

## FIRST OBSERVER TUNA DATABASE WORKSHOP (OTDW-1)

3–7 March 2014

Noumea, New Caledonia

*Draft*

### Recommendations

1. The workshop identified the current main issues that exist in OBSERVER DATA MANAGEMENT in the national and regional offices and these are listed in ANNEX 1. The main issues identified related to:
  - The lack of CERTIFIED DEBRIEFERS
  - The need to implement appropriate COST RECOVERY to cover resources required to adequately manage observer data
  - COMPLIANCE links with Observer data
  - DATA TRANSMISSION and DATA SHARING
  - ENSURING THE QUALITY OF THE DATA
  - DATABASE SYSTEMS and TOOLS
  - CAPACITY BUILDING in DATA MANAGEMENT

The first two items in this list were identified as the most urgent, high-priority issues.

The Workshop recommended that **Member Countries** (with assistance from **SPC**, **FFA** and the **WCPFC**) highlight these issues at the national and regional level so they can be resolved as soon as possible.

2. The workshop noted that some member countries would like clearer guidelines/procedures on the timeliness for submitting their observer data, particularly under circumstances where the debriefing process is yet to be fully established, but data need to be provided nonetheless. The workshop proceeded to produce an agreed set of guidelines with respect to the deadlines for the submission of observer data through the work of four working groups (see ANNEX 2).

The workshop recommended that **Member Countries** (with assistance from **SPC**, **FFA** and the **WCPFC**) strive to work towards the recommended “IDEAL Deadline” requirements in the ANNEX 2 table, acknowledging that resource problems currently restrict some countries to the more conservative “REALISTIC Deadline”.

3. The workshop strongly recommended that **FFA** proceed with the implementation of the OPM (Observer Programme Management) in member country offices as soon as practical. Specific visits to **Nauru, Tonga, Samoa, Tuvalu and the Solomon Islands** were requested to install and enhance the use of OPM in these countries. Several requests for enhancements to OPM were noted by the workshop including:
  - a. Including an alert to highlight when the deadline for (i) scanning data from an observer trip (30 days) and (ii) submitting data from an observer trip to SPC has been reached (50 days);
  - b. Incorporating more workshop and training information into OPM;
  - c. Add individual purse-seine vessel’s gear and electronics to the OPM so observers can get a print-out as a check list to be used before every trip (so observers would then only have to record when electronics/ gear have changed).
4. The workshop noted the progress of the TUBS Observer Data entry system and **SPC** received several requests to install the latest version of the system on a trial basis (**PNG, FSM, RMI, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Tuvalu**) and for full implementation (**Fiji, Tonga, French Polynesia and the Philippines**), noting that the latest version of the TUBS data entry system is already installed at FFA and the WCPFC Secretariat.

5. The workshop noted the progress of the new web-based TUBS Reporting System and recommended that SPC initially produce a manual of the system for Member countries and then provide training on the system during future in-country visits. There were several requests for new reports and modifications to TUBS reports, including:
  - a. A new set of DEBRIEFER reports that can be used by the debriefer to look at summaries of historical data collected by the observer being debriefed;
  - b. A more detailed GEN-3 report for the FFA MCS section;
  - c. Including a breakdown by FATE and Condition in the WCPFC Species of special interests (turtles, birds, marine mammals, sharks) reports;
  - d. A new report that provides a detailed breakdown of catch statistics by Area for a selected species.
  - e. A set of reports that cross-checks observer data with relevant TUFMAN data (e.g. logsheets, unloadings).
  
6. While this workshop was useful in highlighting some key issues in observer data management and presenting the latest observer database tools, it was agreed that future discussions on observer data management at the regional level would be better covered by a specific agenda item at the annual Regional Observer Coordinator Workshop, instead of a dedicated workshop on observer data management.

## ANNEX 1 - THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES in OBSERVER DATA MANAGEMENT

The following table consolidates the outcomes of 4 working groups in the workshop, tasked with prioritizing on the most important issues currently experienced in observer data management in their countries

ISSUE	COMMENTS
<b><u>The lack of CERTIFIED DEBRIEFERS</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The lack of debriefing was considered by all groups as being the most fundamental problem affecting the quality of the data and the timeliness in the provision of data to SPC.</li> <li>– There is sometimes conflict where an uncertified debriefer and observer have questioned each other on who is right and who is wrong, highlighting the need for <u>certified</u> debriefers.</li> <li>– Training standard for certified debriefer: the training process is quite long – could the training standards could be reviewed. Please refer to the discussion and outcomes of the review of a recent Debiefer training audit report at ROCW-14 (10-14 March 10-14).</li> </ul>
<b><u>The need to implement appropriate COST RECOVERY to cover resources required to adequate manage observer data</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Data entry staff: lack of staff and also funding.</li> <li>– Must ensure there are enough resources to fund appropriate people to data management positions (e.g. staff who are qualified and capable to undertake the duties of data entry).</li> <li>– Learn from those that have successfully implemented cost recovery (e.g. PNG).</li> <li>– Request that FFA/SPC/WCPFC, in collaboration with PNG, provide other member countries with guidelines for establishing appropriate cost-recovery models to support all aspects of observer programmes.</li> <li>– It was suggested that cost recovery models must be incorporated into national Tuna Management Plans</li> <li>– Ensure cost-recovery is sustainable (in the long term).</li> </ul>
<b><u>COMPLIANCE links with Observer data</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Improvements are required to highlight potential issues of compliance that exist in the data collected by observers, specifically ensuring the GEN-1 and GEN-3 forms are provided to the relevant compliance authorities in a timely manner.</li> </ul>
<b><u>DATA TRANSMISSION and DATA SHARING</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Problems in sending scanned files due to poor internet bandwidth.</li> <li>– Taking advantage of regional meetings to submit scanned files to SPC</li> <li>– Sharing US Treaty and FSMA Observer data.</li> <li>– Using the WCPFC data dissemination rules to ensure member countries receive observer data collected through other programmes that cover (i) your flagged vessels and (ii) any activity in your EEZ.</li> </ul>
<b><u>ENSURING THE QUALITY OF THE DATA</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Highlight that Data quality is required in all processes, from the collection through debriefing, scanning and data entry.</li> <li>– Data quality also covers ‘completeness’ of data, for example, the observer collects information from all sets and all observer data sheets must be scanned and be of acceptable quality.</li> <li>– A strong request to ensure that the SLOPs v3.0 scanning software is used and that the quality of the scans is checked before submission to the SPC.</li> </ul>
<b><u>DATABASE SYSTEMS and TOOLS</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Ensure there is a continuation of the assistance provided by regional agencies in developing and maintaining observer database systems and database reporting tools.</li> <li>– Link TUBS and OPM as a matter of priority.</li> </ul>
<b><u>CAPACITY BUILDING in DATA MANAGEMENT</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Ensure there is a continuation of the assistance provided by regional agencies in CAPACITY BUILDING related to OBSERVER DATA MANAGEMENT, including database systems.</li> <li>– Countries need a clear and detailed set of procedures and instructions for each step of the management of observer data. Some documentation exists but it needs to be completed and made available, with training, in a coordinated manner.</li> <li>– Including relevant training on COMPUTER usage in future observer training courses was strongly recommended.</li> </ul>

## ANNEX 2 - The AGREED sequence of events and timing with respect to the management and submission of OBSERVER DATA

### Relevant background requirements

*"...WCPFC10 recommended that ROP data should be submitted to the Secretariat or SPC where possible within 100 days of the observer disembarking purse seine vessels and within 120 days of the observer disembarking longline vessels.."*

*"... ideally, SPC would prefer debriefed scanned data to be provided as soon as practical, even if it is one trip at a time. In any event, SPC requests that ALL observer data -- debriefed or not -- rejected or not -- be submitted to SPC ..."*

The following table serves as a guideline for data quality control (e.g. debriefing) and other preparations of observer data (e.g. scanning) for the timely submission to the SPC. Member countries should strive to work towards the recommended "IDEAL Deadline" requirement, acknowledging that resource problems currently restrict some countries to the more conservative "REALISTIC Deadline".

Step	IDEAL Deadline (days since observer returned to port)	REALISTIC Deadline	Comments
1. Observer check-in after arrival (for post-arrival instructions)	2-4 HOURS	1 full day for some countries [	Contractual obligation required.  Current situation may vary from programme to programme, but this is the recommendation.  Coordinator meets observer at dock in some countries.  <b>Issue</b> : landing in a foreign port and not having someone meet you, so need to wait until returning to home country, sometimes 10-14 days (e.g. Nauru). A phone call or email immediately after arriving would satisfy the "check-in".
2. Pre-debriefing	1-2 DAY		For example, GEN-3 and GEN-1 primarily but also preliminary review of the remainder of the observers data  See procedures document for pre-debriefing.  Needs to consider: i. Back-to-back trips without time to debrief; ii. The observer will arrive in another country and will need pre-debriefing from another national observer programme.

Step	IDEAL Deadline (days since observer returned to port)	REALISTIC Deadline	Comments
			<p>Need to take into account of delays in previous step.            In some countries, pre-debriefing same day as arrival.            Need to advise observers doing back-to-back trips that pre-debriefing is essential and that communicated/coordinated amongst observer programmes through the coordinator (formalised in previous ROCWs)</p>
3. Post-trip DATA QUALITY CONTROL			
a. Observer finishes TRIP REPORT	7 DAYS (PS) 14 DAYS (LL)	14 DAYS	<p>Some countries insist on 7 DAYS.             Longline up to 14 days (policy in some countries).</p>
b. Process and deadlines for finishing the DEBRIEFING	9-11 DAYS  16-23 DAYS (LL)		<p>Using the standard debriefing procedures established at the regional level.             Depends on contracts, for e.g. some countries have a rest period before debriefing</p>
c. DEBRIEFING is not available → deadline for Non-DEBRIEF Checking completed		Unless a firm schedule for debriefing occurs within a maximum of 30 days since the end of the trip	<p>If debriefing does not CURRENTLY exist, then a non-debrief check will be required.             The non-debrief check is likely to be undertaken by SPC once the data are submitted.             The trip needs to be clearly identified as NOT DEBRIEFED.             The basis for a non-debrief check needs to be discussed, developed and accepted, initially by the regional agencies, and then presented/discussed/reviewed/accepted by the member countries.             Issue: Observers holding on to data for successive trips.             Consider alerts in the OPM system to identify when non-debriefed trips need to be submitted. An issue is if the observer data are in another country or with the observer.             Potentially undermines the purpose of the DEBRIEFING process and one group thought this step should be removed (not occur). For this reason, there is no IDEAL Deadline, since the desired/ideal situation is that this step does not exist.</p>
4. Scanning TRIP data	30 DAYS		<p>Instructions/Documentation for Best Practise scanning to be provided by SPC – Using the SLOPS v3.0 software.             Need to ensure the instructions for scanning and checking scanned data are followed.</p>

Step	IDEAL Deadline (days since observer returned to port)	REALISTIC Deadline	Comments
5. Transmission of SCANNED data to SPC	50 DAYS		<p>100 days for PS 120 days for LL (recommended WCPFC deadline)</p> <p>Some countries have poor internet bandwidth and so copying data onto USB and DVDs which are then hand-carried with delegates to regional meetings/workshops is the best method of sending the data in.</p>
6. ARCHIVING/FILING Hard-copy and scanned data	50 DAYS		
7. SPC Review of data and follow-up with any issues (e.g. rescans, etc.)	60 DAYS		
8. Countries providing rescans of data as identified in 7. ...	65 DAYS		
9. Receiving processed data back from SPC			