



## **EIGHTH REGIONAL OBSERVER PROGRAMME INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUP MEETING**

Electronic Meeting

1 April 2026

---

### **CHAIR'S SUMMARY REPORT**

---

#### **AGENDA ITEM 1: OPENING OF MEETING**

1. The Chair opened the Eighth Meeting of the Regional Observer Programme Intersessional Working Group (ROP-IWG08) and welcomed all participants (**Annex 2**), including CCMs, sub-regional agencies, the Secretariat, and representatives from other intersessional working groups. The meeting was conducted as a virtual electronic meeting.

2. The Secretariat noted that the meeting had been scheduled for a four-hour session, from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. Pohnpei time, and provided brief logistical information.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 2: INTRODUCTION AND OPENING**

3. The Chair provided an overview of the meeting agenda (**Annex 1**), which covered six items: the opening of the meeting; introduction; review and discussion of the standardized process flow for using ROP data in the CCFS and scope of data fields in the CMS process; review of the proposed MSDF for ROP non-catch transfer monitoring; open discussions on other taskings; and the summary and close of the meeting.

4. The Chair recalled that the two core working draft proposals under consideration had previously been considered by TCC21 and presented at WCPFC22. These had been brought forward again in 2026 for further refinement. The aim was to finalize both proposals in advance of TCC22. The Chair noted a Chair's summary report would be prepared following the meeting to record general discussions and outcomes.

5. No opening remarks were offered from the floor, and the meeting proceeded directly with substantive agenda items.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 3: REVIEW AND DISCUSS THE DEVELOPED STANDARDIZED SOLUTION TO USE ROP DATA IN THE CCFS AND CMS PROCESS AND POTENTIAL CMM INFRINGEMENT OBLIGATIONS**

##### **Sub-Item 3.1: Revisit Working Draft Proposal on CCFS Process Flow ([ROP-IWG08-2026-02](#))**

6. The Chair introduced the working draft proposal on the CCFS process flow, noting its objective to transition from a fragmented system to a unified, CCM-led verification process. This is to be achieved by

integrating observer debriefing and compliance evaluation into a sequential workflow before cases enter the CCFS. The Chair noted the proposed process (Steps 1 – 7) covers observer disembarkation, data transmission, debriefing, compliance evaluation, request for investigation, Secretariat integration into CCFS, and domestic enforcement by responsible CCMs. A sample debriefing questionnaire (Attachment 2 to the working paper) was also again introduced for discussion.

7. Before general discussion, the Chair invited the US to present its proposed detailed step-by-step changes to the seven steps ([DP01](#)) including standardizing the terminology (e.g., replacing “trip report” with “trip data”; clarifying the observer provider responsible for arranging the debrief and repatriation which would be formally identified as the “debriefing observer provider” or “debriefers”; inserting a new bullet point in Step 3 providing that the observer’s draft initial responses to the WCPFC ROP debriefing questionnaire would be reviewed and verified by the debriefer. The presentation further proposed that in Step 4, the vetting person compile the observer’s verified questionnaire and all supporting evidence into an “observer sourced case package” to be sent to the responsible CCM. For Step 5, it was proposed that the formal investigation request be addressed to “responsible CCMs,” which was defined to include both the flag CCM and any coastal state CCM with potential jurisdiction over the alleged infringement. Steps 6 and 7 were also proposed to be refined to ensure that the Secretariat receives and integrates the formal investigation request and all supporting documentation, and that responsible CCMs act, report, and prosecute within the timeframes specified in Article 25(2) of the Convention.

8. Participants sought clarity on the intended status of WP02. The Chair confirmed the aim is to refine the document intersessionally for presentation to TCC22, noting the need for clarity on its pathway to adoption by the Commission.

9. For Step 1, concern was raised about the proposed 90% data completeness threshold at observer disembarkation which was practically difficult to apply in practice as the completeness of a trip report depends on voyage-specific circumstances and the nature of the data fields involved. It was broadly agreed to replace this with a general expectation that trip reports be complete upon disembarkation.

10. For Step 2, participants noted the need for clarity the “debriefing observer provider”, recognising that, in the Pacific Islands, debriefing may be conducted by an observer provider other than the observer’s national observer provider. It was suggested the text accommodate this practice.

11. For Step 3, a significant part of the discussion focused on who should determine who has the appropriate authority to determine whether a potential infringement exists. Concern was expressed at placing this decision at the debriefer level. It was suggested that all observer trip data, regardless of whether a compliance entry had been recorded, should flow to Step 4, and that the compliance evaluation officer would be responsible for determining whether a genuine potential infringement exists. Under this approach, cases not requiring further action would be directed from Step 4 to SPC for scientific purposes. The Chair noted this and undertook to reflect this clarification in the revised draft. The suggestion received broad support from participating CCMs.

12. Differing views were expressed for Step 4 and the contents of the “observer sourced case package.” One CCM maintained the observer case package should include all pages of the observer’s report/forms

for the trip reflecting national evidentiary requirements, not only those specifically related to the alleged infringement. As a potential compromise, redaction of sensitive material was suggested. However, many CCMs supported limiting the package to only those forms directly relevant to the alleged infringement, citing observer safety, confidentiality, administrative burden, and the need for the CCFS to remain practical and proportionate. It was recommended that the current proposed text referencing all other trip data be omitted entirely. The CCM supporting full documentation affirmed that it would not oppose or prevent adoption of the process flow even if agreement on this specific point could not be reached, as it considered progress on the broader process flow to be of primary importance.

13. It was also noted that Step 4 should include a clear pathway in the process flow diagram from Step 4 to the SPC to reflect the “no-case” clearance pathway for consistency between the flow chart and the accompanying text. This was supported. It was noted that a draft notification report template (data fields) would be required.

14. For Step 5, discussion focused on whether the formal investigation requests should be directed to the “flag CCM” only (Art 25(2)) or whether any coastal CCM with jurisdiction should be included. It was agreed that consistent with Art 25(2), the formal investigation request is properly directed to the flag CCM - noting the Convention’s language specifies a request to the flag CCM to investigate its own vessels. It was broadly accepted, however, that coastal CCMs with relevant jurisdiction should be included in the correspondence and given access to the observer case package, even if the formal investigation request itself is directed solely to the flag CCM. This clarification was broadly accepted.

15. On the debriefing questionnaire, participants noted potential overlap with the existing ROP Observer Trip Monitoring Summary form. The Chair clarified that the questionnaire is intended to be completed by debriefers to capture compliance-related information with its purpose being to capture and flag CMM obligation-related information for transmission to compliance authorities. A CCM proposed that observers draft initial responses for debriefer verification and sign-off to confirm its accuracy. It was further suggested replacing the existing ROP Observer Trip Monitoring Summary form with the new questionnaire as a ROP minimum standard, noting the existing form had been adopted to support the pre-notification process at WCPFC12 and was no longer well-aligned with the refined CCFS framework.

16. A technical question was raised regarding whether the debriefing questionnaire, if adopted, would introduce new minimum standard data fields (MSDF). It was observed that under the established approach, data fields are agreed upon and formally adopted, and that certain questions or response fields in the questionnaire might function as new MSDFs if agreed to by CCMs. It was noted that before the questionnaire could be finalized, it would need to be updated intersessionally to reflect the full scope of CMM obligations agreed under WP03.

17. Concerns were also raised about the absence of timelines in the process flow, particularly where cases are entered long after the relevant trip. This could potentially be after the lapse of timeframes that allowed domestic investigation. It was suggested that timelines be assigned to each step, and that the designated personnel in Step 4 be explicitly identified as official government officers of the initiating CCM.

18. In closing Agenda Item 3.1, the Chair summarized key points for revision of the WP including: removal of the 90% completeness threshold from Step 1; clarification of the identity of the debriefing observer provider in Steps 2 and 3; addition of observer and debriefer sign-off on the questionnaire; restructuring of the yes/no decision point from Step 3 to Step 4; addition of a flow chart arrow from Step 4 to SPC and need a template for an infringement notification form (data fields); clarification that the formal investigation request is addressed to the flag CCM with notification to relevant coastal state CCMs; and the ongoing difference of views on the contents of the observer case package. The Chair committed to revising the process flow intersessionally, incorporating all recommendations, with a view to circulating a revised draft prior to the next meeting, anticipating this would be scheduled for July 2026 to allow presentation of a finalized document to TCC22.

**Sub-Item 3.2: Review the Draft Proposal of CMMs Monitored for Potential Infringements for CCFS ([ROP-IWG08-2026-03](#))**

19. The Chair introduced WP03 which proposes a list of CMM obligations to be monitored by observers for potential infringements for CCFS purposes. The objective is to define which observer-collected data can suitably be used to trigger CCFS cases, ensuring that only clearly verifiable facts reported by observers, rather than subjective interpretations that apply for more scientific based reporting, lead to formal notifications. The current draft had been updated based on previous meeting discussions and further revisions would incorporate the outcome of this meeting and feedback in advance of TCC22.

20. The US presented its proposals in [DP01](#) which were based on three principles: removing non-binding obligations (e.g. suggestions or guidance); removing obligations that observers cannot practically monitor at sea (including those requiring post-landing verification); and retaining obligations where binding elements can be clearly identified. In particular, the US recommended retaining several obligations within the shark measure relating to fins naturally attached, alternative measures, retention and transshipment of fins and carcasses together, and retention of sharks harvested in contravention. It was further proposed that where multiple potential infringements from a single underlying act (such as shark finning and full utilization requirements) are detected, they should be treated as a single CCFS case type rather than generating multiple separate case entries, to avoid inflated statistics while preserving flag CCMs' discretion to pursue charges on multiple grounds domestically.

21. There was general support for excluding obligations framed in non-binding or encouraging terms, as well as any obligation that observers cannot reliably monitor at sea. Specific suggestions for removing obligations were made for: provisions relating to fishing on data buoy obligations where reliable observer data collection is impractical; the marine pollution measure obligation; the mobulid obligation; and certain paragraphs of the shark measure pertaining to landing obligations, activities occurring after the vessel reaches port, or obligations whose verification would require post-landing confirmation. It was noted that sub-regional shark finning bans may affect the relevance of certain obligations depending on the fishing area.

22. It was noted that WP02 referred to a shark CMM superseded by a new measure adopted at WCPFC22. It was agreed that references in the document would need to be updated to reflect the current applicable CMMs, noting that substantive obligations remain largely unchanged despite renumbering.

23. Participants asked whether the list would be a “living document.” The Secretariat confirmed it would be updated over time, consistent with changes to CMMs and minimum standard data fields. Ongoing reviews of marine pollution and shark and sea turtle measures may also affect the list.

24. In closing, the Chair summarized the discussion on Agenda Item 3.2, noting that work intersessionally would refine the table of CMM obligations to remove non-binding obligations and obligations where observer data collection is not practicable, and to update references to the superseded shark measure. The revised proposals would be incorporated into the working draft for further consideration later in 2026.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 4: REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED MSDF FOR THE ROP NON-CATCH TRANSFER MONITORING ([ROP-IWG08-2026-04](#))**

25. The Chair introduced WP04 which presented proposed minimum standard data fields for ROP non-catch transfer monitoring. The proposal originated from discussions during ROPIWG07 and subsequent intersessional work and focused on expanding observer reporting to cover the at-sea movement of items other than catch, for example, fuel, bait, gear, and personnel.

26. Support was expressed for the proposal, including adding bait within the scope of reporting of non-catch items. It was recommended that the term “non-fish transfers” be replaced with more precise language such as “non-catch transfer” or “supply provision transfer,”. Suggestions also included expanding the “goods supplied” data fields form to capture basic quantity information for items such as fuel, bait, FADs/FAD materials, passengers, crew, and other goods, where this can be safely and reliably recorded. The importance of recording time in UTC was noted to improve precision and harmonisation. It was further suggested that waste transfers, particularly non-biodegradable materials, be included, given their relevance to the marine pollution CMM.

27. A reservation was expressed regarding the requirement for observers to record numerical quantities, noting this may exceed what can reasonably be expected and recalling that this issue was discussed at TCC21 without agreement. The Chair acknowledged this concern.

28. The Chair invited further written comments intersessionally and advised that a revised proposal would be prepared for further review.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5: OPEN DISCUSSIONS ON OTHER TASKINGS**

##### **Sub-Item 5.1: Progressing Priority Tasking 4 — Consideration Related to Emerging Technologies**

29. The Chair introduced this item, noting that Priority Tasking 4 focuses on transitioning from paper-based observer monitoring to a digitized, integrated system where human observers and electronic monitoring (EM) operate using common data standards. This work is being progressed in coordination with the Electronic Reporting and Electronic Monitoring Intersessional Working Group (ER&EM-IWG), with the aim of aligning observer and EM data outputs.

30. The importance of ensuring consistency between ROP and EM data collection was emphasised. It was noted that any updates to ROP MSDFs should be shared with the ER&EM-IWG, and vice versa, to ensure alignment of data collection standards. The Chair highlighted the need for continued coordinated and collaborative intersessional engagement between the two groups.

31. The IWG noted further progress will benefit from the outcomes of upcoming ER&EM-IWG work and agreed to revisit the task at the next meeting.

#### **Sub-Item 5.2: Review of Minimum Standard Data Fields for Observer Transshipment Monitoring**

32. The Chair introduced the item, noting that the review of the MSDF for observer transshipment monitoring is a critical task aimed at modernising reporting, closing reporting gaps and supporting efforts to address IUU fishing. The focus is on the observer transshipment monitoring MSDFs that entered into force on 1 April 2023.

34. The Secretariat provided context, clarifying that the transshipment observer reporting MSDFs are a distinct set of data fields based on decisions in relation to the work of the Transshipment IWG that required observers to report on monitored transshipments, a function they had previously performed without formal reporting obligations to the Commission. These MSDFs were established as a new reporting framework and the tasking represented a review of implementation of the new reporting data fields.

35. It was noted that certain transshipment forms (FC1 and FC2) had been agreed at a previous annual meeting, with most of the relevant data fields in those forms already forming part of the general MSDFs collected across gear types. The carrier related FC3 form data fields had not progressed through the Transshipment IWG which was no longer active. The tasking had been to consider this element as part of strengthening monitoring of high-seas transshipment. It was also noted that species by number observer reporting, rather than species by weight had not yet been reviewed as a basis for observer report for scientific purposes.

36. The Chair proposed the Secretariat prepare a working paper to support CCMs review of the minimum standard data fields needed for observer transshipment monitoring, for consideration at the next meeting. The invitation was accepted, and a commitment was made to prepare an initial document to support CCM intersessional discussion.

33. Separately, it was noted that a previous review of non-transshipment ROP MSDFs had identified fields duplicated in other reporting processes that could be removed and that additional data fields may be required to ensure the ROP MSDF were up to date. A suggestion was made that the Secretariat examine the fields removed during that review to determine whether any should be reinstated and whether any additional fields not currently captured are necessary.

#### **Sub-Item 5.3: Consideration of Joint IWG Work Resulting from ER&EM-IWG and ROP-IWG**

37. The Chair introduced this sub-item, noting the closer coordination between the ER&EM-IWG and ROP-IWG was driven by the recognition that human observers and electronic monitoring tools share fundamental objectives. Key areas of consideration include the establishment of a regional monitoring

programme, harmonisation of data standards, addressing overlaps and inconsistencies between the two programmes, and integration of technologies.

38. No substantive discussion took place. The Chair advised that further consideration will be deferred pending outcomes of the upcoming ER&EM-IWG workshop, with the joint work to be revisited at the next ROP-IWG meeting.

#### **Sub-Item 5.4: Shark Species and Reporting Data Gaps Enhancements**

39. The Chair introduced this tasking, describing it as a direct response to recommendations from the Science Committee (SC21) to address critical inconsistencies in how shark species are identified and reported in the WCPO. The goal of the tasking is to bridge reporting gaps through improved species identification, standardised MSDFs, and enhanced biological sampling.

40. A technical observation was made regarding the likely origin of this tasking — specifically that it may have arisen from considerations linked to the stock assessment of a particular oceanic shark species rather than from a generalised concern about all programmes. It was noted that some observer programmes in the Pacific have maintained species identification guides with identification keys since 2019 and that existing observer data forms already capture fields related to species identification and handling guidelines. Protocols are also already in place within CMMs encouraging vessels to bring sharks to the surface as close to the vessel as possible to facilitate species identification before release.

41. The Chair acknowledged that progress on this tasking would benefit from further guidance from members. The matter was noted for further consideration later in 2026, and CCMs were encouraged to submit written suggestions on how the tasking might be advanced.

#### **Sub-Item 5.5: Possible Additional Reporting Requirements for Sea Turtles (CMM 2018-04)**

42. The Chair opened discussion on possible additional reporting requirements for sea turtles under CMM 2018-04, noting that this task had been brought forward as a Commission mandate for the IWG to consider.

43. It was noted that an informal intersessional meeting for the review of CMM 2018-04 was scheduled to be convened shortly after the present meeting. That meeting was described as focusing on current sea turtle data reporting requirements, including potential clarifications to promote consistent interpretation, and on the provision of operational longline data. It was clarified that the intersessional review meeting was not planning to address specific ROP data collection requirements under CMM 2018-04 as part of its scope.

44. In the context of this sub-item, previous proposals were recalled for modifications to the WCPFC ROP Minimum Data Standards to strengthen sea turtle monitoring, drawing on recommendations that had emerged from a joint analysis of sea turtle mitigation effectiveness. The fields that had previously been proposed for inclusion included the type and size of hook on which a turtle is caught, the location of the hook on the turtle, and the quantity of gear remaining on live turtles after release. Support was expressed for revisiting those proposals, noting that some of the relevant data fields are already being collected by certain observer programmes even though they have not been formally adopted as MSDFs.

45. It was noted that the context of ongoing reviews of relevant CMMs — particularly those relating to sharks and sea turtles — has the potential to implicitly or explicitly generate suggestions for changes to ROP data collection requirements and MSDFs, and that the IWG should monitor those review processes proactively in order to anticipate and prepare appropriate responses. The Chair acknowledged these considerations and noted the tasking for further work later in 2026.

#### **Sub-Item 5.6: Consideration of Any Other Proposals from CCMs**

46. The floor was opened for additional proposals. The United States advanced three areas to enhance the CCFS. First, it proposed updating CCFS reference materials to ensure clear and consistent terminology reflecting that all referrals are initiated by CCMs under the Convention, removing any distinction between “CCM-initiated” and “observer-initiated” cases. Second, it proposed introducing more detailed CCFS status designations, including automatic identification of the applicable Article 25(2) deadline when a case is created, and a new “CCM completed” status for cases considered concluded by the CCM but not yet formally closed by the Secretariat. Third, it proposed revising the CCFS case ID structure to better identify the detection method (e.g. observer or inspection) and subject matter, to improve analysis and reporting at TCC. The CCM requested that these proposals be included as an agenda item for the next ROP-IWG meeting and indicated it would prepare supporting material intersessionally.

47. A further observation highlighted the need for ongoing review of MSDFs to reflect monitoring requirements under CMMs. It was questioned whether provisions explicitly requiring observer data collection should automatically result in inclusion of corresponding data fields in the MSDFs, rather than requiring a separate IWG review process. The importance of continuing to update MSDFs as new obligations are adopted was reaffirmed.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 6: SUMMARY AND CLOSE OF MEETING**

48. The Chair summarised the key outcomes of the meeting. Under Agenda Item 3.1, the process flow received broad support, with recommendations to: remove the 90% completeness threshold in Step 1; clarify the debriefing observer provider; include observer and debriefer verification of the questionnaire; move the yes/no decision point to Step 4; add a no-case pathway from Step 4 to SPC; clarify the addressee of formal investigation requests; and address the outstanding issue of the scope of the observer-sourced case package. Under Agenda Item 3.2, there was broad agreement to exclude non-binding, non-enforceable, and non-verifiable obligations, with specific removals proposed and a commitment to update references to the current shark CMM. Under Agenda Item 4, recommendations on the non-catch transfer MSDF covered terminology, scope, and quantity recording, alongside a concern regarding the requirement to record quantities.

49. Under Agendas 5.1 through 5.6, various taskings were noted for further intersessional work, including a commitment to prepare a paper to support CCMs review of observer transshipment MSDFs. A request for the IWG to consider CCFS technical enhancements at the next meeting has also been made.

49. The Chair noted the aim was to present finalised proposals to TCC22 and committed to preparing a revised CCFS process flow and other reports intersessionally. CCMs were encouraged to provide written



comments on all draft documents ahead of the next meeting. The Chair has subsequently requested feedback by 29 May 2026.

50. The Chair indicated a second IWG meeting was anticipated July 2026 subject to other meetings, with the exact date to be confirmed.

51. The Chair thanked all participants for their contributions and closed the Eighth Meeting of the ROP Intersessional Working Group closed.



## REGIONAL OBSERVER PROGRAMME INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUP

### Eighth Meeting

1 April 2026

Electronic Meeting

### Proposed ROP-IWG08 Agenda

ROP-IWG08-2026-01\_rev01

1 April 2026

Agenda item	Topic
1	Opening of Meeting
2	Introduction and opening
3	Review and discuss the developed standardized solution to use ROP data in the CCFS and CMS process and potential CMM infringements obligations:
	3.1 Revisit working draft proposal on CCFS process flow ( <a href="#">ROP-IWG08-2026-02</a> ). (Includes consideration of US proposals)
	3.2 Review the draft proposal of CMMs monitored for potential infringements for CCFS ( <a href="#">ROP-IWG08-2026-03</a> ) (Includes consideration of US proposals)
4	Review of the proposed MSDF for the ROP Non-catch transfer monitoring ( <a href="#">ROP-IWG08-2026-04</a> )
5	Open discussions on <a href="#">other taskings</a>
	5.1 Progressing Priority tasking 4: Consideration related to emerging technologies – work closely with ER/EM - IWG for common understanding on the usage of MSDF
	5.2 Review of Minimum Data Fields for Observer Transshipment Monitoring - 2023
	5.3 Consideration of joint IWG work resulting from ERandEM-IWG and ROP-IWG
	5.4 Shark species and reporting data gaps enhancements
	5.5 Possible additional reporting requirements for Sea Turtles (CMM 2018-04)
	5.6 Consideration of any other proposals from CCMs
6	Summary and close of meeting




---

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

---

**CHAIR****Lucas Tarapik**

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

**CANADA****Felicia Cull**

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

**CHINA****LI Yan**

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

**Liangyu Du**

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

**Liu Runlin**

Shanghai Ocean University  
Research assistant  
[107568361@qq.com](mailto:107568361@qq.com)

**Yanxuedan Zhang**

Shanghai Ocean University  
Associate Professor  
[zyxd1985@hotmail.com](mailto:zyxd1985@hotmail.com)

**COOK ISLANDS****Lualua Tua-Trood**

Ministry of Marine Resources, Government of  
the Cook Islands  
Director, Offshore Fisheries Division  
[l.tua@mmr.gov.ck](mailto:l.tua@mmr.gov.ck)

**Sai Sarau**

Ministry of Marine Resources  
Senior Fisheries Officer  
[s.sarau@mmr.gov.ck](mailto:s.sarau@mmr.gov.ck)

**EUROPEAN UNION****Pedro Vieira Martins**

Promarinha – Portugal Observer Providers  
Observer Coordinator  
[pedro.martins@promarinha.pt](mailto:pedro.martins@promarinha.pt)

**FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA****Rocco Samuel**

National Oceanic Resource Management  
Authority (NORMA)  
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR COMPLIANCE  
DIVISION  
[rocco.samuel@norma.fm](mailto:rocco.samuel@norma.fm)

**Tosuo Irons Jr**

FSM National Oceanic Resource Management  
Authority  
Observer Coordinator  
[tosuojr.irones@norma.fm](mailto:tosuojr.irones@norma.fm)

## **FIJI**

### **Jale Wea**

Ministry of Fisheries  
[wea.jale@gmail.com](mailto:wea.jale@gmail.com)

### **Sevanaia Mawi**

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

## **INDONESIA**

### **Mahendra Andriyasa Rahardian**

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of the  
Republic of Indonesia  
Junior Capture Fisheries Production Specialist  
[andriyasamahendra@gmail.com](mailto:andriyasamahendra@gmail.com)

### **Mumpuni Cyntia Pratiwi**

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of the  
Republic of Indonesia  
Capture Fisheries Production Management  
Officer  
[mumpuni.cpratiwi@gmail.com](mailto:mumpuni.cpratiwi@gmail.com)

## **JAPAN**

### **Nobushige Shimizu**

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

### **Yayoi Otani**

Fisheries Agency of Japan  
Section Chief  
[yayoi\\_otani420@maff.go.jp](mailto:yayoi_otani420@maff.go.jp)

## **NAURU**

### **Erana Aliklik**

Nauru Fisheries & Marine Resources Authority  
Chief Executive Officer  
[alikelik.nauru@gmail.com](mailto:alikelik.nauru@gmail.com)

### **John Kazz Olsson**

Nauru Fisheries Marine and Resource Authority

VMS officer

[kazz.olsson@gmail.com](mailto:kazz.olsson@gmail.com)

### **Viti-Louisa Teimitsi**

Nauru Fisheries (NFMRA)  
Observer Coordinator  
[viti.louisa@gmail.com](mailto:viti.louisa@gmail.com)

## **NEW ZEALAND**

### **Greta Davison**

New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries  
Senior Policy Analyst  
[greta.davison@mpi.govt.nz](mailto:greta.davison@mpi.govt.nz)

### **Jordan Owczarek**

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

## **PALAU**

### **Everson Sengebau**

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

## **PAPUA NEW GUINEA**

### **Adrian J Nanguromo**

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

### **Glenda Barry**

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

## **PHILIPPINES**

### **Isidro Tanangonan**

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

**Marlo Demo-os**

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

**Renie Dumlao Siocon**

Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources  
FOP Technical Staff  
[ren.siocon@bfar.da.gov.ph](mailto:ren.siocon@bfar.da.gov.ph)

**REPUBLIC OF KOREA****Mr Jae-geol Yang**

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

**Seonhye Kim**

Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries  
Assistant Director

**REPUBLIC OF MARSHALL ISLANDS****Beau Bigler**

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

**Makbi Bwijko**

Marshall Islands Marine Resources  
Authority(MIMRA)  
Observer Compliance Officer  
[mbwijko@mimra.com](mailto:mbwijko@mimra.com)

**SAMOA****Junior Ajawas**

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries  
Fisheries Officer  
[junior.ajawas@maf.gov.ws](mailto:junior.ajawas@maf.gov.ws)

**Stella Sahara Tuuau**

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries  
Senior Fisheries Officer  
[stella.tuuau@maf.gov.ws](mailto:stella.tuuau@maf.gov.ws)

**SOLOMON ISLANDS****Dan Suhara**

Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, SIG  
Observer Coordinator  
[dsuhara@fisheries.gov.sb](mailto:dsuhara@fisheries.gov.sb)

**Leslie Ariki**

MINISTRY OF FISHERIES AND MARINE  
RESOURCES  
Port coordinator-Noro  
[LAriki@fisheries.gov.sb](mailto:LAriki@fisheries.gov.sb)

**CHINESE TAIPEI****Joy Hsiangyi Yu**

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

**Tzu-Ching Yu**

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

**Wen-Chi Chang**

Fisheries Agency  
Associate Technical Specialist  
[wenchi0902@ms1.fg.gov.tw](mailto:wenchi0902@ms1.fg.gov.tw)

**TUVALU****Gagati Falaima**

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

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA****Emily Crigler**

NOAA Fisheries  
Deputy Director, Fisheries Research and  
Monitoring Division, Pacific Islands Fisheries  
Science Center  
[emily.crigler@noaa.gov](mailto:emily.crigler@noaa.gov)

**Emily Reynolds**

NOAA Fisheries, Pacific Islands Regional Office  
Fishery Policy Analyst  
[emily.reynolds@noaa.gov](mailto:emily.reynolds@noaa.gov)

**Katrina Poremba**

NMFS  
Fisher Policy Analyst  
[katrina.poremba@noaa.gov](mailto:katrina.poremba@noaa.gov)

**Melissa Goldman**

NOAA Fisheries  
Enforcement Attorney  
[melissa.goldman@noaa.gov](mailto:melissa.goldman@noaa.gov)

**Merna Saad**

Department of State  
Foreign Affairs Advisor  
[saadm@state.gov](mailto:saadm@state.gov)

**Valerie Post**

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

**PACIFIC COMMUNITY (SPC)****Colley Falasi**

Secretariat of the Pacific Community  
Fisheries Data Audit Analyst  
[colleyf@spc.int](mailto:colleyf@spc.int)

**Malo Hosken**

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

**Siosifa Fukofuka**

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

**Timothy Park**

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

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

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

**Jason Raubani**

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency  
MCS Policy Advisor  
[jason.raubani@ffa.int](mailto:jason.raubani@ffa.int)

**Jude Piruku**

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

**Philip Lens**

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

**PARTIES TO THE NAURU AGREEMENT (PNA)****Brian Kumasi**

Office of the Parties to the Nauru Agreement  
Policy Manager  
[Brian@pnatuna.com](mailto:Brian@pnatuna.com)

**Joseph Kendou**

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

**Lara Manarangi-Trott**

PNA Office  
Consultant

**SHARKS PACIFIC****Bubba Cook**

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

**WCPFC SECRETARIAT**

**Deatra Iehsi-Solomon**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
HR Officer  
[deatra.iehsi-solomon@wcpfc.int](mailto:deatra.iehsi-solomon@wcpfc.int)

**Eidre Sharp**

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

**Elaine G. Garvilles**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
Assistant Science Manager

**Hilary Ayrton**

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

**Joseph Jack**

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

**Karl Staisch**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
ROP Training and Audit Consultant  
[karl.staisch@wcpfc.int](mailto:karl.staisch@wcpfc.int)

**Kilafwasru Albert**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)

ROP Data Entry Technician  
[Kilafwasru.Albert@wcpfc.int](mailto:Kilafwasru.Albert@wcpfc.int)

**Matthew McGregor**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
Compliance Manager  
[matthew.mcgregor@wcpfc.int](mailto:matthew.mcgregor@wcpfc.int)

**Natsuko Akinaga**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
Administrative Officer  
[natsuko.akinaga@wcpfc.int](mailto:natsuko.akinaga@wcpfc.int)

**Simson Nanpei**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
IT Officer  
[simson.nanpei@wcpfc.int](mailto:simson.nanpei@wcpfc.int)

**SungKwon Soh**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
Science Manager  
[sungkwon.soh@wcpfc.int](mailto:sungkwon.soh@wcpfc.int)

**Tim Jones**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
IT Manager  
[tim.jones@wcpfc.int](mailto:tim.jones@wcpfc.int)

**Van David**

Western and Central Pacific Fisheries  
Commission (WCPFC)  
Vessel Management Officer  
[van.david@wcpfc.int](mailto:van.david@wcpfc.int)