



## 11<sup>th</sup> Regional Observer Coordinators Workshop

### Report

**Forum Fisheries Agency  
Honiara, Solomon Islands  
21<sup>st</sup> to 24<sup>th</sup> June 2011**

#### Opening of Workshop

The ROCW Chairman, John Kelly introduced FFA Deputy Director General (DDG), James Movick.

The DDG then welcomed National Observer Coordinators and representatives from the WCPFC, NOAA and SPC along with relevant staff from FFA to this 11<sup>th</sup> gathering of the Regional Observer Coordinators' Workshop. The DDG delivered FFA Director General, Tanielu Sua's apology for not being able to attend due to prior commitments. However, for the DDG this provides opportunity to be more involved in an area of work that he has had close interest in for many years and from different perspectives. He first worked with observers as a member of industry and has entertained many an observer at home and office over those years. He has heard numerous different observer stories – the adventures, the complaints and the descriptions of the challenges that observers face – from Captains, crew and observers themselves. He praised Observer Coordinators for their efforts to meet the significant challenges of the past couple of years and challenged Coordinators to lift the bar higher as they endeavour to meet the many challenges ahead. He noted the success in meeting the 100% coverage requirements on purse seine fishing vessels and acknowledged the demands that five per cent coverage of longliners and full coverage of carrier vessels involved in high seas transhipment operations will bring.

The DDG referred to recent recommendations coming out of MCS working group deliberations that have been endorsed at FFC level recognising the growing demand for observer data in compliance activity and the need for professionalism amongst observers. Coordinators have a responsibility to impart this sense of professionalism to observers, to ensure that they are looked after as the professionals they are required to be and to ensure that

observer reports and data are professional. He reiterated his special concern about observer matters and assured participants that his office door was open throughout the course of the workshop, if required.

### **Meeting Procedures**

Apologies were received on behalf of FSM and Kiribati. The Chair introduced himself to the French Polynesian Observer Coordinator, Taiana Raoulx, who was the sole new participant to an ROCW workshop.

After calls for new volunteers to act as rapporteurs for the workshop were unsuccessful SPC representatives, Peter Sharples and Sifa Fukofuka offered their services for the task. Comment was made that past reports from ROCWs have sometimes been inadequate to convey the thoughts and recommendations of Observer Coordinators to appropriate decision making bodies. It is important that we improve in this area.

The workshop agenda was presented as a flexible living document, expected to change through the course of the workshop. The chair asked for comments. It was proposed that time be made available to: explain the NZ aid programme funding that has recently been secured for PIRFO support and development; and present information on Forum interest in utilising observer data in non-fisheries areas of law enforcement. The agenda was otherwise accepted.

FFA Observer Manager, Tim Park, explained that the philosophy/theme of this workshop is "Regional Harmonization". He noted that it is important to keep in mind that despite and because of the entry of the new organizations, PNA and Te Vaka Moana we need to keep in mind that our success is based on understanding our common purpose and having unified methods to address such purpose. In observer operations this common approach is particularly apparent in observer training and debriefing, key issues of this meeting.

After other general house-keeping matters were attended to the Chairman asked participants to give thought during the workshop on the future make-up of the ROCW, with particular focus on future chairmanship, to be discussed at workshop closing.

### ***The 7th International Fisheries Observer and Monitoring Conference (IFOMC)***

The Chair took the opportunity to note that the 7th IFOMC is to be held in Vine Del Mar, Chile in 2013 and high-lighted that although this seems a long time off now is the time to mark it on calendars. Funds need to be found and it is a good time to start thinking about preparations and coordination of activities to enable attendance. He highly recommended that the Pacific Island region be represented there and noted that in recent years the conference has moved away from its North American flavour and is much more involved in observer issues in young and developing programmes. He believed that this region has much to gain as well as much to offer at this conference. Further information, including potential funding opportunities, will soon be posted on the website at: <http://www.ifomc.com/>. The conference organisers encourage attendance by active Observers but the conference is useful to people working in all areas of observer support.

Although contributions of presentations and posters are not pre-requisites for attendance they are highly encouraged and it was suggested that if funding could be identified within our region to help PIRFO Coordinators attend then priority for allocation would likely be based on the potential for the recipient to effectively represent the region.

### **Outcomes of MCS Working Group meeting and FFA recommendations**

The FFA Director of Fisheries Operations (DFO), Marc Young, launched the workshop by summarising the outputs and recommendations to do with observers that came out of the 14<sup>th</sup> MCS working group and were subsequently endorsed by the May 2011 FFC.

The MCS working group recognised the high interest in observer data for both science and compliance purposes and that there is increasing reliance on observer data for compliance purposes. Observer safety must always be of primary concern and in any safety implications that may arise from the greater role that observer data has in compliance must not be overlooked. **The formation of a working group on safety issues has been recommended.** Recognising the increasing role of observers in compliance and acknowledging the importance of quality observer data in science, the FFC also endorsed the MCS working group's **recommendation** that comprehensive and quality debriefing exists to facilitate effective use of observer data. The development of a corps of Debriefers capable of providing this service must now be a high priority activity and full debriefing must be considered a normal part of observer activity to be provided on a cost recovery basis. Current debriefing practices and debriefing training need to be updated to accommodate the growing use of observer data in MCS issues.

The FFC has also recommended establishing minimum wage, allowance and insurance guidelines to ensure that people of sufficient skills and integrity to carry out the increasing range of duties professionally can be recruited and retained long enough to make worthwhile contributions to fisheries management.

These MCS working group recommendations and FFC endorsements were hailed from the floor as significant steps forward, as many of the issues now being talked about have been raised by the ROCW over several years with little hearing. WCPFC and SPC representatives commended those who had prepared the papers that have drawn recent attention of decision makers.

The new drive for debriefer development comes from the need to have good observer reports and information for compliance purposes delivered in a timely manner and the DFO, like the DDG before him urged Coordinators to work towards this more timely delivery.

FFA Surveillance and Operations Officer (SOO), Lamiller Pawut, noted that interest has been shown in the Forum Regional Security Committee in looking at observer data as a source of evidence for non-fisheries related illegal activities, such as the movement of contraband, possible people smuggling, etc. He asked for an opportunity to present on this later in the week.

A **summary of the FFC endorsed recommendations is attached as appendix 1**

## **Programme updates and urgent issues**

It had been decided that the country by country status of observer programme reports traditionally presented at ROCWs not be delivered across the floor at the 11<sup>th</sup> ROCW. Instead a standardised report template was sent out with the invitations to attend the ROCW with a request that completed versions of these be returned quickly so they could be summarised and a summary table be made ready for the workshop, against which countries could further report highlights if they so desired. However, there were insufficient returns after the late delivery of invitations for this process to be effectively carried out.

Instead the session was used to review the report template in an effort to ensure that Coordinators are not unduly burdened by a further reporting requirement, that it was unambiguous and to ensure it contained sufficient information that it could be used by programmes as a standard report for internal and external use. The resulting **report template is attached as appendix 2**.

Tonga reported that it had ear-marked observer development as a priority issue over the next couple of years, as they intend to use their observers in a variety of roles should other aspects of their fisheries development programme come to fruition. Those roles include: WCPFC coverage levels of foreign longline vessels that are being encouraged to return to Tongan waters; 100% coverage of planned research cruises; potential involvement with the PNA observer agency; and involvement in non-tuna fisheries such as bêche-de-mer monitoring, the snapper longline fishery and aquarium fish collection.

The ROCW was reminded that Tonga had expressed concern about the observer strategy paper presented at the FFC and that consequent negotiations had resulted in agreement to conduct in-country observer training in Tonga before the end of 2011. This is an added event on an already circulated 2011 training schedule, which FFA and SPC are still under-resourced to deliver. The SPC representative expressed concern that agreement was reached without consulting SPC who currently deliver the training.

The Solomon Islands expressed its need for more debriefers, high-lighting that with the current basic training and another planned for later in the year they would have plenty of observers available but no debriefing capability. SPC expressed concern about the second 2011 training planned, as this is not in the regional training schedule.

### ***PIRFO web-site***

It was suggested that the report template discussed in the previous session could be web-based and be kept up-dated online. It was also suggested that sufficient information should be fed into TUBSMAN, the latest incarnation of the Tuna Observer Management and Administration Database, so that the majority of the report could be generated automatically.

There was a brief discussion about the PIRFO website and participants were asked if it was starting to prove useful. However, the site has not been heavily used to date, in part because it is not yet populated with all the tools promised for it. However, those seeking what is available on the site have found it very useful.

Some PIRFO programmes still do not have ready access to the internet and have asked FFA and SPC to consider providing assistance that will help rectify this situation, as part of

helping PIRFO programmes provide a more professional observer service. Palau would welcome such assistance. It was suggested that a stripped, text-based version, more suitable for dial-up internet connections could help in the shorter term.

Coordinators were urged to forward provide further suggestions for improving the PIRFO website to SPC representatives at any time.

### ***MCS country reports***

The FFA SOO referred participants to MCS country reports available on FFA's website. The reports provide ratings on the current status of countries MCS capabilities against ten base-line components, including one for observer programmes. Countries are rated as weak, moderate, good and very good according to where they are at in meeting these base-line expectations.

### **WCPFC Audit Concerns**

WCPFC Regional Observer Programme Coordinator (ROPC), Karl Staisch, delivered a report on issues encountered during Commission audits of PIRFO programmes, inviting ROCW participants for comments and suggestions. The report is attached as appendix 2. Some further topics and highlights of those in the report include:

#### ***Observer awareness of WCPFC CMMs***

To help ensure observers have a better understanding of the WCPFC CMMS relative to their data collection activities the ROPC intends to issue annual summaries on how CMMs affect observer data collection activities. This paper will be designed to fit within Observer Workbooks and should be addressed during training. It was recommended that future development of PIRFO training standards encompass measures to ensure observers have a good understanding of CMMs. The aim is to have this paper ready in March to incorporate CMM changes and additions introduced at the previous December WCPFC meeting.

#### ***Catch Retention, Bycatch mitigation, Transshipment et al***

If a vessel discards fish then the CMM on catch retention requires that the vessel Captain or Fishing Master provides a signed statement to the observer to explain the reason for discarding. The WCPFC is already getting regular reports from vessels that discard.

The only valid reason to discard target species is that it is unfit for human consumption. However, observers may believe that the true reason for fish being discarded is different to the Captain's declared reason and this should not be ignored. Both reasons need to be reported by the observer.

CMM requirements of observers in by-catch mitigation are already well covered in new PIRFO forms. The main drive to collect new information on bycatch mitigation is concerns about sea-birds and catch of sea-birds is not a big issue for PIRFO programmes.

### *Transshipment at sea for Longliners*

Any carrier that is in our region with the intention of collecting fish from longliners must have an observer onboard. That observer is currently expected to sign off on relevant documentation that describes the amount of catch that is transferred. Otherwise, at this point in time, there is no comprehensive description of the observer's duties during transshipment. All FFA members are signatories to this measure so should be addressing it if necessary. To date there have been no discrepancies in transshipment reporting that have been brought to the attention of the WCPFC.

### *Issuance of safety equipment to observers and safety training*

Most countries have signed onto IMO International Safety standards including all FFA and SPC members. It is a reasonable expectation of DWFNs that people being placed on their vessels be trained to these standards. Failing to provide adequate safety training could provide an easy out for countries looking for excuses not taking Pacific Island observers.

Generally programmes are not performing up to requirements issuing safety equipment. There is too much reliance on the vessels providing this equipment without adequate checks to ensure that they truly are providing appropriate equipment to observers. Standard issue of safety equipment to all observers is encouraged.

### *Vessel Safety Checks*

Most things on the vessel safety check list provided by the WCPFC are already on FFA/SPC Placement Form. It was proposed that the few items that are not could be added to that form at the next Data Collection Committee (DCC) meeting.

Coordinators clearly thought that safety checks are important but concern was raised that for several countries sea-safety is not a fisheries responsibility. No real solution was offered on how to deal with this issue but Coordinators were cautioned against letting vessels go without an observer onboard on the grounds that the vessel is unsafe for an observer, as this could motivate vessels to deliberately be unsafe.

**It is recommended that fisheries authorities become more pro-active at bringing vessel safety concerns to the attention of the relevant authorities and demanding that remedial action be taken.**

### *Insurance*

Many programmes do not have comprehensive insurance of their observers. There is also no real checks made to ensure that the vessels they think are insuring their observers really do have adequate insurance for their observers.

Examples of the insurance arrangements that some programmes have entered into were floored and a promising purpose-built for observers was identified by Vanuatu who use the large international insurance company AON. Vanuatu was asked to make contact details for this company available to other interested parties and to perhaps even consider brokering some further involvement between them and PIRFO programmes and/or the fishing fleets/companies that utilise observers from these programmes, depending on the insurance related components of different licensing arrangements.

### *Health and safety*

**It is recommended that a health certificate should be a pre-requisite for training as an observer. There should also be ongoing checks. The ROPC suggested that one check be carried out before training and one every couple of years there-after. Medical certificates should also be audited.**

It was suggested that only observer health certificates issued by those on a list of recognised medical practitioners be accepted. It was also suggested that this same group of medical practitioners could be used for ongoing health advice and service with respect to observers. A suggestion was made to try to obtain a copy of the same list or lists that donor countries use to clear scholarship students. It was noted that it is important to liaise with medical professionals to come up with a standard guideline for doctors on what a suitable health check for observers consists of.

### *Police clearance*

During this discussion the question was raised as to whether Police clearance certificates should also be pre-requisites in the observer selection process.

### *Observer workbooks and minimum data standards*

Although the PIRFO programmes audited to date have not had all the WCPFC minimum data fields incorporated in their workbooks it was noted that they would all have them before the January 1<sup>st</sup> 2012 deadline when the latest DCC forms are distributed in the second half of this year.

### ***Communications***

The ROPC sought and was given assurance that radio training is part of PIRFO training. He stressed that such training is particularly important with respect to deploying observers on longliners. The WCPFC CMM standard demands that observers have some form of communication, not necessarily voice, capability while they are at sea. There is a PIRFO Communications module and that the Sea-safety training module available throughout the Pacific incorporates radio operating.

### ***Proposal WCPFC7-2010-DP/19 - Review of Observer Reports***

The ROPC also circulated information on a proposal to be delivered from WCPFC members: the European Union, Japan, Korea and Chinese Taipei to require greater access to observer reports by vessel operators/captains. An initial demand to have observer data signed off by the Captain to verify it was correct has been tempered with this current request to have observer reports made available soon after they get off a vessel. This could have significant impact on observer training and on debriefing and Coordinators need to stay in tune with developments.

### ***Debriefers***

The ROCW noted that some observer programmes are still without debriefers. This is a major deficit but it is understood that a lot has been achieved in two years and that it was unrealistic to expect that sufficient experienced people could be available as debriefers in such a short time. Nevertheless it was urged that high priority be given to getting sufficient numbers of debriefers available within the time frame for full ROP authorisation.

### ***PIRFO Debriefing Implementation Strategy***

SPC Observer Support and Development Coordinator (OSDC), Peter Sharples, presented a summary of outcomes of two debriefing workshops held in Cairns (July 2010) and Noumea (March 2011).

At the Cairns meeting Coordinators were invited to review and update the PIRFO Debriefing Policy and to discuss debriefing issues. In particular the skills and experience level expectations were agreed on. The guideline for the number of Debriefers a programme should have remained at one for the programme plus one for every five regular observers that the programme has. However, there was agreement that, as a regional strategy, resources should be targeted at having at least one Debriefers for every ten observers that the programme has within the next year.

Another significant outcome of the Cairns workshop was delineation of pre-debriefing from full debriefing. Coordinators agreed that ideally, a full debriefing should be completed after every trip. However, recognising that in the current climate of 100% coverage, shortage of observers, even greater shortage of debriefers and insufficient funding it was accepted that a process of pre-debriefing during which an observer and observer debriefers get together to go over any observer related work that may have a time-critical element to it would suffice at the



end of every trip. PIRFO programmes must strive to have their observers pre-debriefed after every trip, even if the observer is continuing on the same vessel. It was agreed that full debriefings where all of the observers work is examined should be carried out after every trip, whenever possible but in any event MUST be carried out within three completed observer trips. If an observer carries out three trips without being debriefed then they must be replaced and retained onshore until that debriefing can be carried out.

At the Cairns workshop Coordinators worked together to tease out the important, time-critical, issues that ought to be part of the pre-debriefing process.

The Noumea workshop essentially had three tasks.

1. to provide final training and certification to already experienced acting but not PIRFO certified Debriefers
2. to review the whole PIRFO Debriefing development process and current PIRFO competency-based-training standards and use the experiences to date to help document an ongoing PIRFO Debriefing Certification Policy
3. to develop a regional strategy for delivering a set of national observer debriefing implementation plans to present to FFC for endorsement and mandate to utilise and seek further funds to address our current critical shortage of debriefers.

Programmes were invited to send their most experienced debriefers to Noumea so that they could be formally certified under task 1, above and their expertise and personal experiences would provide sound advice in task 2. Programmes were also asked to ensure that they came equipped with adequate information to take part in assembling National Debriefing Implementation Plans described in task 3.

The regional strategy will involve conducting a series of three workshops to recognise previous learning (RPL) amongst currently acting debriefers and to fully certify those that demonstrate they have the appropriate debriefing competency. Those fully PIRFO certified Debriefers can then be used for on-the-job training of other potential debriefers. Standard PIRFO Debriefing development will involve attending an Introduction to Debriefing Workshop and then a programme of progressively more involvement in real debriefings with certified Debriefers turning over more and more of the Debriefing responsibility to the new guy. This work will be tracked and assessed with the use of the Debriefing Activity Book that was also designed in the Noumea workshop. When the aspiring Debriefing is ready they will be invited to attend a fine tuning and assessment workshop the successful completion of which will lead to certification.

To facilitate the rapid development of PIRFO Debriefers to meet the ten to one initial target a programme of Debriefing exchanges is envisioned so that countries without or with few certified debriefers will be able to import certified debriefers from other countries to help with the on-the-job training of their aspiring Debriefers. The exchange programme will also see aspiring Debriefers go overseas to work under certified debriefers in the countries that currently have them.

The Noumea workshop proved very productive with all of the tasks being successfully undertaken. The road to PIRFO Debriefing certification and the regional implementation plans are reported in detail and are attached as [appendix 3](#).

### *Stationing of debriefers in major ports*

At times of busy fishing and consequent increased transshipping in localised areas of the Pacific in line with weather patterns and other factors influencing the movement of fish and fishing boats there is a need to temporarily increase the number of Debriefers in port. Recognising that it will take time for programmes to have sufficient numbers of observers with the experience necessary for them to become Debriefers participants at the Cairns debriefing workshop had recommended a short-term fix of forming a flexible pool of full-time mobile Debriefers that can be moved from port to port to address this need. As yet this mobile corps of Debriefers has not been formed, the Debriefers shortage is as acute a problem as ever, and the request to discuss it led to the item being on the agenda.

However, to successfully assuage participants concerns they were reminded of the element in the Debriefing implantation plans presented in the previous session that describes a series of exchanges so that aspiring debriefers can get on-the-job training from certified debriefers from other countries. This is an expensive but considered effective training exercise. The expense can be further justified if the times for these exchanges are carefully crafted so that extra experienced Debriefers are flown into a port, increasing the number of Debriefers there when it is operating at its busiest. This may also provide further justification for seeking some of the cost of Debriefers training from industry as part of the normal cost of observer operations.

### **Planning Basic Observer Training**

Tables showing the FFA and SPC observer training that was scheduled for the remainder of 2011 and endorsed at FFC77 and the tentative training schedule for 2012 were presented. These are attached as appendices 5 and 6. Tonga noted that although in-country training for Tonga was not on the FFC77 table presented that during the FFC77 further discussions had led to FFC77 endorsement of in-country training in Tonga as reflected in other areas of the FFC77 report.

Concerns about training demands were discussed at length. With training being in high demand and training resources being limited it is important to have an efficient and effective training plan.

The OSDC described various factors believed to influence the call for more observers training and various reasons for not increasing observer numbers too rapidly. Not all are practically driven and well thought out. He urged that programmes give more thought to developing the structures that support their observers before they train more observers. Today, the need for Observer Debriefers far outweighs the need for more Observers. Data quality suffers markedly from the lack of ongoing training that debriefing provides.

Whilst recognising that some programmes are still short of observers from time to time and that there is scope to increase numbers of observers to more readily address the increasing number of observer responsibilities, the region is still served by a limited amount of fully tasked observer support services. Significantly, there are programmes with recently trained observers yet to be deployed, who have almost no debriefers, and yet who are still asking for more observer basic training. Having more observers than can readily be deployed can only lead to higher turnover of those that have been trained and thus further waste of training

resources. These programmes would make more effective use of the same resources available for observer basic training to develop their debriefer corps so that eventually the programmes will be better placed to carry out their own training. Benefit can also be derived from developing more effective observer management strategies so they can deploy current observers more efficiently. Once these components are in place programmes will be able to increase their observer numbers with less wastage and with the confidence that their observer will be better placed to produce quality product.

That some observers remain unemployed after training is a considerable waste of that training, as most effective training comes of having newly trained recruits go from the classroom to sea as quickly as possible.

PNG noted that their training is all self-funded now and that until recently they had two full-time observer trainers. However their trainers were both recently recruited by SPC and they are now in the position of having to develop two further trainers and so will be requiring more assistance from FFA and SPC at their future trainings.

The Cook Islands noted with thanks the help provided by SPC for training delivered earlier this year. They will need two further observers trained in 2012.

Tonga, the Cook Islands and Samoa noted that small southern members of FFA and SPC had waited patiently while the majority of observer support services had been diverted to assist with the rapid changes required to meet the 100 per cent coverage of purse seiners operating in the waters of their fisheries-rich neighbours. However, it is time that more of that support is re-directed to assisting the smaller countries, particularly as a deadline to meet five per cent coverage of longliners nears.

Vanuatu indicated that they would like upgrade training for the fifteen of their observers that were previously only trained as observer cadets.

Solomon Islands also indicated that they intended to hold a second training this year. Their first will end on the same day as tis ROCW. However, the Solomon Islands also noted their critical shortage of Observer Debriefers and the OSDC urged that they re-think their strategy of having another training so soon, as the training resources that should be committed to full PIRFO basic training are not available.

### ***Training Trainers***

Tonga proposed that if training resources are in short supply then a senior member of Tonga Fisheries could attend training and then return to deliver observer training in Tonga themselves. The OSDC explained that a PIRFO training programme currently exists but due to the already high demand on FFA and SPC observer support staff time for placement and training only a limited number of participants in the programme can be taken on at a time, currently three. The programme is not as straight-forward as sending someone to a training for them to immediately become trainers.

There is still a lack of understanding amongst many of our fisheries administrators of what is entailed in running an effective observer programme. With respect to training, some of today's fisheries decision makers were employed briefly in the early days of the USMLT

Observer Program and may have some idea. However, many of these overlook the fact that training in the early days of that programme was delivered by a corps of specialists and consultants to people from existing government fisheries departments. They thus tended to be more mature with significant fisheries training backgrounds. Today's trainee observer will have considerably more tasks to carry out, appreciably greater responsibility and typically will not have the maturity nor the prior fisheries training had by those USMLT observers. They will come from a wide range of education and socio-economic backgrounds. The trainers currently delivering PIRFO training have been doing so for many years and have constantly been developing the skills required to incorporate the many new tasks expected of observers. More and more they rely on organising expertise to provide complementary training.

In an effort to prepare for passing on training roles from the regional organisations to national or regional training institutions FFA and SPC have been developing PIRFO training standards. These include the standards for basic training and for debriefer development that are currently available on the PIRFO website. The remaining tasks in the project include formalising standards for PIRFO trainers and developing processes for auditing the training. These will be completed in 2011. The PIRFO Trainer development programme will be reviewed at a PIRFO Trainers workshop in Noumea in late July.

#### ***Basic, Refresher, Upgrade***

Observer training courses are often referred to as basic, refresher or upgrade training. PIRFO basic training normally refers to fully training new observer recruits to function effectively as observers on purse seine and longline fishing vessels. They are usually also introduced to pole-and-line vessels. Refresher training is provided to observers that have been around for a few years but need to be updated on current tasks and new forms. It may also be offered to all observers after biennial PIRFO form revisions. Upgrade training is provided to observers that were for one reason or another were not initially provided with a full basic training. In the past there was cadet training that would require future upgrading and there have also been purse seine only or longline only courses that have been delivered in the shorter time-frame available at the time of training, which can lead to further upgrade training. In the future there may also be specialist training, such as for observer transshipment monitoring duties.

#### **FFA overview**

FFA Observer Manager (OM), Tim Park presented an overview of FFA observer activities during the 17<sup>th</sup> USMLT and parallel FSMA licensing period. 474 observer trips were carried out. Thirty-three per cent of placements on US vessels were provided by the Solomon Islands.

No formal correspondence has yet been entered into with respect to the FSMA Observer Programme being transferred to the PNA.

The OM gave a brief outline of the various elements involved in cost recovery for an observer service provider. There are many non-salary expenses to be considered in both the operations and administration of an observer programme. Placements, debriefing, training at

all levels of observer operations all need to be taken into account. The cost-recovery bill for 2011 is over three million US dollars.

<table>

There is a need for more cross-endorsement training for ROP observers on US flagged vessels that may move to fish in the eastern Pacific in the current climate of USMLT uncertainty and relaxing IATTC rules. However, it may just be easier to have observers from both sides on the boat at the same time.

The OM presented details and a graph that demonstrated the significant reduction in the time it takes between receiving and reconciling trips so that observers can be paid earlier. A second graph demonstrated that a significant part of the delay in this process is in the time it takes for data to actually get to FFA so reconciliations can be carried out.

<graphs>

It was noted that delays in finalising TUBSMAN have not been helped by the loss of staff to recent SPC recruitment drives, however work will continue in partnership with SPC.

PNA Observer Agency –  
FSMA programme hasn't delivered full cost recovery – 1<sup>st</sup> year  
2<sup>nd</sup> year –  
3<sup>rd</sup> year –

FAD closure schedule  
FFA observer contracts question from Fiji

### **New Zealand Observer Support Project**

The OM and ODSC gave brief descriptions of the different positions that the NZ observer project will fund, under what organisations (FFA or SPC) they will work, what the physical locations will be and when the new staff members are likely to come online.

### **Observer Administration Issues**

#### ***Standardized Placements***

This topic has been raised at ROCW after ROCW mainly because despite the recognition of the value of placements many observers are reporting that formal placement meetings are not happening, especially when they go to foreign ports.

Various speakers offered advice on why thorough placement procedures should be common practice in well run observer operations: enhanced observer safety; reinforcing the importance of vessel Captain and crew working cooperatively with observers; reducing the chance of Captain and officers being confused about what rights an observer has onboard their vessel are; reminding Captain and crew of what the observers regular duties are and explaining any special tasks the observer might have, fostering an understanding and support for any special needs of such tasks; ensuring the Captain signs off that they understand what the observer is doing onboard the observer may have. It is also a time to ensure the observer

is up to speed with their tasks and for last minute briefings on any special tasks, if necessary, or delivery vessel-specific information to the observer.

Coordinators were reminded that well reviewed standard Placement Meeting Record forms already exist if programmes wish to use them. A copy of these complete with an envelope so that the placement officer can quickly return them to the observer's programme is usually included with every workbook that SPC distributes. Papua New Guinea also has them translated into Chinese.

Programmes not currently carrying out regular placement meetings were urged to do so.

NOAA's legal officer recommended that original placement forms eventually be matched up to the original copies of observer data and that when full sets of observer data are scanned and sent elsewhere that the Record of Placement forms be also copied as part of a full data set. They can be used to help form a case history of a vessel.

### ***Contracts***

There was discussion about what makes an ideal observer contract and the pros and cons of different types of contract used to employ observers around the Pacific. A wide range of contracts are used from single trip by trip to various term contracts that may be based on time or number of completed trips. No firm favourites emerged in the discussion but it was suggested that it may be useful to have various contract templates made available on the PIRFO website.

A question was asked as to whether one contract might take automatic precedence over another contract should an observer be subscribed to two contracts at the same time, as for example an observer operating under a term contract who has been released to work under a one-trip contract arrangement with a sub-regional observer programme. No firm answer could be given as it would depend on the actual contracts involved and what other understandings existed between the programmes involved.

The WCPFC Observer Coordinator (OC), Karl Staisch was asked whether the ROP had a standard observer contract and responded that the ROP relies on the ROP authorised programmes / service providers to deal with contracting observers.

### ***Regional Observer Identification Cards***

The OC noted that flag states have requested that observers be issued with ID cards. There have already been incidents of people falsely claiming to be observers. There is a potential for such activity to cause significant problems. Formal identification cards would reduce this risk.

The OM noted that a project to provide ID for observers is in the pipeline. A design has been produced and fine details are being finalised. All that remains to be done is to obtain observer photographs from their national programmes.

The ODSC also mentioned that early efforts have gone into producing a passport-like PIRFO Certificate that will indicate the qualification/certification that an observer has with endorsements for longline, purse seine, transshipment, etc., observing.

### *Standardised fees*

Discussion about the value of standardising observer fees throughout the region settled on the acceptance that this was not feasible due to the different economic situation of each country. However, there may be some merit to standardising allowances, particularly those related to travelling around the region.

There may also be merit to having a standardised fee structure for debriefing seeing as it is highly likely that many debriefings of PIRFO observers may be carried out by PIRFO Debriefers operating in different PIRFO programmes. Inter-programme agreements that cater for debriefing each others observers may work easier in a standardised debriefing fee environment.

Coordinators were mostly in agreement that observer fees are generally too low to compensate for skill sets and degree of responsibility expected of today's observers. Neither do they compensate for the hardships and deprivations that they so often endure. Coordinators welcome the FFC77 endorsement of providing adequate remuneration for this work and a review of pay rates is strongly recommended.

## APENDIX 1

---

---



---

### **REPORT TO THE 11<sup>TH</sup> ROCW OF SOME OBSERVER PROGRAMME STANDARDS**

---

ROCW11 - WCPFC 1

#### **Sea Safety and safety equipment for observers**

##### **Standard**

The standard for “Sea - Safety” is that all ROP observers must undergo training in sea safety and emergency procedures to international recognized standards, and that such training procedures be made available to the Secretariat

The standard for “Equipment and Materials” is that observers are provided with appropriate equipment, including safety equipment to carry out their roles and tasks on board a vessel.

The standard is generally not up to the requirements on distribution of “Safety equipment” in most programmes but it is realized that currently some safety equipment is given by PS vessels when boarded and therefore some observers do have some safety equipment. However it is not adequate to rely on this happening, as many PS issue nothing to observers when they board. This requirement needs to be rectified particularly with long liner observation commencing.

Some programmes had previously given observers boarding long Liners some extra items such as gum boots as well as other equipment, scoop nets, line cutters, etc. but that apparently is not maintained by all programmes as they have all become unavailable. There is a need that the programme budgets include enough funds to fit out all observers with quality safety equipment and that this is properly monitored and maintained by the observers and its distribution is closely administered by a member of the observer programme staff. Observers should also take responsibility of the items issued to them and be expected to compensate the programme for equipment lost or left behind on vessels or during travel.

***Equipment that should be supplied to observers;***



**Priority,**

*Ensure there is a spare life jacket available on board and that will fit the observer, if not must be supplied before observer embarks*

**Essential**

*Non Slip Work boots/shoes for on deck work*

*Wet weather gear particularly for temperate waters*

*Personal Hard Hats -correct size (purse seine and pole and line work)*

*Appropriate Sun glasses/protective glasses*

**Safety Items if possible to supply**

*Personal EPIRBs*

*Small Medical kit*

**Other Considerations**

*Satellite phones*

---

**Vessel Safety Checks (VSC)**

The minimum standard for a Vessel Safety Checklist (VSC) will be that a CCM should have a VSC in place, and to be used prior to an observer boarding a vessel; and if not in place, CCMs may use, as a guideline, the VSC developed by the Commission.

Following discussion with various Coordinators, most have agreed that there is a need for a VSC to be completed before the vessel leaves port. The Commission has designed a VSC as a guide. When it is in place as a standard part of the placement of observers, a copy of the VSC should be retained and attached to an observer report possibly a briefing or debriefing reports.

FFA has developed an observer placement report which is in use, and with some slight modifications this could encompass the required fields on safety and be used as a VSC. More work on this will be carried out through the DCC process.

---

**Communications**

**Standard**

The standard for "Communications" is that observers have access to appropriate communication facilities, including emergency communication facilities while on board a vessel."

Regular communications are useful for many purposes including safety and health determinations. Most programmes have no regular voice communications (sometimes a SAT phone is used and a couple of programmes do have radio communications set up) – however only a regular (weekly) Email or fax is sent to most programmes by the observers.

Radio communications is included in the SPC/FFA training but it isn't clear in some of the training conducted whether a Restricted Radio Operators Certificate is issued during this

training or if any radio communications work is carried out. It is noted that many long liners do not have any facilities other than HF/VHF Radio and all observers need to be refreshed with radio communication protocols from time to time.

It was felt that currently with the emphasis on 100% Purse seine coverage, with most having Satellite phones and Emails available that this was currently sufficient. However this may not assist the observer when there is a requirement to contact someone if there is no Sat phone or email system in place, this will occur on many long liners.

Personnel electronic communication devices that can independently be used to communicate through satellite system are available but are still reasonably costly to purchase (US\$1500)

---

## **Insurance**

### **Standard**

The Interim Standard for Insurance of Observers for ROP duties is that CCMs will use existing national standards for health and safety insurance. CCM providers of observers will make sure an observer placed on a vessel for ROP duties, has health and safety insurance.

Many programmes do not have comprehensive insurance of their observers, There is also no real checks made to ensure the vessel insures the observers, as most observers are used by purse seiners it is probably ok, as most purse seiners if not all do cover their crew with insurance and they usually include the observer as a crewman to ensure coverage when they are on board.

There is no insurance when many observers are on shore or travelling, although one coordinator believed that the vessel crew coverage may also include travel cover. In a few programmes government employed observers are covered by Government insurance but observers contracted are not.

Programmes may specifically, expose themselves to various unforeseen liabilities and must make specific efforts to ensure observers are covered by comprehensive insurance.

---

## **Health or medical certificate**

Many programmes did not have any plan for medical certification of their observers, most said that they require that observers must have a medical clearance to be an observer, but this was not followed up with any rechecks during the observer's career. There were various responses with some programmes requiring a certificate at least every couple of years to programmes who only require it when first employed and nothing after. One programme required a medical clearance to do more trips only if the observer became ill.

There is no real WCPFC standard on a time frame but think that FFA/SPC could insist all participants of a course be medically cleared before a course commences. This may save training someone who is medically unfit. Then national and sub regional programmes should adopt a regular medical check-up regime after the first medical clearance.

## **CMM adherence**

### **Standard**

**The providers are to ensure that all observers fully understand the content of the CMMs especially in relation to their roles and tasks in monitoring the CMMs**

A system to ensure the programme and observers are continually updated on the requirements of the CMMs was not evident in most programmes, however much of the information distributed relies on emails circulars from WCPFC and other bodies such as FFA/SPC and PNA and then are supposedly passed onto the observers.

The ability to ensure observers can be trained in the monitoring of new tasks and the roles brought about by the monitoring provisions of the CMMs is part of observer training. New observers should go through this process. If required, previously trained observers should attend refresher courses or special sessions to cover the requirements of the CMMs.

It was mentioned that a problem some coordinators said they had on learning what has been changed or is new not only for CMMs but for other observer requirements and issues dealt with by FFA/SPC and PNA, is due to the lack of feedback from senior staff on some of the issues after they attended relevant meetings.

- *There is an ongoing problem with most of the Pacific Island observer programmes. The Commission Secretariat, after the mandatory time period, does make available to all members the summary report containing new CMMs or changes to CMMs which are on the Commission website. They also send out circulars on these CMMs, but as reported, these hardly ever get to the Coordinator level. Therefore the ROP Secretariat intends to develop and put out a yearly ROP document as a guide to send to Observer Coordinators and others involved in placing observers to try and cover the relevant observer sections of the CMMs. These could be attached to workbooks or manuals printed.*

## *APENDIX 2*

---

### 1. FFC Recommendations to ROCWS

The Committee endorsed that the FFA Secretariat:

- i. Adopt the proposed training schedule for observers, debriefers and national trainers;
- ii. Continue development and auditing accreditation standards for debriefers and trainers;
- iii. Continue to provide full cost recovery placements for the UST observer programme;
- iv. Continue to develop the full cost recovery concept for the FSMA observer programme;
- v. Establish formal communication protocols with Home Parties where national arrangements with certain vessels exist;
- vi. Recover outstanding costs for FSMA vessels from the 16DP and 17DP;
- vii. Note the initiation of the NZ Aid Observer programme project to develop observer infrastructure and capacity across the Membership;
- viii. Note the need to develop realistic observer programme transition processes to meet the aspirations of PNA parties; and
- ix. Initiate an MCS data sharing arrangement, to include observer reports, consistent with the agreed recommendations from MCSWG14.

APENDIX 3

**Addendum to Country Reports for Observer Programmes**

<b>Country</b> _____													
<b>Observer Programme (Name)</b> _____													
Coordinators ( Name) - _____													
Email - _____													
Phone - _____ Mobile _____													
Do you perform other roles (apart from coordinator); if so, what other roles? Do you perform other roles, if so, what role/s?													
<b>Programme Type</b>  Government  Private Provider  Both	<table style="width:100%; border:none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align:right;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align:center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align:left;">No</td> <td style="text-align:center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align:right;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align:center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align:left;">No</td> <td style="text-align:center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align:right;">Yes</td> <td style="text-align:center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align:left;">No</td> <td style="text-align:center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>										
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>										
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>										
<b>Observer available for vessel boarding's</b>  Cadets _____ Fully Trained _____  No of active observers -                      None Active													
<b>Observer boarding's - (yr_)</b>  National _____	<b>Vessels Boarded (yr)</b>  Purse Seine _____  Long Line _____												

Sub Regional _____  <b>Other (Reciprocal Arrangements)</b> _____	Other Gear Type _____
<b>Training standards used</b>  PIRFO <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> Own <input type="checkbox"/>	Number new observers _____  Number of Certified National Trainers _____  Number of Authorized National Debriefers _____  do you have trainer trainees in place?  How man trainers you need for yr programme trained up?
<b>Percentage of observers from your programme debriefed after trip</b>  National _____ Sub Regional _____  Debrief other programme observers? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> How many _____  Have you identified potential debriefers to get proper training? How many?	
Did you assist with placements from other programmes Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>  <b>Assisted with placements (19xx to 2010)</b>  Sub Regional Placements Number _____ Other _____  Other Programmes bilateral placements. Number _____  Should FFA trips be using the regional standard trip numbering system?	
Observer Discrepancies that required disciplinary action. Name: 1. 2.	

Observer Discrepancies that required disciplinary action. (continued)

- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Result of disciplinary action

Do you have code of conduct in you programme, if so, provide a copy to all  
Do you have port samplers;

Number of port samplers;

Regional samplers \_

number of vessels sampled (yr range)

- LL\_

-PS -

NMFS samplers:

Number of vessels sampled (yr ranges)

PS

Other issues of priority needed to be resolved in your programme.?

---

**APENDIX 4**

## 1. MARCH 2011 WORKSHOP

### Context

The PIRFO Debriefing Workshop held at SPC headquarters in Nouméa, New Caledonia from 28<sup>th</sup> February -18<sup>th</sup> March 2011 was a follow up to the Debriefing Workshop held in Cairns, Australia from 15<sup>th</sup> –21<sup>st</sup> July, 2010.

The Nouméa workshop had three objectives – firstly to review the regional observer programs with particular focus on the debriefing component; secondly to develop a debriefing training and assessment strategy and certify at least one experienced Debriefier from eight of the countries attending; and thirdly to develop regionally coordinated national debriefing implementation strategies so as to continue to certify Debriefiers.

The first two weeks concentrated on the debriefing program regionally; how debriefers could be certified; presentations by SPC Offshore Fisheries Program scientists and technicians; and the embryo of the Debriefier Training and Assessment strategy.

The first week also coincided with the SPC Heads of Fisheries meeting and workshop attendees were invited to attend a number of social events held during the week, attended a session of the Heads of Fisheries forum and could mingle with regional attendees at joint tea and lunch breaks.

The third week concentrated on finalising the PIRFO Training and Assessment strategy and the accompanying PIRFO Debriefier Assessment Record; undertaking simulated debriefings for those Debriefiers present who were seeking to be certified; developing a regionally coordinated set of PIRFO National Debriefier Implementation Strategies; and certifying ten participants as PIRFO Debriefiers.

The workshop was attended by experienced Debriefiers from the region, a number of observer program managers and coordinators, PIRFO trainers, SPC Observer program staff and the consultant. Three Debriefiers from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Observer Program based in Hawaii attended the first two weeks and representatives from Vanuatu, Tonga, Tuvalu and Western Samoa attended in the last week for the implementation strategy component of the workshop.

A list of all attendees is presented in Appendix 2 and an indicative workshop timetable is outlined in Appendix 3.

### Week 1

#### Day 1

The workshop was opened by the facilitator, Peter Sharples, from the SPC OFP Observer section, followed by introductions and an overview of workshop goals.

There was discussion on the value of pre-debriefing and debriefing and the debriefing policy in general. There was concern raised regarding the extra requirements on Debriefiers and a view that there was a need for future workshops on interviewing techniques and the skills that are expected of debriefers.

The PNG Observer program representatives presented an overview on the PNG program and how it functioned. PNG Debriefiers get together on a regular basis to exchange ideas and to attempt to standardize the debriefing process to lessen inconsistency. The Palau representative commented that it was important that experienced Debriefiers identified Observers who had the potential to make good Debriefiers.

**Comment [pbs1]:** Sounds a bit clumsy I know but have stuck with this terminology in the belief that one of the funds that I hope we can target to further these plans prefers that the money goes to national rather than regional capacity building



There was initial discussion on training options for Debriefers and the Consultant outlined some options to consider, including on the job training and workshops. It was unanimously agreed that on the job training was very important, which was followed by discussion on when best to program attendance courses or workshops – at the beginning, in the middle or at the end of the training process or a combination of all.

Joe Arceneaux from the NMFS Pacific Islands Region Observer Program gave a presentation on the US program and the debriefing process in particular. He invited discussion on the merit of random general knowledge questions to determine an Observer's competence, how long should a debrief take and questioning techniques.

The day concluded with a general discussion on debriefing steps, preparations prior to debriefing such as the tools and venue, and when does pre-debriefing end and the next step begin.

#### *Day 2*

There was a session on the competencies (or standards), how they fitted into various levels of certification, the relevance of the standards and the need to review the current ones and develop new ones.

The consultant said that in his view the format of the standards could be more contemporary and user friendly and would present a revised format at a later date for participant's views and input.

Following sessions focused on group discussion on issues that commonly occurred, experiences of individual countries, further discussion on pre-debriefing and in particular a pre-debriefing checklist. PNG presented a pre-debrief checklist their Debriefers used, which would become an important tool later in the workshop when the observation checklist for assessing Trainee Debriefers was being developed for the PIRFO Debrief Assessment Record.

The day concluded with a session facilitated by Joe Arceneaux on training methodology. Good teaching strategies and active listening approaches were presented and discussed.

#### *Day 3*

Marc Young, Director of Fisheries Operations at the Forum Fisheries Agency gave a very good presentation on the role of his division in monitoring and surveillance work in the region and stressed the important role observers played in assisting that role.

He generated robust and good discussion on priorities in pre-debriefing and what constituted critical incidents. He prioritized incidents into 1) time critical; 2) act on but time to do so; and 3) report through normal channels.

He also separated incidents by observer/crew issues; fisheries operations issues; and fisheries reporting/documentation issues. His session highlighted the synergies between his division's role and the role of observers and gave an important insight into the importance of the observer program.

The next session the group went through the evaluation forms and discussed the need for pre-debriefing guidelines. The final session included presentations by Joe Arceneaux on species identification and sample and measurement validation.

#### *Day 4*

A number of SPC scientists from the Oceanic Fisheries Program presented during the morning sessions. These included:

- Dr Simon Nicol, who outlined the role of his unit in biological sampling, the importance of sampling in stock assessment, and his view that biological sampling information was an important part of debriefing;
- Shelley Clarke, who discussed her program, which focused on shark assessment, the general lack of data because of zero reporting of commercial activities and the different national policies on whale sets in the tuna fishery;
- Jesus Jurato Molina, who emphasized the importance of accurate data collection by observers and how that data was used by the scientists
- Simon Hoyle provided an insight into how data collected by observers is used for stock assessment and that inaccurate data could seriously distort results of that assessment; and
- Dr Tim Lawson gave a presentation on grab and spill samples and said there was a move to spill sampling because research had shown it produced more accurate data than grab samples.

The presentations reinforced to workshop attendees the critical role that the observer program played in scientific research and the importance that the data be accurate.

Attendees were free to attend the Heads of Fisheries sessions in the afternoon session so as to get an insight into the workings of the regional fisheries and how they operated.

#### *Day 5*

Joe Arceneaux gave a presentation on the longline observer forms and facilitated discussion on filling out those forms and common errors that were made by observers.

The middle sessions were devoted to structures for PIRFO Debriefing training and assessment and built on the initial discussions on Day 1. There was agreement that an on the job training component was essential and the consultant presented for discussion a number of options for an overall strategy.

These included options on timing and scope of support workshops, how much time should be spent doing on the job training and the need for an "activity book" to document each Trainee Debriefing's progress. There was good discussion on the options and it was agreed that the consultant would prepare a more formal outline of both the Debriefing Training and Assessment strategy and a first draft "Activity" book.

The week concluded with a very entertaining and informative presentation by the PNG team, led by Manoi Kutan, on the Debriefing Workshop held in Port Moresby in October, 2010.

### **Week 2**

#### *Days 1 & 2*

Both days were spent on an overview of the evaluation forms; the Debriefing policy (which hadn't been widely read by participants); examples of poorly reported incidents resulting in unsuccessful prosecutions; different approaches to checking data; tricks of the trade as Debriefers; the skills that a Debriefing needed and how this could be incorporated into training programs; and pre-debriefing and debriefing.

These discussions laid the foundation for the training and assessment strategy that was being developed as a key task at the workshop and informed the skills and issues that needed to be part of the training.

Graham Pilling from the SPC Oceanic Fisheries Program gave a presentation on the Pacific Nauru Agreement (PNA) Vessel Day Scheme that had been introduced as a

management measure for the tuna fishery. He outlined issues such as what constituted a fishing day and the Conservation Management Measures that had to be adhered to by vessels fishing in the region. He said that data provided by observers gave key information of the impact of fishing activities on the ecosystem and stressed the need for the return of all catch on the high seas.

The three PNG Debriefers undertook Debriefing role playing exercises, with one acting as an observer, another as a Trainee Debriefers and the third as an experienced Debriefers. This was an introduction to the simulated debriefings that would be part of the RPL assessment of experienced Debriefers during the latter stages of the workshop.

#### *Days 3-5*

The last three days of week 2 concentrated on the development of the training and assessment strategy, the structure of the activity book and ongoing debriefing role playing.

There was now general agreement that the process to certify new Debriefers would be an introductory workshop, followed by documented on the job experience and assessment and a final workshop with a written assessment.

The consultant facilitated a number of sessions where valuable input was provided by workshop participants on the content of the PIRFO Activity Record Book, the working title currently used. In particular the observation checklist that Assessor Debriefers would sign off on in the workplace was developed and prioritized.

Participants were separated into groups to continue debriefer role playing in preparation for assessment in week 3 and to allow more experienced Debriefers to work with others that had less experience.

### **Week 3**

The final week saw the validation by the workshop participants of both the PIRFO Debriefers Training and Assessment Strategy and the PIRFO Debriefers Assessment Record, as general consensus decided the "activity book" should be called. The Assessment Record was sent to the SPC Publishing section for the design and printing of draft booklets and was finished on the last day of the workshop. It is presented in Appendix 4 in its pre-published format.

A regionally coordinated national debriefing implementation strategy was also developed, calling on local information from individual country representatives about current program status and targets that have been set. This information was married with known data on program resources and the PIRFO Debriefing Policy Debriefers/Observer ratio to formulate the strategy.

The Debriefers Training and Assessment Strategy and the Regional Observer Program Implementation Strategy developed during the workshop are outlined in greater detail in the following two sections.

Debriefing Assessment was conducted during the last three days of the workshop, with participants alternating as Observers, Debriefers and Assessors. Ten participants were successful in gaining certification and are the inaugural fully certified PIRFO Debriefers.

In conclusion the March 2011 workshop was agreed by all to have been a successful event and had generally met the ambitious objectives set. The challenge for the region will be to deliver on the outcomes of the workshop.

Debriefers Trainees:

Cook Islands-1, Andrew Jones  
 Fed. States of Micronesia-1, Steve Peters (also SPC's Manasseh Avicks)  
 Fiji-1, Apenisa Sauturaga  
 Kiribati-1, Benaia Bauro  
 Nauru-2; Peter Dema, Ace Capelle  
 Palau-1, Ian Tervet  
 Papua New Guinea-4; Adrian Nanguromo, Lucas Tarapik, Manoi Kutan, Philip Lens  
 Rep. of Marshall Islands-1, Jagob Kezu  
 Solomon Islands-2; John Still Vili, Fred Austin

Workshop Staff:  
 SPC; Sifa Fukofuka, Peter Sharples  
 NMFS-PIROP; Michael Marsik, Jamie Marchetti, Joe Arceneaux  
 Contractor: Grant Carnie; developing competency based training standards

## APENDIX 5

---

### Western-Central Pacific Regional Observer Training for 2012

<b>Months</b>	<b>Training Type</b>	<b>Host:</b>	<b>Sponsor:</b>
Feb/Mar	Basic	FSM	RMI
Mar/Apr	National	PNG	PW,NA
Apr/May	Sub-regional	FJ	TG,TV,SA
May/Jun	Basic	SB	SB
Jun/Jul	Standard	VU	NI, TK, NA,PW
Sep/Oct	Standard	RMI	RMI
Sep/Oct	National	PNG	TV
Oct/Sep	Standard	KI	KI
Oct/Nov	Sub-regional	VU	FJ,CK,NA

CK=Cook Is.  
 FJ=Fiji  
 FSM=Fed. States of Micronesia  
 KI=Kiribati  
 NA=Nauru  
 NI=Niue  
 PNG=Papua New Guinea

PW=Palau  
RMI=Rep of Marshall Is.  
SA=Samoa  
SB=Solomon Is.  
TG=Tonga  
TK=Tokelau  
TV=Tuvalu  
VU=Vanuatu

## APENDIX 6

---

### Western-Central Pacific Regional Observer Training for 2011

1. Sub-regional LL course for Cook Islands, Samoa and Cook Islands Jan/Feb
2. Sub-regional basic training (FSM/Palau) February/March
3. PNG basic training (with sponsored participants from Tuvalu) March / April
4. Sub-regional basic training (Tonga/Cook Is./Samoa/Fiji) April /May
5. Solomon Islands basic training May / June
6. Sub-regional basic training (Vanuatu/Niue/Tokelau/Tuvalu) June/July \*\*
7. PNG basic training (with sponsored participants from Palau ) June/July
8. Kiribati upgrade training September
9. PNG basic training (with sponsored participants from Palau) September/October
10. Marshall Islands basic training October/November
11. Sub-regional basic training (Fiji/Vanuatu/Tuvalu/Nauru) November/December
12. PNG basic training November / December

\*\* not carried out.