

PIRFO Debrief Certification

Audit Report October 2013

Prepared for: Forum Fisheries Agency, EU Devfish Project and
Secretariat of the Pacific Community



By:
Grant Carnie
Carnie Consultants
7B Morrison Street
North Perth WA 6006
Australia
P +61 (0) 8 93286663
M +61 (0) 408 802461
E grantcarnie@gmail.com

Table of Contents

Acronyms	2
1. Background	3
2. Debriefer certification	5
Development of the process	5
PIRFO Debriefer Certification Training Programme	5
3. Audit findings	7
Methodology	7
Prerequisites	8
Introduction to Debriefing, RPL workshops	9
On the job training and assessment	10
Final debriefing workshop	13
Certification.....	14
Audit summary	15
4. Recommendations	16
Recommendation 1 – Prerequisites	16
Recommendation 2 – Introduction to debriefing workshop	16
Recommendation 3 - On the job training and assessment	16
Recommendation 4 - Final debriefing workshop	17
Recommendation 5 - Certification	17
Appendices.....	18
Appendix 1 – Individual Trainee audit reports.....	18
Appendix 2 – Status of PIRFO Debriefer Certification process proforma.....	46

Acronyms

AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
CBT	Competency Based Training
CMC	(PIRFO) Certification Management Committee
CMM	Conservation Management Measure
DAR	Debriefer Assessment Record
EU	European Union
FFA	Forum Fisheries Agency
FFC	Forum Fisheries Council
FSM	Federated States of Micronesia
MSC	Marine Stewardship Council
NFC	National Fisheries College (of PNG)
NZAID	New Zealand Agency for International Development
OFP	Offshore Fisheries Programme (of SPC)
PIRFO	Pacific Island Regional Fisheries Observer
PNG	Papua New Guinea
RPL	Recognition of Prior Learning
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
WCPFC	Western & Central Pacific Commission
WCPO	Western & Central Pacific Ocean

1. Background

The Western & Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) tuna fishery has grown to be the largest source of tuna in the world for the canned fish market in particular and also provides significant quantities of fish to the premium fresh and frozen tuna markets globally. The 2012 catch was a new record for the region with provisional reports suggesting around 2.2 million tonnes of tuna was landed with an estimated value in excess of US\$6 billion.

The importance of the fishery as a major source of tuna supply globally, but more significantly as the principal source of revenue for many of the island nations in the Pacific region has emphasized the need to actively and prudently manage the fishery to ensure its longer term sustainability. A crucial feature of that management process is the need for a competent, credible observer programme so that scientific data is available to make informed management decisions and on the spot monitoring takes place to assist in the prevention of IUU fishing.

Observers have been placed on vessels fishing in the WCPO fishery over a long period of time, either managed by individual countries or by the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA). These observers have generally been trained by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and FFA with financial support provided by a mix of funding from a range of donors, including NZAID, AusAID, the European Union (EU) and Japan. In recent years the Papua New Guinea (PNG) National Fisheries College (NFC) based in Kavieng, PNG has also provided training for observers working in PNG's national observer programme.

Training has evolved over time to meet the needs of fisheries managers and scientists overseeing the fishery and to ensure that observer programmes were meeting expectations of all stakeholders. However there were no formal regional protocols and standards for observers so a project to develop a regional wide approach to observer programme benchmarks was initiated. This led to the endorsement at the 67th Forum Fisheries Council (FFC) meeting in May 2008 of the newly developed Pacific Island Regional Fisheries Observer (PIRFO) Certification and Training Standards for PIRFO Observers and Debriefers working for the Pacific Island members of FFA and SPC. The standards included a PIRFO Certification and Training Policy Manual and these standards and the accompanying training policy manual consolidate observer programmes by providing a framework for expected observer competence throughout the WCPO fisheries.

These standards also provide guidance for trainers when developing and delivering training courses. The development and upgrading of those standards and protocols is a fluid process and they are constantly reviewed and adjusted, as circumstances require. An example is the recent addition of a chain of custody standard to meet the need for observers to monitor fish destined for sale as Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certified fish.

The extensive regional training programme delivered by SPC and FFA underpins the success of the observer programme but critical to the proficiency of individual observers is the need for ongoing review, assessment and feedback of their performance to ensure consistently high standards. This is carried out by debriefers, who are experienced observers and are expected to work one on one with observers at the end of a trip to analyse trip reports, get a feel of what might have occurred during the trip that wasn't perhaps reported and identify critical incidences.

While the PIRFO Certification and Training Standards for Observers and Debriefers outlines debriefer standards and protocols there hasn't previously been formal, uniform training of debriefers as there was for observers, with individual countries providing ad hoc training and processes and debriefers relying on their own experiences and judgements to undertake debriefings. There was clearly a need to develop a training programme for debriefers to ensure debriefing met acceptable, uniform standards throughout the region.

A regional debriefing policy called the Western and Central Pacific Island Observer Programmes Regional Observer Debriefing Policy was first developed and presented at the 6th PIRFO Coordinators' Workshop held in Honiara in January 2006 and provided a framework for debriefing activities. However since 2006 there have been major changes in observer activity in the region not least of which have been the adoption of the Western & Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) CMM 2008-01 prescribing 100% observer coverage of purse seine vessels and 5% coverage of longline vessels.

Addressing the immediate demand for a five plus fold increase number of trained observers had fully occupied PIRFO programme support staff since the inception of CMM 2008-01 at the expense of development of the debriefing processes that should accompany that increase. In particular the debriefing policy recommends an eventual goal of one debriefer for every five active observers, with programmes endeavouring to ensure their programmes do not drop below a ratio of one debriefer to ten observers. Clearly most, if not all programmes failed to meet these requirements with worst-case scenarios of one debriefer for more than one hundred observers.

The policy also states only PIRFO certified debriefers trained to minimum regional certification standards as outlined in the PIRFO Certification and Training Standards for Observers and Debriefers can carry out debriefing. To meet this policy guideline would require the development of an appropriate training course to train selected experienced observers as PIRFO certified debriefers. Given the dearth of debriefers across the region and the need to quickly develop a cadre of certified debriefers this was considered a priority and in 2011 a consultant was engaged to facilitate this development process. A meeting of PIRFO trainers and experienced debriefers was held at SPC headquarters in Noumea, New Caledonia in March, 2011 to progress this process and collectively design a relevant, user friendly PIRFO Debiefer certification training programme.

2. Debriefer certification

Development of the process

The workshop held in Noumea in March 2011 was attended by SPC and FFA PIRFO Coordinators and Trainers, senior Coordinators from some country observer programmes, experienced Observer/Debriefers from the region who assist in PIRFO training and the consultant engaged to facilitate a training process. The collective expertise and longstanding experience of this group was critical if a workable, creditable process to certify Debriefers that met the debriefing standards and policy guidelines was to be developed.

The first decision reached at the workshop was that the best way to train Debriefers was primarily through on the job practical experience with mentoring provided by experienced Debriefers. This practical experience or competency based training (CBT) would be supplemented by short workshops or courses to provide underpinning knowledge and to undertake final assessment prior to certification. A prerequisite process was agreed on to ensure that only experienced, competent observers were accepted into the programme and an activity/log book, to be called a Debriefer Assessment Record (DAR), would be developed to accurately track each individual Debriefer Trainee's progress.

A training programme was eventually agreed on and is outlined in the Debriefer Assessment Record as a three-part process. The complete process, as well as the required prerequisites, can be viewed by accessing a DAR but a précis of that process is outlined below.

PIRFO Debriefer Certification Training Programme

PREREQUISITES

To qualify for entry into the debriefer training programme an applicant must first have served as a certified PIRFO Observer:

- in one or more of the gear types (purse seine, long line, pole & line) used in the WCPO fishery for the number of days specified according to vessel/gear type (eg. 150 days on a purse seine vessel);
- undertaken a minimum number of observer trips from which near perfect data (under current PIRFO guidelines) has been completed and verified;
- provide a written recommendation from an Observer Coordinator or an Observer Manager substantiating the applicant's character and confirming likely continuance with observer-related work; and
- provide at least one other referee who will confirm that the applicant is of good character and has good communication skills and motivation.

PART A – INTRODUCTION TO DEBRIEFING WORKSHOP

Successful applicants to the PIRFO Debriefer Certification programme must first satisfactorily complete an Introduction to debriefing workshop, which provides an overview of the PIRFO Debriefing Certification process and the skills required to be a debriefer.

PART B – ON THE JOB EXPERIENCE

On successful completion of the Introduction to Debriefing workshop the candidate will be issued with a Debriefing Assessment Record (DAR) booklet and will return to their workplace to undertake on the job training for a minimum of three months under the guidance and supervision of a certified PIRFO Debriefing. The candidate must:

- observe a minimum of two (2) full debriefings conducted by a certified PIRFO Debriefing (ideally different debriefings);
- conduct a minimum of three (3) full debriefings supervised by a certified PIRFO Debriefing;
- undertake an assessment and complete all the tasks contained in the observation checklist in the PIRFO Debriefing Assessment Record and have them verified and signed as competency achieved (CA) by a certified PIRFO Debriefing;
- complete the three written questions in the PIRFO Debriefing Assessment Record; and
- return the completed PIRFO Debriefing Assessment Record to the SPC/FFA PIRFO program section for verification.

PART C – FINAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP

On notification of verification of successful completion of Parts A & B in the PIRFO Debriefing Assessment Record a Trainee Debriefing will attend a Final Assessment Workshop. The workshop will include:

- revision of the skills learnt in the Introduction to Debriefing workshop and group discussion on the lessons learnt during the on the job training component; and
- a written knowledge test with a re-sit allowed at the discretion of the final workshop facilitator if the candidate doesn't achieve the required 80% pass mark.

FINAL CERTIFICATION

On successful completion of PARTS A, B and C the candidate will be issued a Certificate of Competency as a PIRFO Debriefing certifying that the holder is able to conduct debriefings of observers under the PIRFO framework in the gear type specified.

Under circumstances where observers with some debriefing experience are undertaking a PIRFO approved Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) process, PARTS A, B and C may be combined as a single RPL workshop. As part of RPL process the candidate must complete a simulated debriefing at the workshop under the observation of an experienced Debriefing and/or Trainer and be signed off as competent by that person if they successfully complete the skills in the observation checklist used as evidence in PART B. The candidate must also complete the written knowledge test and obtain a pass mark of 80%.

3. Audit findings

Methodology

Given that the debriefer certification process was a new initiative it was agreed that it needed to be audited to ensure that it met the expected outcomes and an analysis undertaken to identify areas for improvement.

As part of that auditing/analysis process the consultant/auditor attended the first Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) workshop held at the PNG National Fisheries College, Kavieng, New Ireland, PNG in August 2011; the Introduction to Debriefing workshop held in Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) in October 2011; and the second RPL workshop also held at NFC in Kavieng in November/December 2011.

While it was difficult logistically to audit first hand the on the job training and assessment each Trainee Debriefing Auditor would undergo the auditor was able to observe the process while on another assignment in Tuvalu, where the Tuvaluan Trainee Debriefing Auditor Onasai Takataka was being mentored and assessed by PNG Debriefing Auditor/Assessor Richard Aisi. Though not perfect it did allow the auditor to make some in the field assessment of the all important on the job practical training and assessment.

The major part of the audit was conducted in October 2013 to coincide with the initial Final Debriefing workshop held at FFA, Honiara, Solomon Islands. This workshop was the culmination of the certification process for the first group of Trainee Debriefers who had commenced in 2011 and 2012. They had supposedly completed all the processes required leading to the final workshop and would now undertake feedback sessions, verification of the on the job components and an underpinning knowledge assessment leading to certification if successful.

The methodology used to audit the overall process while in Honiara included:

- attending and observing the final debriefing workshop;
- obtaining feedback from SPC and FFA PIRFO coordinators and trainers and PIRFO Debriefing Auditor/Assessors about their observations/analysis of the process to date;
- critical analysis of the Debriefing Auditor Assessment Record of each participant to determine whether due process had been followed;
- completing an audit table for each participant outlining the status of each activity from the DAR, comments regarding each activity and general comments and recommendations relating to the evaluation of each individual's progress and legitimacy of process;
- a post workshop feedback session with PIRFO personnel regarding issues, observations, process and suggested changes; and
- evaluating each stage of the audited process against the designed debriefing certification process.

Prerequisites

The first issue identified has been the failure of all Trainee Debriefers to provide the necessary prerequisites before beginning the certification training process. The DARs of the thirteen Trainee Debriefers attending the final debriefing workshop were audited and not one had provided a record of prerequisites as required under the process and outlined under "prerequisites" on page 10 of this report and more fully in the DAR.

The failure to provide the necessary prerequisite information should have resulted in the nominees being refused acceptance into the programme until the necessary prerequisite requirements were met. Unfortunately all nominees began the programme, attended an Introduction to Debriefing workshop, undertook the on the job training and assessment and attended the Honiara final workshop without the all important eligibility requirements being provided and assessed. This undermines the eligibility criteria that determine whether a nominee has the experience, capability and motivation to undertake the training programme and needs to be addressed as a matter of priority for future intakes of Trainee Debriefers. Nominees should not be accepted into the programme nor be funded to attend the Introduction to debriefing workshop as the first stage of the three part CBT programme until all prerequisites have been provided and approved.

While the auditor is of the view that the DAR clearly outlines the prerequisite requirements and the process to provide the necessary evidence, the procedure for accepting nominations could be streamlined. To improve the likelihood of prerequisites being complied with prior to the start of the training programme it is suggested that an application form be developed and sent to Observer Programme coordinators (the nominators) inviting them to nominate potential Trainee Debriefers, complete the form and return it to the SPC PIRFO programme coordinator. The application form should require the nominator to provide the nominee's personal and professional details, complete the prerequisite details and provide the recommendation letter (from a proforma provided).

It is further suggested that it may be more effective for SPC to verify the existence of near perfect data under PIRFO guidelines by each nominated Trainee Debriefers. This option should be explored with the SPC Observer Data Quality Control Officer from the Fisheries Monitoring Section of the Offshore Fisheries Programme (OFP) at SPC to determine whether this is feasible.

Once the application form has been returned, the SPC PIRFO Programme Coordinator (or his nominee) will vet the information and make a judgment on whether the nominee meets the requirements to be accepted into the course. The record of prerequisites section on page 10 of the DAR can then be simplified by listing the prerequisite requirements with a box for ticking as sighted adjacent to each prerequisite and signed by the SPC PIRFO programme coordinator as having provided the necessary eligibility criteria. Once this part

of the process is complete the nominee is then, and only then, formally accepted into the training programme, the nominee and nominator advised and the necessary arrangements made regarding the individual's funding and attendance at the next available Introduction to Debriefing workshop. The DAR should then be presented to the Trainee Debriefers at the commencement of the Introduction to Debriefing workshop and sufficient time allocated to ensure all participants are aware of the process and the responsibilities they have in following due process.

Perhaps of greater concern was an issue that arose at the first Introduction to Debriefing workshop and needs to be addressed as part of the prerequisites. The issue is more fully explored in the report pertaining to that workshop¹ but in essence most if not all Trainee Debriefers who attended had never been debriefed as observers. The assumption when designing the workshop content was that participants had been debriefed regularly as required under PIRFO debriefing guidelines and so the workshop moved forward from that position.

A mechanism to ensure that all nominees have been debriefed during their careers as observers needs to be implemented as part of the prerequisites. That could either be included as a sentence in the recommendation letter guaranteeing debriefing participation or more in depth verification requiring tangible proof of the nominee having been debriefed.

Introduction to Debriefing, RPL workshops

As outlined earlier in this report the auditor attended the first Introduction to Debriefing workshop held in Pohnpei, FSM in October 2011 and the first two RPL workshops for experienced Debriefers held at NFC, Kavieng, PNG in August and November/December 2011 respectively. The August RPL workshop is more fully detailed in a relevant report¹ and the Introduction to Debriefing workshop and the November RPL workshop are covered in another report prepared in December 2011². However in brief the observations/recommendations that resulted from monitoring those workshops were:

- addressing the issue discussed in this report that some (or perhaps many) potential Trainee Debriefers will have had limited or no debriefing exposure;
- including sessions on scenario debriefing/role playing in the Introduction to Debriefing workshop and consider increasing the workshop to two weeks;
- ensuring observer programme coordinators are fully aware of the Trainee Debriefers program structure, understand the selection criteria and prerequisites and provide observers who meet eligibility requirements; and
- developing a monitoring system so that Trainee Debriefers are provided ongoing support, undertake the necessary debriefing under supervision sessions and meet the assessment requirements as laid out in the DAR.

¹ Fisheries Observer, Debriefers & Trainer Development Strategy & Audit Implementation, Report Phase 1 – October 2011

² Fisheries Observer, Debriefers & Trainer Development Strategy & Audit Implementation, Report Phase 1 – December 2011

While the Introduction to Workshop covered by the auditor was disturbing in that participants attended who clearly had little or no exposure to debriefing creating course delivery problems for the trainers, it has been reported that subsequent courses with participants who had previous exposure to debriefing, were more successful. The prerequisite requirements will need to be tightened to ensure all participants have been exposed to debriefing as an observer. Overall the structure of the workshop is satisfactory and simply requires ongoing fine-tuning of the training delivery and ideally more time allotted.

The RPL courses attended by the auditor were generally satisfactory and delivered on the aim to fast track experienced Debriefers towards PIRFO certification. While there were some minor delivery and assessment practices that need to be tightened they were discussed during feedback sessions at the conclusion of each workshop and in the relevant reports. The most important outcome is that a pool of competent Debriefers is evolving, albeit predominately from PNG through the RPL process. This pool of Debriefers was to prove useful in assisting Trainee Debriefers from countries without access to experienced Debriefers through the on the job component of the Debriefing Training programme.

On the job training and assessment

The PIRFO Debriefing Certification Training Programme is a competency-based training and assessment approach, which recognises that on the job training in the workplace is vitally important because the Trainee Debriefing can gain rapid, first-hand experience of real work as a Debriefing under close supervision. The on the job debriefing supervision and assessment is the most critical part of the training programme and it is an imperative that it is conducted with the appropriate rigor and attention to correct procedure so that it prepares a person to be a proficient Debriefing and accurately determines a person's competence.

The audit of the on the job experience (Part B) component of the DARs revealed a disturbing, widespread trend. This critical three part process of Part B combining the on the job debriefing observations, supervised debriefings and the debriefing assessment was only followed correctly in one instance.

This first raised concerns that the instructions in the DAR regarding the process for this component were ambiguous and didn't clearly articulate the steps leading to assessment. However a thorough review of the relevant instructional sections for both the Debriefing/Assessor and the Trainee Debriefing by the auditor and other PIRFO personnel satisfied all that the process was quite clear. While it may be necessary to change the odd word and highlight relevant key words and phrases in the instructions they should have been easy to follow. This was further established where the correct process had been followed according to the prescribed procedure by the PNG Debriefing/Assessor who had assisted the Tuvalu Trainee Debriefing through the on the job experience.

Eight of the thirteen Trainee Debriefers were from one country with one lead Debriefer/Assessor and a discussion with that Debriefer/Assessor confirmed that he hadn't read the instructions and simply presumed he knew the process.

The process as described in the DAR and laid out in the PIRFO Debriefer Certification Training Programme section earlier in this report is that the Trainee Debriefer must:

1. Observe a minimum of two (2) full debriefings conducted by a certified PIRFO Debriefer (ideally different debriefers).
2. Conduct a minimum of three (3) full debriefings supervised by a certified PIRFO Debriefer.
3. Undertake an assessment of a debrief, complete all the tasks contained in the observation checklist in the PIRFO Debriefer Assessment Record and have them verified and signed as competency achieved (CA) by a certified PIRFO Debriefer.

There were a range of procedural mistakes made in the on the job experience component, including:

- using the (practice) debriefings while being supervised as the assessment of a debrief rather than completing the required minimum number of debriefings under supervision and then conducting the assessment once both parties felt the Trainee Debriefer was ready to be assessed;
- assessing the Trainee Debriefer (incorrectly if part of the debriefing under supervision sessions) on a number of occasions, even though any assessment process only requires the one assessment if the person being assessed has been deemed competent in that assessment;
- not completing the required number of debriefings at one or more of the steps;
- anomalies with regards to dates, timing and recording of the various steps with (incorrect) assessments being recorded as occurring before the required number of observation or supervision of debriefings has taken place; and
- in some instances the three step process was completed in a few days, which is counter to instructions that clearly state that the on the job experience must be conducted over a minimum of three months and not withstanding that it is impossible to believe an inexperienced Trainee Debriefer can achieve competence in such a short period of time.

There are a number of suggestions that if undertaken will help ensure that the on the job experience component is correctly followed. While the opinion of the auditor is that the DAR does clearly outline the process it could be reviewed and minor changes in wording or highlighting of words or phrases made to reinforce the process. What is more important is that there will need to be more time allocated to explaining the process to both the Trainee Debriefers and the Debriefer/Assessors and stressing the importance of following correct procedure.

There are also concerns that there may have been a lack of rigor in assessing competence with the observation checklists simply ticked without make a more critical judgment that the person is demonstrating competence in all the tasks listed. This was confirmed when independent reassessments of some of the Trainee Debriefers during the Final Debriefing workshop in Honiara found that not all the candidates met full competence in the judgment of the second Debriefer/Assessor even though they had been deemed competent previously.

While competence can be subjective there was enough evidence to certainly raise concerns about whether all the candidates did meet the level of competence that is expected in the practical debriefing component. There is no suggestion that candidates were being favored because of friendship or professional relationships or that pressure was applied to the assessors though there is always a risk of both those situations occurring. A better matching of trainees to assessors might avoid that risk and perception and thought should be given to using independent assessors for final assessment, though the logistics and cost of that approach might be prohibitive in many instances.

What is more likely to have contributed to the issues of procedural failure and lack of rigor in assessment is the inexperience of the Debriefer/Assessors in assessing. While some of the Debriefer/Assessors attended an assessing workshop held at SPC in Noumea in 2012, there obviously needs to be more attention placed on ensuring that all assessors receive the necessary training to assess competently and according to recognised assessment protocols.

A lot of the on the job experience issues could be overcome by creating a pool of carefully selected Debriefer/Assessors who have demonstrated competence and experience as a Debriefer and who have been judged as exhibiting the qualities to make a good assessor. An assessor training programme with a mentoring type process where new assessors work with experienced assessors would need to be developed and implemented to ensure the Debriefer/Assessors meet the standard required.

A Debriefer/Assessor resource package should also be prepared for dissemination that includes an instruction manual outlining the debriefer certification process and assessment protocols and a separate set of observation checklists for the assessors to use as a guide when they are supervising debriefing and providing feedback to the trainees on their performance prior to assessment.

The most disturbing finding from the audit was that the Kiribati trainee hadn't even completed all the steps of the on the job component (even if incorrectly completed) and had been allowed to attend by that country's Observer Programme Coordinator. This is a waste of people's time and resources, is an unwarranted expense and is particularly disheartening for the trainee who in this instance proved by his strong result in the underpinning knowledge written assessment at the workshop that with support and mentoring from his in-country supervisors has the potential to make a good Debriefer.

Final debriefing workshop

The final debriefing workshop was a wrap up of what had been learned through the programme, in particular focusing on debriefing methodology. Given that this was the first group to undertake the certification training programme there was also important two-way feedback to highlight what had worked and what could be changed. Overall this part of the workshop appeared to be constructive, the facilitators were able to reinforce how a debriefing should be conducted and the feedback provided was useful in informing the structure of the certification training programme going forward.

An important part of the workshop was the written assessment, which assesses the underpinning knowledge of the participants. While the practical application, conducting a debriefing, is the core competency assessed it must be supported by a good level of knowledge of the debriefing process and the PIRFO Observer programme if a person is to be a competent debriefer.

There were some issues that came to light once the written assessment had been conducted. The assessment paper used had been developed for the RPL workshops held in PNG in 2011 and it became clear they focused on the purse seine fishery, which didn't matter at those workshops because all the participants were being certified for that method of fishing. However the two Fijian participants at this workshop had no experience with purse seining but rather worked as observers on long liners. While one of those participants did pass the written assessment, one did not and it was clearly unfair to have some questions that referred exclusively to the purse seine fishery.

There will obviously be other trainees in the future who are seeking certification for the long line fishery and/or pole and line fishery and so either specific written assessments will have to be developed for each fishery or a bank of questions designed for each fishing method that can be substituted into a proforma written assessment to supplement the general debriefing questions.

A suite of questions should be developed and a number of papers designed that have some different questions but overall still cover the underpinning knowledge required. This will then allow trainees at the same workshop to be issued different papers (perhaps two papers) so half the group get one paper and the other half get another paper. This lessens the potential for underhand attempts to copy answers from someone sitting nearby. The difficulty with this approach though is that all papers have to be of similar standard otherwise there is the risk the 80% pass mark is obtainable in one paper but much harder to achieve in another paper. The option if this occurs is a weighted average pass mark if one paper is clearly getting lower marks than the other, though that then places pressure on the facilitator to make that decision.

The other reason a number of papers should be available is to provide a new paper for any candidates who don't meet the pass mark at the first attempt and are undertaking a resit. With a number of papers at the facilitator's disposal the participants can be issued a new paper for any resits, so providing variation.

The PIRFO training team facilitating the workshop had made a last minute decision to add a second written assessment, which were various log sheets with errors or issues for the trainees to identify. While the sentiment is fine and with work a set of very useful log sheets for further assessing trainees could be developed it highlighted the need to "road test" new papers thoroughly before taking them "live". Not one candidate was able to pass this component and it was decided that it wouldn't count in the final results.

Overall the written test used was passed well by eight of the thirteen candidates, particularly given that the pass mark of 80% is higher than would normally be expected with a written paper. The questions should now be reviewed, the purse seine focus remedied and a suite of questions and a number of separate papers prepared for future use. And all the questions should be subjected to vigorous appraisal before they are used.

One point to note from observing the facilitation of the written assessment at the workshop is the absolute requirement for a facilitator to be present in the examination room at all times. There were times when no facilitator was present, albeit for reasonably short periods of time and this undermines the integrity of the process.

Another issue that will need to be addressed going forward is the structure of the concluding part of the certification training programme. Given that in future trainees are more likely to finish at different times and in smaller numbers it might not be feasible to hold a three day final debriefing workshop, given the inherent costs in doing that. A recognised Debriefing/Assessor could facilitate the underpinning knowledge written assessment in country or at a convenient location and a general programme debrief could be conducted at the same time.

Certification

No participant met all the requirements to be certified at the end of the workshop, however some only have to address minor administrative issues such as providing the prerequisites to achieve sign off for certification. Others have to be independently assessed conducting a debriefing to ensure competence and/or resit the written assessment.

There were a small number of participants who have some way to go before they can be deemed as competent and will need to spend more time improving their debriefing skills on the job before they can be reassessed.

A *Status of PIRFO Debriefing Certification process proforma* was developed (Appendix 2) and all Trainee Debriefers were provided a record of their current status towards PIRFO Debriefing certification with instructions on what they needed to complete before they were certified.

One issue that should be addressed, not only for Debriefing certification but also for the integrity of the PIRFO Observer programme certification process in general is to activate and ratify the Certification Management Committee (CMC). This committee is referred to regularly in PIRFO documentation as the

overarching committee guiding, monitoring and endorsing the quality assurance of PIRFO Certification and Training Standards for Observers and Debriefers but as far as the auditor is aware the committee isn't in place at this stage. That should be a priority and while the committee wouldn't necessarily meet on a regular basis it should be activated so that the standards and guiding principles underpinning the PIRFO programme has a recognised body that is responsible for continuous improvement and overseeing certification.

Audit summary

While it was disappointing that no participant left Honiara already certified this reflects more on the lack of provision of prerequisites, the debatable selection of some candidates and poor on the job support and mentoring in other instances rather than on the certification system.

The auditor is of the view that the overall process is sound and the competency based approach is the only way to develop good Debriefers. The process will need to be tightened in areas that have been discussed in the report and some minor changes will be necessary.

Most importantly observer programme managers, coordinators, support staff and prospective Debriefers/Assessors will need to be more fully informed on the overall certification process. In particular the importance of the on the job experience and assessment component and the need for strong support and mentoring during that process must be stressed and country programmes must be encouraged to select suitable participants who are likely to be successful.

In summary the following observations were made and issues identified either through discussion with those involved as participants or facilitators or through the audit process.

- Prerequisites not met and/or provided
- Lack of experience as observers in the debriefing process from some participants
- A better application process should be implemented to ensure prerequisites are met prior to acceptance into the programme
- Poor selection of participants in some instances
- Near perfect participant data could be better accessed directly from SPC data bases
- Due process in the on the job experience (Part B) component not generally followed correctly
- A lack of rigor in assessment with candidates signed off without appearing to fully demonstrate competence
- Debriefers/Assessors not experienced in assessment methods and protocols
- A pool of suitable Debriefers/Assessors established, making sure they are cognizant of the process and developing their assessing skills through training
- A greater suite of good underpinning knowledge questions needs to be developed and papers specific to particular fishing methods available

- Participants attending workshops even though all or some requirements of Parts A & B hadn't been completed

A number of recommendations that flow from observations, feedback and the audit process are provided to address issues that have arisen during the pilot programme and will strengthen the PIRFO Debriefing certification process.

4. Recommendations

Recommendation 1 – Prerequisites

- 1.1 An application process developed that is disseminated to Country Observer programme management inviting them to nominate potential Trainee Debriefing/s, complete the application form and return it to the SPC PIRFO programme coordinator. The application form should require the nominator to provide the nominee's personal and professional details; complete the prerequisite details as outlined in the DAR; and provide the recommendation letter (from a proforma provided). The application kit should also include a brief overview of how the certification programme works and the responsibilities of all involved.
- 1.2 Proof provided that the potential Trainee Debriefing has been debriefed on a number of occasions as an observer (to be determined by PIRFO personnel) and so is familiar with a debriefing process.
- 1.3 The option to access near perfect data for each nominee directly from the Observer Data Quality Control Officer, Fisheries Monitoring Section, Offshore Fisheries Programme (OFP) at SPC is investigated.
- 1.4 A clear policy guideline is included that a nominee is not accepted into the PIRFO Debriefing Certification programme until the prerequisites and the application form has been completed to the satisfaction of the SPC Observer Programme Coordinator.

Recommendation 2 – Introduction to debriefing workshop

- 2.1 The length of the Introduction to debriefing workshop be extended to two weeks, include sessions on scenario debriefing/role playing and ensure that no one attends the workshop until the criteria outlined in 1.2 and 1.4 in Recommendation 1 have been met.

Recommendation 3 - On the job training and assessment

- 3.1 A pool of Debriefing/Assessors established who have experience and demonstrated skill as a Debriefing and who have been identified as having the potential to be a competent assessor. People from this pool should then undertake all on the job assessment of Trainee Debriefings.
- 3.2 A PIRFO assessor training programme developed and implemented that is specific to the requirements of Debriefing/Assessors with the specific aim of providing those chosen to be Assessors with the skills and knowledge to undertake a valid, reliable, flexible and fair assessment process.

- 3.3 The Record of Prerequisites section (page 10) in the Debriefing Assessment Record (DAR) should be changed to reflect the introduction of an upgraded application process recommended in 1.1 and streamlined by listing the prerequisite requirements with a box for ticking adjacent to each prerequisite and signed by the SPC PIRFO programme coordinator as having sighted all the necessary eligibility prerequisites. This then becomes the formal acceptance into the programme.
- 3.4 Undertake a review of the DAR and make minor word changes or high lighting of phrases that might clarify further the instructions for the certification process. In particular the information sections for the Trainee Debriefing and the Debriefing/Assessor on pages 12-15 should be a focus of that review process.
- 3.5 A Debriefing/Assessor resource package prepared that includes an instruction manual outlining the debriefing certification process and assessment protocols and a separate set of observation checklists for the assessors to use as a guide and report template when they are supervising debriefing and providing feedback to the trainees on their performance prior to assessment.

Recommendation 4 - Final debriefing workshop

- 4.1 A more comprehensive suite of underpinning knowledge questions is developed so that there is a greater range of questions to prepare assessment papers. The questions must be thoroughly checked by PIRFO training personnel before they are used to ensure they are valid and clear.
- 4.2 A minimum of two assessment papers prepared for each gear type so that during the written assessment alternate papers can be issued to candidates and in the event of a resit a candidate can undertake a different paper to that attempted in the original assessment.
- 4.3 A Trainee Debriefing must not be allowed to attend the Part C final debriefing workshop until all requirements of Parts A & B have been completed, signed off in the DAR and verified by the SPC PIRFO programme coordinator.
- 4.4 Written assessments must be supervised in person by a PIRFO facilitator at all times.
- 4.5 A strategy for the methodology of Part C is devised that takes into account the likelihood in future that Trainee Debriefings will complete the final requirements at different times and the logistics and cost may prevent delivery of a final debriefing workshop similar to the one delivered in Honiara.

Recommendation 5 - Certification

- 5.1 Activate the PIRFO Certification Management Committee (CMC) as the overarching committee guiding, monitoring, reviewing and endorsing PIRFO Certification and Training Standards for Observers and Debriefings. Careful consideration will need to be given to members of this committee with a mix of observer programme experience and training background essential.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Individual Trainee audit reports

AUDIT OF PIRFO DEBRIEFER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

AUDITING DETAILS		
NAME OF AUDITOR: Grant Carnie, Carnie Consultants	LOCATION: FFA, Honiara, Solomon Islands	DATE: 20 th October 2013
TRAINEE DEBRIEFER DETAILS		
NAME: Harold Vilia	COUNTRY: Solomon Islands	
DEBRIEFER/ASSESSOR		
OBSERVATION SESSIONS: Ambrose Orianiha'a, John Still Villi		
DEBRIEFING UNDER SUPERVISION SESSIONS: Ambrose Orianiha'a, John Still Villi		
ASSESSMENT OF DEBRIEFING SESSION/S: Ambrose Orianiha'a, John Still Villi		
ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
1. Photo ID and personal details (page 1)	Completed	
2. Record of prerequisites (page 10)	Not completed	Shouldn't have started programme without completing the prerequisites.
3. Introduction to Debriefing Workshop (page 11)	Completed	Shouldn't have attended the Introduction to Debriefing Workshop and been signed off without having completed the Record of Prerequisites.
4. Record of Trainee Debriefers Observing Debriefings (page 16)	Completed	Satisfactory.
5. Record of a Trainee Debriefers conducting debriefings under supervision (page 17)	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. These sessions were also used as assessments, which isn't allowed under the process. b. Some minor anomalies include a subsequent debriefing under supervision taking place before the second and third debriefings under supervision according to dates provided (possibly a simple recording error) and some back-to-back trips of the same observer here and in the previous observations of debriefing section, which can occur.

ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
6. Assessment of a Trainee Debriefer (page 18-35)	Not completed correctly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Three (incorrect) assessments were conducted even though the candidate was deemed competent on the first assessment. b. The Trainee Debriefer Conducting Debriefing under Supervision sessions were used as assessments without a dedicated assessment after the minimum of three (3) supervised debriefings, which isn't allowed under the process. c. The comments from the Debriefer/Assessor weren't relevant and continually referred to the assessor's view of Harold's observer history and that he would make a competent Debriefer (probably correct) rather than comments related to the actually assessment.
7. Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions (page 36-37)	Completed	Satisfactory.
8. Final Assessment Workshop (page 38)	Completed	Attended and passed the written assessment.
9. Sign off for Certification (page 39)	Not completed	To be certified when Harold has provided the record of prerequisites and satisfactorily completed the practical debriefing assessment requirements.
GENERAL COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The process wasn't completed according to protocols, including the prerequisite section. 2. Apart from failing to provide a record of prerequisites and not following correct assessment protocols Harold has demonstrated over the certification process do date that he should make a competent debriefer and it is suggested that he be made a priority for reassessment so that he is certified as soon as possible. 3. It is recommended that before Harold is certified as a PIRFO Debriefer he: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. provide the record of prerequisite requirements; and b. undergo a further practical debriefing assessment as soon as possible with an SPC nominated Debriefers/Assessor. 		

* The Activities relate to the process outlined in the Debriefers Assessment Record (DAR) book and the page numbers refer to the page/s that the activity is outlined in the DAR.

AUDIT OF PIRFO DEBRIEFER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

AUDITING DETAILS		
NAME OF AUDITOR: Grant Carnie, Carnie Consultants	LOCATION: FFA, Honiara, Solomon Islands	DATE: 20 th October 2013
TRAINEE DEBRIEFER DETAILS		
NAME: Frederick Anii	COUNTRY: Solomon Islands	
DEBRIEFER/ASSESSOR		
OBSERVATION SESSIONS: Ambrose Orianiha'a		
DEBRIEFING UNDER SUPERVISION SESSIONS: Ambrose Orianiha'a, John Still Villi		
ASSESSMENT OF DEBRIEFING SESSION/S: Ambrose Orianiha'a, John Still Villi		
ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
1. Photo ID and personal details (page 1)	Completed	
2. Record of prerequisites (page 10)	Not completed	Shouldn't have started programme without completing the prerequisites.
3. Introduction to Debriefing Workshop (page 11)	Completed	Shouldn't have attended the Introduction to Debriefing Workshop and been signed off without having completed the Record of Prerequisites.
4. Record of Trainee Debriefers Observing Debriefings (page 16)	Completed	Satisfactory in that according to the DAR Frederick observed a total of five (5) debriefings, which is significantly more than the required minimum of two (2) but there are anomalies in the dates of these observation sessions, debriefing under supervision and (incorrect) assessments.
5. Record of a Trainee Debriefers conducting debriefings under supervision (page 17)	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. These sessions were also used as assessments, which isn't allowed under the process. b. Timing anomalies include the first debriefing under supervision taking place before the minimum of two (2) observations of a debriefing was concluded.
6. Assessment of a Trainee Debriefers (page 18-35)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Three (incorrect) assessments were conducted even though the candidate was deemed competent on the first assessment. b. The Trainee Debriefers Conducting Debriefing under Supervision sessions were used as assessments without a dedicated assessment after the minimum of three (3) supervised debriefings, which isn't allowed under the process.

ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
6 continued		c. The comments from the Debriefers/Assessors aren't relevant and continually refer to the assessor's view of Frederick's observer history and that he would make a competent Debriefers rather than comments related to the actual assessment.
7. Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions (page 36-37)	Completed (with concerns)	There are some concerns with these answers as two have been whited out and rewritten and the third answer seems to be very light on for information. It has been signed by a Debriefers/Assessor (Ambrose Orianiha'a).
8. Final Assessment Workshop (page 38)	Not completed	Frederick failed the written assessment and will need to resit.
9. Sign off for Certification (page 39)	Not completed	To be certified when Frederick has provided the record of prerequisites has had his underpinning knowledge verified by oral questioning, successfully completed the written assessment and satisfactorily completed the practical debriefing assessment requirements.
GENERAL COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The process wasn't completed according to protocols, including the prerequisite section and Frederick failed the written assessment. 2. There are concerns about the validity of the underpinning knowledge written questions in the DAR with, as outlined above, original answers whited out and rewritten. There has been no explanation about whether this was detected by the Debriefers/Assessor signing off and so verified as taking place prior to the sign-off. 3. There are some minor anomalies regarding the dates of observation sessions, debriefing under supervision and (incorrect) assessments activities in the on the job process. 4. It is recommended that before being certified, Frederick: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. complete the record of prerequisites; b. be orally questioned by an SPC nominated Debriefers/Assessor on the underpinning knowledge written questions in the DAR; c. successfully resit the written assessment; and d. undertake further debriefing assessment/s with an SPC nominated Debriefers/Assessor until deemed competent. 		

* The Activities relate to the process outlined in the Debriefers Assessment Record (DAR) book and the page numbers refer to the page/s that the activity is outlined in the DAR.

AUDIT OF PIRFO DEBRIEFER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

AUDITING DETAILS		
NAME OF AUDITOR: Grant Carnie, Carnie Consultants	LOCATION: FFA, Honiara, Solomon Islands	DATE: 18 th October 2013
TRAINEE DEBRIEFER DETAILS		
NAME: Onasai Takataka	COUNTRY: Tuvalu	
DEBRIEFER/ASSESSOR		
OBSERVATION SESSIONS: Esmond Dalle		
DEBRIEFING UNDER SUPERVISION SESSIONS: Esmond Dalle, Richard Aisi		
ASSESSMENT OF DEBRIEFING SESSION/S: Richard Aisi		
ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
1. Photo ID and personal details (page 1)	Completed	
2. Record of prerequisites (page 10)	Not completed	Shouldn't have started programme without completing the prerequisites.
3. Introduction to Debriefing Workshop (page 11)	Completed	Shouldn't have attended Introduction to Debriefing Workshop and been signed off without having completed the Record of Prerequisites.
4. Record of Trainee Debriefers Observing Debriefings (page 16)	Completed	Satisfactory, though an anomaly in the dates shows that the second observation occurred after the first conducting debriefing under supervision had taken place. This could be a recording error by the Debriefers/Assessor and whatever the reason is not a sufficient breach of process to challenge certification.
5. Record of a Trainee Debriefers conducting debriefings under supervision (page 17)	Completed	First Debriefing under supervision (23/10/12) was conducted before the second observation of a debriefing (25/10/12). See comments in 4 above.
6. Assessment of a Trainee Debriefers (page 18-35)	Completed	a. Followed correct procedure with one (successful) assessment with a different observer and trip report and after the third debriefing under supervision. b. Comments by the Debriefers/Assessor were targeted and to the point.
7. Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions (page 36-37)	Completed	Satisfactory.

ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
8. Final Assessment Workshop (page 38)	Not completed	Attended but failed the written assessment at the first attempt and will need to re-sit the test.
9. Sign off for Certification (page 39)	Not completed	To be completed once Onasai has passed the written assessment and the record of prerequisites is provided.
GENERAL COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apart from the failure to provide a record of prerequisites this was the only example of the current Debriefing certification process that correctly followed all other protocols, including the important on the job experience/assessment section. 2. It is recommended that Onasai be certified once he has successfully completed the written assessment and provided the record of prerequisites. 		

* The Activities relate to the process outlined in the Debriefing Assessment Record (DAR) book and the page numbers refer to the page/s that the activity is outlined in the DAR.

AUDIT OF PIRFO DEBRIEFER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

AUDITING DETAILS		
NAME OF AUDITOR: Grant Carnie, Carnie Consultants	LOCATION: FFA, Honiara, Solomon Islands	DATE: 18 th October 2013
TRAINEE DEBRIEFER DETAILS		
NAME: Bernard Aitafia Fiubala	COUNTRY: Marshall Islands (Solomon Islands citizen)	
DEBRIEFER/ASSESSORS		
OBSERVATION SESSIONS: Ambrose Orianiha'a, John Still Villi		
DEBRIEFING UNDER SUPERVISION SESSIONS: Selvin Iworimaw		
ASSESSMENT OF DEBRIEFING SESSION/S: John Still Villi, Selvin Iworimaw		
ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
1. Photo ID and personal details (page 1)	Not completed	Personal details provided but photo ID needs to be inserted in the DAR.
2. Record of prerequisites (page 10)	Not completed	Shouldn't have started programme without completing the prerequisites.
3. Introduction to Debriefing Workshop (page 11)	Completed	Shouldn't have attended the Introduction to Debriefing Workshop and been signed off without having completed the Record of Prerequisites. Workshop facilitator hasn't signed confirmation of attendance.
4. Record of Trainee Debriefing Observing a Debriefing (page 16)	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Trainee Debriefing observed a total of five (5) debriefings, even though only two are required so on face value that is to be commended. b. However the third observation of a debriefing by the Trainee Debriefing was also used as an assessment, which is logistically impossible and not allowed under the process.
5. Record of a Trainee Debriefing conducting debriefings under supervision (page 17)	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. These sessions were also used as assessments, which isn't allowed under the process. b. The three conducting debriefings under supervision sessions were each conducted over three days, which appears unusual and probably warrants further investigation. c. A subsequent debriefing under supervision with another Debriefing/Assessor, who also undertook (incorrectly) the assessment during that debriefing, was one day.

ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
6. Assessment of a Trainee Debriefer (page 18-35)	Not completed correctly	<p>a. Three (incorrect) assessments were conducted even though the candidate was deemed competent on the first assessment. The second and third (incorrect) assessments haven't been signed by a Debriefers/Assessor.</p> <p>b. The first (incorrect) assessment was undertaken at the same time as the third observation by the Trainee Debriefers, which as pointed out in Activity 4 above is logistically impossible and not allowed under the process.</p> <p>c. There are genuine concerns about the rigor and validity of the assessment process including not following due process, timing anomalies, lack of signatures on two (2) of the (incorrect) recorded assessments and the irrelevant comments in the first (incorrect) assessment focusing on Bernard's history as an observer rather than a critique of performance during assessment.</p>
7. Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions (page 36-37)	Not completed	The written questions in the DAR haven't been completed, though Bernard has signed (but not dated) in the section requiring the Trainee Debriefers to verify that the work is his own work.
8. Final Assessment Workshop (page 38)	Completed	Attended and passed the written assessment.
9. Sign off for Certification (page 39)	Not completed	To be certified when Bernard has provided the record of prerequisites, completed the Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions and had them signed off as correct by an assessor, has provided signed confirmation of attendance at the Introduction to Debriefing workshop by an SPC Facilitator and undertaken the practical debriefing assessment requirements according to the procedures in the DAR.
GENERAL COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The process wasn't completed according to protocols, including the prerequisite section and the on the job debriefing observation, supervision and assessment process. 2. Overall there are genuine concerns regarding correct protocols and rigor being followed in this particular certification process. There are too many anomalies with regards to dates, timing and recording of the important on the job component. To satisfy these concerns the process going forward to complete the certification should be undertaken and overseen by an SPC nominated Debriefers/Assessor and follow the recommendations outlined below. 		

GENERAL COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS continued

3. It is recommended that before Bernard is certified as a PIRFO Debriefer he:
- a. provide the record of prerequisite requirements;
 - b. complete the Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions and have them signed off as correct by an SPC nominated Debriefier/ Assessor;
 - c. provide confirmation and sign off of attendance at the Introduction to Debriefing Workshop by an SPC facilitator; and
 - d. undergo further practical debriefing assessment with an SPC nominated Debriefier/Assessor until deemed competent

* The Activities relate to the process outlined in the Debriefier Assessment Record (DAR) book and the page numbers refer to the page/s that the activity is outlined in the DAR.

AUDIT OF PIRFO DEBRIEFER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

AUDITING DETAILS		
NAME OF AUDITOR: Grant Carnie, Carnie Consultants	LOCATION: FFA, Honiara, Solomon Islands	DATE: 20 th October 2013
TRAINEE DEBRIEFER DETAILS		
NAME: Jimmy Belade	COUNTRY: Solomon Islands	
DEBRIEFER/ASSESSOR		
OBSERVATION SESSIONS: Ambrose Orianiha'a		
DEBRIEFING UNDER SUPERVISION SESSIONS: Ambrose Orianiha'a, Steve Peter		
ASSESSMENT OF DEBRIEFING SESSION/S: Ambrose Orianiha'a, Steve Peter		
ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
1. Photo ID and personal details (page 1)	Not completed	Photo ID needs to be inserted into DAR.
2. Record of prerequisites (page 10)	Not completed	Shouldn't have started programme without completing the prerequisites.
3. Introduction to Debriefing Workshop (page 11)	Completed	Shouldn't have attended the Introduction to Debriefing Workshop and been signed off without having completed the Record of Prerequisites.
4. Record of Trainee Debriefing Observing Debriefings (page 16)	Completed	Satisfactory.
5. Record of a Trainee Debriefers conducting debriefings under supervision (page 17)	Completed	Satisfactory, other than these sessions were also used as assessments, which isn't allowed under the process.
6. Assessment of a Trainee Debriefing (page 18-35)	Not completed correctly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Three (incorrect) assessments were conducted even though the candidate was deemed competent on the first assessment. b. The Trainee Debriefing Conducting Debriefing under Supervision sessions were used as assessments without a dedicated assessment after the minimum of three (3) supervised debriefings, which isn't allowed under the process.

ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
6 continued		c. The comments from the Debriefers/Assessor weren't relevant and continually referred to the assessor's view of Jimmy's observer history and that he would make a competent Debriefers (probably correct) rather than comments related to the actual assessment.
7. Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions (page 36-37)	Completed	Satisfactory.
8. Final Assessment Workshop (page 38)	Completed	Attended and passed the written assessment.
9. Sign off for Certification (page 39)	Not completed	To be certified when Jimmy has inserted an ID photo on the DAR, provided the record of prerequisites and satisfactorily completed the practical debriefing assessment requirements.
GENERAL COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The process wasn't completed according to protocols, including the prerequisite section. 2. Apart from failing to insert a photo ID in the DAR or provide a record of prerequisites and not following correct assessment protocols Jimmy has demonstrated over the certification process to date that he should make a competent debriefer and it is suggested that he be made a priority for reassessment so that he is certified as soon as possible. 3. It is recommended that before Jimmy is certified as a PIRFO Debriefers he: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. insert a photo ID into his DAR; b. provide the record of prerequisite requirements; c. undergo a further practical debriefing assessment as soon as possible with an SPC nominated Debriefing Assessor. 		

* The Activities relate to the process outlined in the Debriefers Assessment Record (DAR) book and the page numbers refer to the page/s that the activity is outlined in the DAR.

AUDIT OF PIRFO DEBRIEFER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

AUDITING DETAILS		
NAME OF AUDITOR: Grant Carnie, Carnie Consultants	LOCATION: FFA, Honiara, Solomon Islands	DATE: 20 th October 2013
TRAINEE DEBRIEFER DETAILS		
NAME: John Agi	COUNTRY: Solomon Islands	
DEBRIEFER/ASSESSOR		
OBSERVATION SESSIONS: Ambrose Orianiha'a		
DEBRIEFING UNDER SUPERVISION SESSIONS: Ambrose Orianiha'a		
ASSESSMENT OF DEBRIEFING SESSION/S: Ambrose Orianiha'a, John Still Villi		
ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
1. Photo ID and personal details (page 1)	Not completed	Photo ID needs to be inserted into DAR.
2. Record of prerequisites (page 10)	Not completed	Shouldn't have started programme without completing the prerequisites.
3. Introduction to Debriefing Workshop (page 11)	Completed	Shouldn't have attended the Introduction to Debriefing Workshop and been signed off without having completed the Record of Prerequisites.
4. Record of Trainee Debriefing Observing Debriefings (page 16)	Completed	Satisfactory.
5. Record of a Trainee Debriefers conducting debriefings under supervision (page 17)	Not completed	<p>a. Only two (2) debriefings under supervision were undertaken rather than the minimum of three (3), they took place three (3) days apart, with the first one (1) day after the two (2) observations of a debriefing.</p> <p>b. The two debriefings under supervision were also used (incorrectly) as assessments, which contravenes due process and it would, in the auditor's view, be impossible to obtain a rigorous, quality focused outcome in this timeframe.</p>
6. Assessment of a Trainee Debriefing (page 18-35)	Not completed	<p>a. Two (incorrect) assessments were conducted even though the candidate was deemed competent on the first assessment.</p>

ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
6 continued		b. The first two (incorrect) assessments were conducted at the same time as the two (2) debriefings under supervision with the same trip reports. A third assessment was conducted three (3) months later even though the minimum of three (3) debriefings under supervision hadn't been undertaken.
7. Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions (page 36-37)	Completed	Satisfactory
8. Final Assessment Workshop (page 38)	Completed	Attended and passed the written assessment.
9. Sign off for Certification (page 39)	Not completed	To be certified when John has inserted a Photo ID in the DAR, provided the record of prerequisites and satisfactorily completed the practical debriefing assessment requirements.
GENERAL COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The process wasn't completed according to protocols, including the prerequisite section. 2. While there was the recommended minimum time frame of three (3) months between the first observation of a debriefing through to the final (incorrect) assessment the two (2) observations of a debriefing, the two (2) debriefings under supervision (less than the required three) and the (incorrect) assessments conducted at the same time as the debriefings under supervision were all completed within seven (7) day, which would in the auditor's opinion be impossible to achieve with any reasonable validity. 3. It is recommended that before John is certified he: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. insert a photo ID in his DAR; b. complete the record of prerequisites; c. undertake further observations and debriefings under supervision as deemed necessary by an SPC nominated Debriefier/Assessor; and d. undertake debriefing assessment/s with an SPC nominated Debriefier/Assessor until deemed competent. 		

* The Activities relate to the process outlined in the Debriefier Assessment Record (DAR) book and the page numbers refer to the page/s that the activity is outlined in the DAR.

AUDIT OF PIRFO DEBRIEFER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

AUDITING DETAILS		
NAME OF AUDITOR: Grant Carnie, Carnie Consultants	LOCATION: FFA, Honiara, Solomon Islands	DATE: 18 th October 2013
TRAINEE DEBRIEFER DETAILS		
NAME: Mijieli Bosevakatubou	COUNTRY: Fiji	
DEBRIEFER/ASSESSOR		
OBSERVATION SESSIONS: Apenisa Sauturaga		
DEBRIEFING UNDER SUPERVISION SESSIONS: Apenisa Sauturaga		
ASSESSMENT OF DEBRIEFING SESSIONS: Apenisa Sauturaga		
ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
1. Photo ID and personal details (page 1)	Completed	
2. Record of prerequisites (page 10)	Not completed	Shouldn't have started programme without completing the prerequisites.
3. Introduction to Debriefing Workshop (page 11)	Completed	Shouldn't have attended the Introduction to Debriefing Workshop and been signed off without having completed the Record of Prerequisites.
4. Record of Trainee Debriefing Observing Debriefings (page 16)	Completed	Satisfactory.
5. Record of a Trainee Debriefers conducting debriefings under supervision (page 17)	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. These sessions were also used as assessments, which isn't allowed under the process. b. One extra debriefing under supervision was conducted after the third conducting a debriefing under supervision/assessment, which appears an anomaly given that the Trainee/Debriefing was already (incorrectly according to protocols) deemed competent.
6. Assessment of a Trainee Debriefing (page 18-35)	Not completed correctly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Three (incorrect) assessments were conducted even though the candidate was deemed competent on the first assessment. b. The Trainee Debriefing Conducting Debriefing under Supervision sessions were used as assessments without a dedicated assessment after the minimum of three (3) supervised debriefings, which isn't allowed under the process.

ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
6 continued		<p>c. In the first (incorrect) conducting a debriefing under supervision/ assessment session the candidate was deemed competent even though some of the elements weren't assessed. This appears to be because the Debriefing/Assessor decided that certain elements weren't relevant to the debriefing (such as no critical incident occurring). In cases such as this the Assessor should still assess competence by, for example, determining how the Trainee Debriefing decided that no critical incident occurred. If the particular element isn't assessed the candidate hasn't met all the assessment criteria and must be reassessed on that missing element (at the very least).</p> <p>d. Apart from reference to the fact no critical incident occurred in a particular (incorrect) assessment, the Debriefing/Assessor provided no other comments, which is disturbing.</p>
7. Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions (page 36-37)	Completed	
8. Final Assessment Workshop (page 38)	Not completed	Attended but failed the written assessment at the first attempt and will need to re-sit the test.
9. Sign off for Certification (page 39)	Not completed	To be certified when Mijieli has passed the written assessment, provided the record of prerequisites and completed the practical debriefing assessment requirements.
GENERAL COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The process wasn't completed according to protocols, including the prerequisite section. 2. It has been concluded that the written assessment is focused in some questions on purse seining rather than long lining and so disadvantages candidates such as Mijieli who are from countries like Fiji where long lining is the predominate catching method. That will be addressed in the overall audit report however the PIRFO assessors who marked the written assessments are of the view that Mijieli wouldn't have passed even if the purse seine focused questions are discounted. 3. It is recommended that before Mijieli is certified as a PIRFO Debriefing he: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. provide the record of prerequisite requirements; b. redo and pass the final written assessment paper; c. undertake further observations and debriefings under supervision as deemed necessary by an SPC nominated Debriefing/Assessor; and d. undergo practical debriefing assessment/s with an SPC nominated Debriefing Assessor until deemed competent. 		

* The Activities relate to the process outlined in the Debriefing Assessment Record (DAR) book and the page numbers refer to the page/s that the activity is outlined in the DAR.

AUDIT OF PIRFO DEBRIEFER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

AUDITING DETAILS		
NAME OF AUDITOR: Grant Carnie, Carnie Consultants	LOCATION: FFA, Honiara, Solomon Islands	DATE: 20 th October 2013
TRAINEE DEBRIEFER DETAILS		
NAME: Patteson Omi	COUNTRY: Solomon Islands	
DEBRIEFER/ASSESSOR		
OBSERVATION SESSIONS: Ambrose Orianiha'a		
DEBRIEFING UNDER SUPERVISION SESSIONS: Ambrose Orianiha'a,		
ASSESSMENT OF DEBRIEFING SESSION/S: Ambrose Orianiha'a, Lyndsay Mundri		
ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
1. Photo ID and personal details (page 1)	Completed	
2. Record of prerequisites (page 10)	Not completed	Shouldn't have started programme without completing the prerequisites.
3. Introduction to Debriefing Workshop (page 11)	Completed	Shouldn't have attended the Introduction to Debriefing Workshop and been signed off without having completed the Record of Prerequisites.
4. Record of Trainee Debriefers Observing Debriefings (page 16)	Completed	Observed the required minimum two debriefings in two (2) days, which in itself isn't a major issue other than this activity, the debriefing under supervision and two (incorrect) assessments were conducted over a total of eight (8) consecutive days. The minimum requirement for undertaking the on the job activities is three (3) months).
5. Record of a Trainee Debriefers conducting debriefings under supervision (page 17)	Not completed	<p>a. Only two (2) debriefings under supervision were undertaken rather than the minimum of three (3), they took place over a four day period and one day after the two (2) observations of a debriefing.</p> <p>b. The two debriefings under supervision were also used (incorrectly) as assessments, which contravenes due process and it would, in the auditor's view, be impossible to obtain a rigorous, quality focused outcome in this timeframe as was subsequently proven when a further assessment was conducted by another Debriefers/Assessor and Patteson didn't meet the required standard.</p>

ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
6. Assessment of a Trainee Debriefer (page 18-35)		<p>a. Two (incorrect) assessments were conducted even though the candidate was deemed competent on the first assessment.</p> <p>b. The two (incorrect) assessments were conducted at the same time as the debriefings under supervision, with the same trip reports and the validity of those assessments would be very doubtful even if they had been undertaken following due process.</p> <p>c. The process from observing debriefings, to debriefings under supervision through to the second (incorrect) assessment were completed in eight (8) days, which is well short of the three (3) months minimum stipulated in the Debriefing certification process.</p>
7. Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions (page 36-37)	Not completed	Didn't attempt the Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions.
8. Final Assessment Workshop (page 38)	Not completed	Didn't attend the final debriefer workshop and so didn't attempt the written assessment.
9. Sign off for Certification (page 39)	Not completed	<p>Patteson will need to undertake a range of activities before he can be certified, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. providing the record of prerequisites; b. completing, as a minimum, the required number (3) of debriefings under supervision; c. satisfactorily completing the practical debriefing assessment requirements; d. completing the underpinning knowledge written questions in the DAR; e. attending a final debriefing workshop; and f. passing the written assessment.

GENERAL COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The process wasn't completed according to protocols, including the prerequisite section and Patteson didn't attend the Final Debriefing workshop.
2. It is very concerning that Patteson was allowed to complete all the on the job requirements in eight (8) days even though subsequent evidence clearly proves that he wasn't ready for assessment.
3. It would appear from the evidence provided with the DAR and in the opinion of experienced PIRFO Debriefers/Assessors that Patteson isn't ready for assessment at this stage and it is recommended that he start all the on job components again starting with observing a debriefing so that he can develop the skills and confidence required to attempt assessment of a debriefing at a later date.
4. It is further recommended that he complete the record of prerequisites and a mutual decision with Patteson, his supervisor and an SPC nominate Debriefers/Assessor be made on whether it might be in his interest to attend another Introduction to Debriefing workshop.

* The Activities relate to the process outlined in the Debriefers Assessment Record (DAR) book and the page numbers refer to the page/s that the activity is outlined in the DAR.

AUDIT OF PIRFO DEBRIEFER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

AUDITING DETAILS		
NAME OF AUDITOR: Grant Carnie, Carnie Consultants	LOCATION: FFA, Honiara, Solomon Islands	DATE: 20 th October 2013
TRAINEE DEBRIEFER DETAILS		
NAME: Paul Bonga	COUNTRY: Solomon Islands	
DEBRIEFER/ASSESSOR		
OBSERVATION SESSIONS: Ambrose Orianiha'a		
DEBRIEFING UNDER SUPERVISION SESSIONS: Ambrose Orianiha'a		
ASSESSMENT OF DEBRIEFING SESSION/S: Ambrose Orianiha'a, Lyndsay Mundri		
ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
1. Photo ID and personal details (page 1)	Not completed	Personal details provided but photo ID needs to be inserted in the DAR.
2. Record of prerequisites (page 10)	Not completed	Shouldn't have started programme without completing the prerequisites.
3. Introduction to Debriefing Workshop (page 11)	Completed	Shouldn't have attended the Introduction to Debriefing Workshop and been signed off without having completed the Record of Prerequisites.
4. Record of Trainee Debriefers Observing Debriefings (page 16)	Completed	Observed the required minimum two debriefings on corresponding days, which in itself isn't a major issue other than this activity, the debriefing under supervision and two (incorrect) assessments were conducted over a total of five (5) consecutive days. The minimum requirement for undertaking the on the job activities is three (3) months).
5. Record of a Trainee Debriefers conducting debriefings under supervision (page 17)	Not completed correctly	<p>a. Only two (2) debriefings under supervision were undertaken rather than the minimum of three (3), they took place over two consecutive days and one day after the two (2) observations of a debriefing.</p> <p>b. The two debriefings under supervision were also used (incorrectly) as assessments, which contravenes due process and it would, in the auditor's view, be impossible to obtain a rigorous, quality focused outcome in this timeframe as was subsequently proven when a further assessment was conducted by another Debriefers/Assessor and Paul didn't meet the required standard.</p>

ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
6. Assessment of a Trainee Debriefer (page 18-35)	Not completed correctly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Two (incorrect) assessments were conducted even though the candidate was deemed competent on the first assessment. b. The two (incorrect) assessments were conducted at the same time as the debriefings under supervision, with the same trip reports and the validity of those assessments would be very doubtful even if they had been undertaken following due process. c. The process from observing debriefings, to debriefings under supervision through to the second (incorrect) assessment were completed in five days, which is well short of the three (3) months minimum stipulated in the Debriefing certification process.
7. Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions (page 36-37)	Not completed	The written questions in the DAR haven't been undertaken.
8. Final Assessment Workshop (page 38)	Not completed	Attended but failed the written assessment at the first attempt and will need to re-sit the test.
9. Sign off for Certification (page 39)	Not completed	To be certified when Paul has inserted an ID photo in his DAR, passed the written assessment, provided the record of prerequisites and satisfactorily completed the practical debriefing assessment requirements.
GENERAL COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The process wasn't completed according to protocols, including the prerequisite section. 2. It is very concerning that Paul was allowed to complete all the on the job requirements in five (5) days even though subsequent evidence clearly proves that he wasn't ready for assessment. 3. It would appear from that evidence, including an unsuccessful third assessment with an independent Debriefing/Assessor, that Paul should undertake further debriefings under supervision so that he can develop the skills and confidence required to attempt assessment of a debriefing at a later date. 4. It is recommended that before being certified Paul: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. insert an ID photo in his DAR and complete the record of prerequisites; b. undertake further debriefings under supervision with an SPC nominated Debriefing/Assessor; c. complete the Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions in the DAR; d. successfully complete the written assessment; and e. successfully complete assessment/s of a debriefing with an SPC nominated Debriefing/Assessor. 		

* The Activities relate to the process outlined in the Debriefing Assessment Record (DAR) book and the page numbers refer to the page/s that the activity is outlined in the DAR.

AUDIT OF PIRFO DEBRIEFER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

AUDITING DETAILS		
NAME OF AUDITOR: Grant Carnie, Carnie Consultants	LOCATION: FFA, Honiara, Solomon Islands	DATE: 18 th October 2013
TRAINEE DEBRIEFER DETAILS		
NAME: Ricky Narruhn	COUNTRY: Federated States of Micronesia (Pohnpei)	
DEBRIEFER/ASSESSOR		
OBSERVATION SESSIONS: Steve Peter		
DEBRIEFING UNDER SUPERVISION SESSIONS: Steve Peter		
ASSESSMENT OF DEBRIEFING SESSION/S: Steve Peter, Charles Hitolo		
ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
1. Photo ID and personal details (page 1)	Completed	
2. Record of prerequisites (page 10)	Not completed	Shouldn't have started programme without completing the prerequisites.
3. Introduction to Debriefing Workshop (page 11)	Completed	Shouldn't have attended Introduction to Debriefing Workshop and been signed off without having completed the Record of Prerequisites.
4. Record of Trainee Debriefing Observing Debriefings (page 16)	Completed	Satisfactory.
5. Record of a Trainee Debriefers conducting debriefings under supervision (page 17)	Completed	a. These sessions were also used as assessments, which isn't allowed under the process.
6. Assessment of a Trainee Debriefing (page 18-35)	Not completed satisfactorily	a. Three assessments were conducted even though the candidate was deemed competent on the first assessment. b. The Trainee Debriefing Conducting Debriefing under Supervision sessions were used as assessments without a dedicated assessment after the minimum of three (3) supervised debriefings, which isn't allowed under the process. c. Some concerning anomalies regarding dates – assessment 2 was conducted after assessment 3 (which were both meant to be debriefing under supervision sessions).

ACTIVITY	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
6 continued		d. The third assessment/debriefing under supervision session conducted by Debriefers/Assessors Steve Peter had comments in two different hand writing styles – further investigation concluded that another Debriefers/Assessors Charles Hitolo had assessed the candidate at another time in the future but because all three assessment sections had been completed (incorrectly) that Debriefers/Assessors had made comments in the third assessment session but hadn't ticked the competency achieved (CA) boxes or signed off because those areas were already filled.
7. Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions (page 36-37)	Completed	Has to sign himself and get a PIRFO Assessor to sign in the appropriate section.
8. Final Assessment Workshop (page 38)	Completed	Attended and passed the written assessment.
9. Sign off for Certification (page 39)	Not completed	To be completed once correct assessment process is verified and the record of prerequisites is provided.
GENERAL COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The process wasn't completed according to protocols, including the prerequisite section. 2. The further investigation of the assessment process (outline in 6d above) concluded that if the subsequent assessment can be verified and the Debriefers/Assessors confirms competence Ricky will have met the important on the job practical assessment criteria. 3. It is recommended that on verification of the independent assessment and confirmation of competency achieved by that Debriefers/Assessors Ricky can be certified once he has provided the information required in the Record of Prerequisites section on Page 10 of the Debriefers Assessment Record. 		

* The Activities relate to the process outlined in the Debriefers Assessment Record (DAR) book and the page numbers refer to the page/s that the activity is outlined in the DAR.

AUDIT OF PIRFO DEBRIEFER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

AUDITING DETAILS		
NAME OF AUDITOR: Grant Carnie, Carnie Consultants	LOCATION: FFA, Honiara, Solomon Islands	DATE: 18 th October 2013
TRAINEE DEBRIEFER DETAILS		
NAME: Roy Murdoch	COUNTRY: Solomon Islands (Forum Fisheries Agency)	
DEBRIEFER/ASSESSOR		
OBSERVATION SESSIONS: Jacob Keju		
DEBRIEFING UNDER SUPERVISION SESSIONS: Steve Peter, Ambrose Orianiha'a, John Still Villi		
ASSESSMENT OF DEBRIEFING SESSION/S: Steve Peter, Ambrose Orianiha'a, John Still Villi		
ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
1. Photo ID and personal details (page 1)	Completed	
2. Record of prerequisites (page 10)	Not completed	Shouldn't have started programme without completing the prerequisites.
3. Introduction to Debriefing Workshop (page 11)	Completed	Shouldn't have attended the Introduction to Debriefing Workshop and been signed off without having completed the Record of Prerequisites.
4. Record of Trainee Debriefing Observing Debriefings (page 16)	Completed	Satisfactory. Completed over three days but did three (3) observations rather than the minimum two (2).
5. Record of a Trainee Debriefers conducting debriefings under supervision (page 17)	Completed	a. These sessions were also used as assessments, which isn't allowed under the process. b. Some minor anomalies include a subsequent debriefing under supervision taking place after the three (3) required debriefings under supervision, even though these had been (incorrectly) used as assessments and the candidate had been already deemed competent.
6. Assessment of a Trainee Debriefing (page 18-35)	Not completed correctly	a. Three (incorrect) assessments were conducted even though the candidate was deemed competent on the first assessment. b. The Trainee Debriefing Conducting Debriefing under Supervision sessions were used as assessments without a dedicated assessment after the minimum of three (3) supervised debriefings, which isn't allowed under the process.

ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
6 continued.		c. Three different assessors were used for the three (incorrect) assessments with all deeming Roy competent, which provide some confidence that assessment was reasonably rigorous, even though they were conducted outside required protocols. d. The comments from the Debriefers/Assessors weren't relevant and continually referred to the assessor's view of Roy's observer history and that he would make a competent Debriefers (probably correct) rather than comments related to the actual assessment.
7. Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions (page 36-37)	Completed	Satisfactory.
8. Final Assessment Workshop (page 38)	Completed	Attended and passed the written assessment.
9. Sign off for Certification (page 39)	Not completed	To be certified when Roy has provided the record of prerequisites and satisfactorily completed the practical debriefing assessment requirements.
GENERAL COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The process wasn't completed according to protocols, including the prerequisite section. 2. Apart from failing to provide a record of prerequisites and not following correct assessment protocols Roy has demonstrated over the certification process to date that he should make a competent debriefer and it is suggested that he be made a priority for reassessment so that he is certified as soon as possible. 3. It is recommended that before Roy is certified as a PIRFO Debriefers he: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. provide the record of prerequisite requirements; and b. undergo a further practical debriefing assessment as soon as possible with an SPC nominated Debriefing Assessor. 		

* The Activities relate to the process outlined in the Debriefers Assessment Record (DAR) book and the page numbers refer to the page/s that the activity is outlined in the DAR.

AUDIT OF PIRFO DEBRIEFER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

AUDITING DETAILS		
NAME OF AUDITOR: Grant Carnie, Carnie Consultants	LOCATION: FFA, Honiara, Solomon Islands	DATE: 18 th October 2013
TRAINEE DEBRIEFER DETAILS		
NAME: Sekonaia Balekana Naicovitabia	COUNTRY: Fiji	
DEBRIEFER/ASSESSOR		
OBSERVATION SESSIONS: Apenisa Sauturaga		
DEBRIEFING UNDER SUPERVISION SESSIONS: Apenisa Sauturaga		
ASSESSMENT OF DEBRIEFING SESSIONS: Apenisa Sauturaga		
ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
1. Photo ID and personal details (page 1)	Completed	
2. Record of prerequisites (page 10)	Not completed	Shouldn't have started programme without completing the prerequisites.
3. Introduction to Debriefing Workshop (page 11)	Completed	Shouldn't have attended the Introduction to Debriefing Workshop and been signed off without having completed the Record of Prerequisites. Workshop facilitator hasn't signed confirmation of attendance.
4. Record of Trainee Debriefing Observing a Debriefing (page 16)	Completed	Satisfactory.
5. Record of a Trainee Debriefers conducting debriefings under supervision (page 17)	Completed	a. These sessions were also used as assessments, which isn't allowed under the process. b. A minor date anomaly where a second subsequent debriefing under supervision was recorded as having occurred well before all the other debriefings under supervision.
6. Assessment of a Trainee Debriefing (page 18-35)	Not completed correctly	a. Three (incorrect) assessments were conducted even though the candidate was deemed competent on the first assessment. b. The Trainee Debriefing Conducting Debriefing under Supervision sessions were used as assessments without a dedicated assessment after the minimum of three (3) supervised debriefings, which isn't allowed under the process.

ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
6 continued.		<p>c. In the first (incorrect) conducting a debriefing under supervision/ assessment session the candidate was deemed competent even though one of the elements wasn't ticked as meeting competence. This appears to be because the Debriefing/Assessor made comment that Sekonaia should provide more feedback to the observer. In cases such as this the Assessor can make a judgment call that the issue is minor, doesn't warrant a competency not achieved decision and that feedback to the candidate will ensure the issue doesn't reoccur. If the particular element isn't assessed (and ticked) as achieving competence the candidate hasn't met all the assessment criteria and must be reassessed.</p> <p>d. Apart from reference to the lack of feedback by the Trainee Debriefing/Assessor in that particular (incorrect) assessment, the Debriefing/Assessor provided no other comments, which is disturbing.</p>
7. Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions (page 36-37)	Completed	Satisfactory.
8. Final Assessment Workshop (page 38)	Completed	Attended and passed the written assessment.
9. Sign off for Certification (page 39)	Not completed	To be certified when Sekonaia has provided the record of prerequisites and satisfactorily completed the practical debriefing assessment requirements.
GENERAL COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The process wasn't completed according to protocols, including the prerequisite section. 2. It has been concluded that the written assessment is focused in some questions on purse seining rather than long lining and so disadvantages candidates such as Sekonaia who are from countries like Fiji where long lining is the predominate catching method. That will be addressed in the overall audit report however Sekonaia passed regardless of that perceived disadvantage. 3. It is recommended that before Sekonaia is certified as a PIRFO Debriefing Assessor he: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide the record of prerequisite requirements; and b. Undergo a further practical debriefing assessment with an SPC nominated Debriefing Assessor. 		

* The Activities relate to the process outlined in the Debriefing Assessment Record (DAR) book and the page numbers refer to the page/s that the activity is outlined in the DAR.

AUDIT OF PIRFO DEBRIEFER CERTIFICATION PROCESS

AUDITING DETAILS		
NAME OF AUDITOR: Grant Carnie, Carnie Consultants	LOCATION: FFA, Honiara, Solomon Islands	DATE: 18 th October 2013
TRAINEE DEBRIEFER DETAILS		
NAME: Tataua Rabunataai	COUNTRY: Kiribati	
DEBRIEFER/ASSESSOR		
OBSERVATION SESSIONS: Esmond Dalle		
DEBRIEFING UNDER SUPERVISION SESSIONS: Benaia Bauro		
ASSESSMENT OF DEBRIEFING SESSION/S: Hasn't undertaken any assessment at this stage		
ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
1. Photo ID and personal details (page 1)	Completed	
2. Record of prerequisites (page 10)	Not completed	Shouldn't have started the programme without completing the prerequisites.
3. Introduction to Debriefing Workshop (page 11)	Completed	Shouldn't have attended the Introduction to Debriefing Workshop and been signed off without having completed the Record of Prerequisites.
4. Record of Trainee Debriefers Observing Debriefings (page 16)	Completed	Satisfactory.
5. Record of a Trainee Debriefers conducting debriefings under supervision (page 17)	Not completed	Has only completed one conducting a debriefing under supervision and will need to undertake a minimum of two (2) more debriefings under supervision.
6. Assessment of a Trainee Debriefers (page 18-35)	Not started	Assessment hasn't taken place and cannot take place until a minimum of two (2) more debriefings under supervision have been completed.
7. Underpinning Knowledge Written Questions (page 36-37)	Completed	Satisfactory.
8. Final Assessment Workshop (page 38)	Completed	Attended and passed the written assessment with an excellent mark (93%), which was the equal highest in the group.

ACTIVITY*	COMPLETED	COMMENTS
9. Sign off for Certification (page 39)	Not completed	To be completed once a minimum of a further two (2) debriefings under supervision are conducted, a successfully assessment process is undertaken and the record of prerequisites is provided.
GENERAL COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The process wasn't completed according to protocols and was the worst example of due process not being followed. The debriefings under supervision weren't completed and assessment was not undertaken at all. Tataua shouldn't have attended the workshop as he was well short of the requirements needed to be a participant, which was unfortunate as he had the highest mark of the group (93%) at the workshop for his written assessment. 2. Tataua's situation reinforces the need for good Observer Management in-country so that due process is followed and the necessary support is provided to assist the Trainee Debriefing get certified. A situation such as this not only undermines the certification process but is also very costly and wastes the time of workshop trainers and the Trainee Debriefing. 3. The recommendation is that, while it contradicts due process, in this instance Tataua: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. complete a minimum of a further two (2) debriefings under supervision with an approved SPC Debriefing/Assessor; b. successfully undertake an assessment of a debriefing with an approved SPC Debriefing/Assessor after the debriefings under supervision have been completed; c. provide the necessary record of prerequisites; and d. have his attendance at the Final Debriefing workshop accepted, despite it being out of the preferred order of process, given his strong performance with the written assessment. 		

* The Activities relate to the process outlined in the Debriefing Assessment Record (DAR) book and the page numbers refer to the page/s that the activity is outlined in the DAR.

Appendix 2 – Status of PIRFO Debriefing Certification process proforma

Name:

Country:

Date:

Activity from DAR ¹	Page/s ²	Status ³	Further action required
1. Photo ID	1		
2. Record of pre-requisites	10		
3. Introduction to Debriefing Workshop sign off	11		
4. Record of Trainee Debriefing observing debriefings (minimum 2)	16		
5. Record of Trainee Debriefing conducting debriefings under supervision (minimum 3)	17		
6. Assessment (one only if successful first time, maximum of three)	18-35		
7. Underpinning knowledge written questions	36-37		
8. Final Assessment Workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written knowledge test - PART 1 • Written knowledge test - PART 2 	38		
9. Sign of for certification	39-45		

¹ DAR – Debriefing Assessment Record ² Page number/s in DAR ³ Status entered as completed/not completed