed MSDF data fields - Time of SSI first</p>	<p>Secretariat comment: <i>Could be a new yes no question on Observer Trip Monitoring Summary as to whether the vessel had any interactions with cetaceans that are documented. The MSDFs data fields should be reviewed to check that they will sufficiently document observations related to safe handling practices</i></p> <p><i><u>PNA comment: PS-3 already capture SSI sighting and encirclement data for purse seine and support that additional Yes/No question on the GEN3 maybe taken up during debriefing to minimize at-sea workload</u></i></p>

		<p>sighting with time recorded before or after Set time (row 157), SSI is incidentally encircled in the purse seine net (row 172), if SSI is caught by longline, what is the length of line on released live animal (longline caught) (row 173)</p> <p><i>Check that there are some observed fate codes indicates retention in whole or in part for SSI</i></p>	
--	--	---	--

Attachment 2

Current list of MSDF Data Fields with preliminary agreement for removal during ROP-IWG06 ([ROP-IWG06 Summary Report](#))

Recommendations on the Table in Attachment 2:

SC21 is invited to:

- recommend to TCC21 that the list of ROP Minimum Standard Data Fields in the following Table, as amended by SC21 discussions, are removed from the ROP MSDF.

List of Data Fields Recommended for Removal from the MSDFs

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

Colour codes used to highlight suggested changes

No change suggested	Field that could be collected by other means.	New Data Field to be added	Data Field suggested to be Removed	Data Field with suggested updates
---------------------	---	----------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

At ROP_IWG06 meeting, participants preliminarily agreed to recommend that the attached list of data fields are removed from the list of WCPFC ROP Minimum Standard Data Fields.

WCPFC CURRENT FIELD	WCPFC AGREED NOTES	COMMENT ON HOW COLLECTED **	COMMENT ON ANY SUGGESTED CHANGES	ALTERNATIVE OR SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS	Row # from WP2
VESSEL IDENTIFICATION					

Flag State Registration Number	This number will be sourced from the vessel papers. You can normally get this information during the briefing.	<i>Observer asks to check vessel documentation.</i>	<i>Field that could be collected by other means and so suggest removal.</i>	<i>This information is available and collected in the RFV - could be removed.</i>	2
Vessel Owner/Company	Name and contact if possible, of the owner of the vessel, if owned by a company, then use the company name.	<i>Observer asks to check vessel documentation</i>	<i>Field that could be collected by other means and so suggest removal.</i>	<i>This information is available and collected in the RFV - could be removed.</i>	4
VESSEL ATTRIBUTES					
Vessel fish hold capacity	The total maximum amounts in metric Tons (mT.) that the vessel freezers, wells and other fish storage areas on a vessel can hold.	<i>Observers have been collecting information in metric tonnes since 1994.</i>	<i>2024 PNA Comment: Could be also considered for removal, because this information is also available on the RFV, although we note that the units for this field in the RFV are volume or weight, whereas the units for the MSDF are weight.</i>	<i>RFV records Cubic Metres and can be accessed if needed</i> <i>Japan supports removing this field since the information is available from the RFV.</i> <i>USA supports Removal of this field</i>	30

Length (specify unit)	The "LOA" Length Over All can be taken from the vessel plans or from other paper work that indicates the LOA.	<i>Observer asks to check vessel documentation or the vessel plan. Observer cannot verify if length is correct.</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is available in the RFV and no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>	<i>This information is available and collected in the RFV - could be removed.</i>	32
Tonnage (specify unit)	The vessel may be registered using Gross Tonnage (GT) or in (GRT) this will be indicated on the vessel registration papers.	<i>Observer asks to check vessel documentation or the vessel plan. Observer cannot verify if tonnage is correct</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is available in the RFV and no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>	<i>This information is available and collected in the RFV - could be removed.</i>	33
Engine power (Specify unit)	The engine power and the power units used on board can usually be found in the vessel plans or from other paper work of the vessel. If not sure where to look, ask the engineer.	<i>Observer can get this in several ways, can get it from engine model number info online if available. Most observers ask the engineer who will tell them the HP.</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is available in the RFV and no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>	<i>This information is available and collected in the RFV - could be removed.</i>	34
VESSEL ELECTRONICS					
Radars	Indicate Yes if on board No if not sighted	<i>Observer collects information on make and Model</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is available in the RFV and no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>		35
Global Positioning System (GPS) (Yes/ No)	Indicate Yes if on board No if not sighted	<i>Observer collects information if on board (yes no)</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>		37
Track Plotter	Indicate Yes if on board No if not sighted	<i>Observer collects information if on board (yes no)</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is no longer required to be collected by observers</i>		38

Weather Facsimile	Indicate Yes if on board No if not sighted	<i>Observer collects information if on board (yes no)</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>		39
Sea Surface Temperature (SST) gauge	Indicate Yes if on board No if not sighted	<i>Observer collects information if on board (yes no)</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is no longer required to be collected by observers</i>		40
Vessel Monitoring System	Indicate the type of systems used on a vessel- The most popular and widely used system is the INMARSAT system, however some vessels may use the ARGOS system- some vessels may have both. There are also other systems if these are being used please record	<i>Observers are asked to identify the system used and the make and model of the units on board</i>	<i>Field that could be collected by other means.</i>	<i>USA comment: (as above for crew attributes and supports Removal of this field)</i>	47
GENERAL GEAR ATTRIBUTES					
Mainline length	What is the total length of the mainline when it is fully set usually recorded in miles or kilometer's (make sure the unit is clearly indicated)	<i>Observer collects information from Captain or Deck Boss</i>	<i>There may be technological approaches that could streamline the estimation of mainline length by observers.</i>	<i>Eg Using a known Lat and long for start and end of set on a GPS/VMS tracks could be used to estimate the distances travelled and the shape of the set</i> <i>USA Supports Removal of this Field</i>	50
Mainline hauler	Indicate Y or No - Most longline vessels will have an instrument that hauls the lines in after it has been set- some very small	<i>Observer collects Yes, No information</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>		54

	vessels may haul line by hand.				
Branch line hauler	Indicate Y or No - Some long line vessels may use special haulers to coil the branch lines	<i>Observer collects Yes, No information</i>	<i>Field suggested for removal, as it is no longer required to be collected by observers.</i>		55
PURSE SEINE - INFORMATION ON DAILY ACTIVITIES					
Numbers of schools sighted per day	How many free or associated schools of fish were sighted during the day? The vessel may not set on these because of size or amount in school	<i>Observer is asked to record every free school or floating object sighted during the day when searching, also record all activities involved with free schools and floating objects. For this to be accurate the observer would need to be on constant watch from 0430 to 1930 every day 15/16 hrs. a day</i>	<i>No change suggested</i>	<i>Difficulties in collecting this info as observer would need to be on watch all day to record accurately. As it is, observers generally only indicate what the vessel investigates</i> <i>Japan supports removing this field</i>	118
OBSERVER TRIP MONITORING SUMMARY					
Vessel certificate of registration:	Flag State Registration Number as in 'General Attributes'	<i>Observer asks to check vessel documentation.</i>	<i>Field that could be collected by other means – suggest removal.</i>	<i>This information is available and collected in the RFV – could be removed.</i>	197

WCPFC Authorisation:	WIN number if supplied	<i>Observer asks to check vessel documentation.</i>	<i>Field that could be collected by other means– suggest removal.</i>	<i>This information is available and collected in the RFV = could be removed.</i>	199
-----------------------------	------------------------	---	---	---	------------

Consideration of Non-Fish Transfers (as discussed at ROP-IWG06)

Recommendation:

SC21 is invited to:

- provide feedback as the basis for further consideration of proposals for changes to [observer minimum data fields for monitoring transshipment](#) and the formulation of other recommendations related to “non-fish transfers” or other supplies” for discussion at TCC21.



Virtual Meeting 6 of ROP-IWG

20 June 2025 10:00h – 14:00h (Pohnpei time)

Consideration of Non-Fish Transfers

WCPFC-ROP-IWG06-2025-03

4 June 2025

Background

1. At WCPFC21 in December 2024, the Commission tasked the ROP-IWG with discussing the addition of non-fish transfers to the [observer minimum data fields for monitoring transshipment](#) (WCPFC21 Summary Report paragraph 511). This followed discussions during the review of the Transshipment CMM ([CMM 2009-06](#)), which highlighted the challenges in identifying and understanding these transfers. The review also identified the need for enhanced reporting which is critical for validating and verifying activities within the Convention Area.

The Proposal

2. In 2024, a proposal was submitted to the Transshipment IWG to amend Annexes I and III of the Transshipment CMM. These Annexes list the required information for WCPFC Transshipment Declaration and Notices (Notifications) to the Executive Director. The proposed amendments were as follows:
 - In Annex 1 (Declaration) - “7. Did non-fish transfer occur? (yes or no”) If yes, provide details of this non-fish transfer, including the exchange of crew (numbers) and provision of supplies between vessels. “
 - In Annex 3 (Notification) – “7. Will non-fish transfers occur? (“Yes” or “No”). If yes, provide details of this proposed non-fish transfer, including the exchange of crew (numbers) and provision of supplies between vessels.”
 - To include a footnote to define ‘non-fish transfer’ based on the North Pacific Fisheries Commission (NPFC) CMM definition – ““means a transfer of fuel, gear, materials, or other supplies, or a transfer of at least one person, from one fishing vessel to another fishing vessel in the Convention Area”
3. The proposal aims to improve monitoring of interactions at sea where no fish were transferred but other activities occurred—such as the exchange of crew or supplies. Capturing this data would

help verify such encounters and reduce potential compliance queries, especially as the Secretariat continues to develop tools to detect vessel proximity.

4. Although the Commission has yet to fully consider changes to CMM 2009-06, assigning this task to the ROP-IWG is a step toward identifying necessary data and assessing how additional reporting might impact observer programmes.

Refresh of CCM consideration at ROP-IWG05¹

5. The tasking to the ROP-IWG was briefly discussed at the ROP-IWG05 meeting April 2025 and the following points raised:
 - General support to revising the [observer minimum data fields for monitoring transshipment](#) in response to the tasking.
 - Recalling that the discussions at TCC in 2024, had identified that bait is also “fish”, and the importance of having clear phrasing and/or specific guidance.
 - Desirability of WCPFC considering harmonizing with other RFMOs, noting that ICCAT uses “supply services” as the equivalent of “non-fish transfers”, and IOTC has adopted an explicit definition of “non-catch transfer”.
 - An interest in reviewing other changes to the [observer minimum data fields for monitoring transshipment](#), for example SP_number which is currently non-mandatory.
6. There was also brief reference to the appropriateness of the name ‘non-fish transfers’.

Discussion Points for ROP-IWG

7. The following points are provided to support ROP-IWG discussion. They reflect the proposal on non-fish transfers submitted to TCC20, initial discussion and outcomes from ROP_IWG5 and the tasking to consider harmonisation with other RFMOs.
 - I. **Definition of Non-Fish Transfer**

The proposed definition—drawing on the NPFC’s approach—lists specific items such as fuel, gear, and materials, and includes a broader reference to “other supplies.” Standard interpretation suggests that “other supplies” would be of a similar nature to those specifically listed. One issue for TCC consideration is whether “bait” should be explicitly included within this definition.
 - II. CCMs should note that a high-level review of other RFMOs reveals they share similar approaches to reporting requirements for non-fish transfers. These typically involve confirming whether such transfers took place, identifying the time and location, and specifying the type of supplies exchanged. Examples include:

¹ [Chairs Summary Report of Meeting 5 of ROP-IWG](#)

- NPFC - Requires reporting and records of reporting on “Other Transfer Activities” between fishing vessels, including the timing and location of the transfer.
 - IOTC, ICCAT and CCSBT - Refer to “Supply services” and require a “Supply Declaration” between a carrier and another vessel. These declarations generally include details on the goods supplied, such as fuel, bait, provisions, spare parts, medical supplies, and the transfer of passengers or crew.
 - SPRFMO - Mentions transfers of fuel, crew, gear, or any other supplies between vessels.
8. While these requirements are directed at flag CCM reporting, they provide valuable insight into the types of information that might be considered by the ROP-IWG as the basis for categorizing and capturing through observer data fields for consistent and effective monitoring.

Next Steps

9. The ROP-IWG Chair requests further feedback on this paper and this will be used to further consider proposals for changes to [observer minimum data fields for monitoring transshipment](#) and the formulation of other recommendations related to “other supplies”.