



Western and  
Central Pacific  
Fisheries  
Commission

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE  
TWENTIETH REGULAR SESSION

Manila, Philippines  
14 – 21 August 2024

---

Update from the Intersessional Working Group for the Regional Observer Programme

---

WCPFC-SC20-2024-ST-WP-04  
29 July 2024

**Paper submitted by IWG-ROP Chair and Secretariat**

**Purpose**

1. The purpose of this paper is to provide an update on intersessional progress made to streamline and to facilitate consideration of additional updates Regional Observer Programme (ROP) data fields. The paper also identifies areas of work arising from other IWG work and from SC20 and TCC20 discussions, which will need to be prioritised by CCMs for inclusion in the IWG-ROP Workplan.
2. This paper documents and presents for review the feedback that was received from IWG-ROP participants intersessionally following WCPFC20. Additional feedback will be sought from IWG-ROP participants and from the SC20 participants on priorities and suggested changes and additions to the ROP Minimum Standard Data Fields (MSDF).

**Background to IWG-ROP Workplan 2023-2025 tasks**

3. The IWG-ROP was established in 2006 in accordance with the terms of reference in [CMM 2006-07](#). In December 2021 at WCPFC19, the Commission supported TCC's recommendation that there was a need to reactivate the IWG-ROP to provide advice to assist in Commission discussions, ensuring the ROP can continue to optimize its contribution to the Commission's independent monitoring and verification programme and achieve the Commission's objectives as set out in the Convention.
4. The [IWG-ROP Workplan 2023-2025](#) aims to consider tasks within the following four main areas during the 2023 – 2024/5 period:
  - a. Review the existing ROP data collection, to further identify, and discuss improvements to the current processes that support independent monitoring by Observers,
  - b. Review the ROP Observer coverage with considerations to increase coverage,
  - c. Recommend ROP Standards, and
  - d. Consider use of emerging technologies to support Observer work.
5. The IWG-ROP Chair provided an update to WCPFC20 ([WCPFC20-2023-IWGROP](#)) on the activities of the IWG-ROP. The IWG-ROP Chair suggested that **Annex 1** to the WCPFC20 update would provide the basis for intersessional email communications between IWG-ROP participants in 2024, and proposed that the priority work plan tasks would include:

- 1(b) "Observer data fields for "Species of Special Interest"; and
- 1(d) "Consider removal of redundant ROP data fields".

## 2024 progress to date

6. On 4<sup>th</sup> April 2024, the IWG-ROP Chair sent an email communication to IWG-ROP participants reiterating that highest priority work is to provide comments or feedbacks on tasks:

- 1(b) "Observer data fields for "Species of Special Interest". This can be seen on pages 20 - 22 of the table in Annex 1; and
- 1(d) "Consider removal of redundant ROP data fields"

Participants were also reminded that copies of relevant documents circulated by email to the IWG participants will be posted <https://www.wcpfc.int/iwg-rop>.

7. In response comments and suggestions were received from three IWG-ROP participants:

a. **New Zealand** – submitting suggestions related to IWG-ROP workplan priority 1(b) and providing suggested additional data fields related to SPECIAL GEAR ATTRIBUTES - seabird mitigation measures which primarily relate to enhancing observer data being collected for seabird mitigation measures on the surface longline fleet.

b. **United States** - supporting discussing Workplan priorities 1(b) and 1(d) and providing some preliminary views for those discussions. The United States indicated that they would like to reserve the opportunity to revisit and address other ROP workplan priorities in the course of the IWG's work between now and WCPFC21.

- for Workplan Priority 1(b) and Species of Special Interest: "it would be useful to request a notation on how much gear (eg, 0.5 m line) may be left on a released animal"
- for Workplan Priority 1(d) and streamlining:
  - support the suggested changes on pages 8-11 (*crew attributes, vessel attributes, and vessel electronics*) that would remove fields from the current WCPFC at sea form streamlining it and requiring the form to be updated accordingly,
  - support having further discussion on the specific fields being considered for placement officers' collection. In some cases, this will require an update to the SPC/FFA Regional Purse-Seine Fisheries Observer Workbook version "REV.2018" - Observer Placement Meeting Record that is used to place WCPFC observers on purse seine vessels, and
  - seek guidance and further discussion on how the following Alternative would result in streamlining "removing the field from observer forms which give more space to add new required fields."

c. **PNA Office** – provided some general comments:

- We generally support the proposals to remove fields that are redundant because the information can be sourced elsewhere, including on the WCPFC RFV. At the same time, we think it essential that there should be sufficiently robust fields retained in the MSDF so that an observer record can be reliably linked to a vessel. In that respect, we don't consider a Vessel Name alone is sufficient for that purpose because Vessel Names are often spelled in different ways. For that reason, we support retaining

either the WIN or the IMO number, or both.

- We don't support the rationale that removing fields from observer forms gives more space to add new required fields because the Commission should be planning for electronic reporting of observer data. We think it is sufficient to note that redundant fields should be removed from the MDSF because the information can be sourced elsewhere.
- We don't see the collection of data by a placement officer on a placement format as an alternative to inclusion of data fields in the MDSF because placement data is not provided as Commission data to our knowledge.
- We are not sure why it is proposed to retain the field "Vessel fish hold capacity" when this information is also available on the RFV, although we note that the units for this field in the RFV are volume or weight, whereas the units for the MFSD field are weight.
- We also notice that there is specific and different comment on this measurement for pole and line vessels, and we are not sure why.
- For vessels generally "The total maximum amounts in metric Tons (mT.) that the vessel freezers, wells and other fish storage areas on a vessel can hold."
- For pole and line vessels "Record in metric tonnes the total capacity of the fish holds of the vessel."
- Lastly, we have provided some specific comments regarding the Observer Trip Monitoring Report, which includes some alternative additional fields, for consideration.

## Review of ROP Minimum Standard Data Fields

8. The table in **Annex 1** sets out the data fields from the MSDF as they were approved by the Commission (refer to the [WCPFC website](#)). Data field categories are shown in the same order as the MSDF. Fields not suggested for removal have been retained in the table for ease of understanding and can be discussed if required. Areas that will be the subject of future work to review and modify ROP minimum data fields as set out in sections 1 – 4 of the [Workplan](#) are shown as placeholders.
9. Changes proposed to the existing ROP MSDF set out in **Annex 1** recognise that some data fields could be deleted as they are or could be collected by alternative mechanisms. The proposals are in accordance with 1d. of the [IWG-ROP Workplan 2023-2025](#) and additional suggestions of IWG participants received in 2024 have been reflected.
10. Other MSDF are not proposed for change, and the additional or alternative suggestions of IWG-ROP participants received in 2024 have also been reflected for consideration. Annex 1 recognises that further work is required by the IWG-ROP to identify the nature of the changes required to achieve the objectives of the taskings from [TCC18](#) (refer to Summary Report pages 27-28, 33-34 and 41-42) and [WCPFC19](#) (refer to Summary Report pages 77-78 and 80-81).
11. Other proposals relating to more substantive taskings to review and modify ROP minimum data fields as set out in sections 1 – 4 of the [Workplan](#) are shown as placeholders in **Annex 1** to indicate areas that will be the subject of future work.
12. There are additional areas for future changes to data collection requirements not reflected in the table below. Some were discussed during [TCC18](#) and others arose during [TCC19](#), in broader discussions on the ROP as part of the broader Commission data collection and monitoring framework. Future changes reflect the need to consider:

- a. new measures or changes to measures such as the draft measure on Crew Labour Standards being developed and FADMO-IWG proposals that include stronger FAD monitoring;
- b. refinements to current data fields collected by ROP observers to allow for more useful consideration of ROP data in the CCFS and in the Compliance Monitoring Scheme processes which includes the currently planned 2023-2024 work that prioritises improvements in ROP minimum standard data fields for Non-target and Associated or Dependent Species (NTADs) to allow for a distinction between an interaction that is of scientific interest from those interactions that are a possible infraction in the CCFS which include interactions or actions by the crew that could indicate a potential infringement has occurred;<sup>1</sup>
- c. refinements to ROP minimum standard data fields for sea turtles, seabirds, and mobulids that are relevant to the CMM obligations; and
- d. potential refinements to the shark CMM 2019-04 based on interpretation issues arising during CCM's evaluation of annual reporting for RY2021 and RY2022 during TCC19;
- e. refinements to ensure a balance and appropriate linkages between new measures and standard, specifications and procedures arising from the work of the ERandEM-IWG including taking account of the five data fields that were identified in the WCPFC agreed ER-standards for observer data<sup>2</sup> for consideration in future reviews of ROP minimum data standards:
  - i. VESSEL IDENTIFIER To support electronic reporting of observer data, to consider the inclusion of WCPFC RFV VID, which is currently encouraged, as mandatory field WCPFC field.
  - ii. EMBARK\_LAT is the actual depart LAT position for the observer trip (if embarking AT SEA)
  - iii. EMBARK\_LON is the actual depart LON position for the observer trip (if embarking AT SEA)
  - iv. DISEMBARK\_LAT is the actual depart LAT position for the observer trip (if disembarking AT SEA)
  - v. DISEMBARK\_LON is the actual depart LON position for the observer trip (if disembarking AT SEA); and
- f. use of the ROP to support Commission data collection and monitoring programmes for developing management measures e.g. harvest strategies (refer to [TCC19 Summary Report](#)) analytical discussion e.g. harvest strategies.

## Next steps

- 13. Further feedback on this paper is requested from IWG-ROP participants and SC20 and TCC20 participants. This will be used to further consider proposals for changes to MSDF in 2024.
- 14. It is noted that there may be flow-on effects that mean consequential changes to CMMs or other requirements such as the Electronic Reporting Standards for Observers may be needed.

---

<sup>1</sup> For further information see [TCC19-2023-09](#) Use of ROP data in the Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMS)

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.wcpfc.int/doc/data-05/e-reporting\\_ssps](https://www.wcpfc.int/doc/data-05/e-reporting_ssps)

**Working Table to facilitate intersessional feedback from IWG-ROP participants in 2023/24 in support of the review the ROP minimum standard data fields (MSDF) – and reflecting additional suggestions and comments from IWG-ROP participants received in 2024**

**Introduction**

The following table sets out proposals for initial change to MSDF for feedback and should be read in conjunction with the [IWG-ROP Workplan 2023-2025](#), and the two sets of [Electronic Reporting Standards for observer reporting](#), which respectively, provide additional details on the taskings for the IWG and on the data reporting standards and requirements already approved by the Commission.

It should be noted:

- a. the column \*\* “How Collected by Observer” indicates the method usually used to collect this information, but other methods of collection may be used; and
- b. where an “*Observer Placement Form/format*” has been suggested, this refers to the potential for a form/format to be created by observer providers that could collect this information as part of preparations for placement of an observer. For example, data can be taken from existing data such as the Record of Fishing Vessels for use by the observer. The observer can also check this information for any changes or updates. For example, the collection of phone numbers and other communication addresses currently collected by the observer during the trip can be collected at placement, checked once on board, and then ensures the observer provider has the latest communication information of the vessel in case of any emergency or need to communicate with the observer; this will aid with observer safety. This will also add to the currency and therefore quality of data held by the Commission.
- c. *Vessel logs* contain information on catch details and methods used to catch fish. The “Vessel Master” is often the best source of information on vessel dimensions and gear information, observers must rely on vessel captains and crew to give verbal information or documentation when collecting this information during the trip. The verbal information is difficult for observers to verify; therefore, the vessel captain could supply some of this information on their log sheets which can be checked against the RFV, etc.

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<b>GENERAL VESSEL AND TRIP INFORMATION FOR ALL VESSEL TYPES</b>			
<b>VESSEL IDENTIFICATION</b>			
Flag State Registration Number	Observer asks to check vessel documentation.	This information is available and collected in the RFV	This information could be collected by a placement officer on a placement format. Therefore, removing the field from observer forms which gives more space to add new required fields
Vessel Owner/Company	Observer asks to check vessel documentation	This information is available and collected in the RFV	This information could be collected by a placement officer on a placement format. Therefore, removing the field from observer forms which gives more space to add new required fields
WCPFC Identification number” WIN markings consistent with CMM 2004-03  WIN format for markings consistent with CMM 2004-03	Observer checks markings on vessel.  The (IRCS) Call Sign (Which is usually the same as the WIN number) of the vessel markings should be consistent with the measurements required by CMM 2004-03	This information is available and collected in the RFV.	If the vessel does not have an IRCS (Call sign) the flag State must create and issue a “WCPFC Identification Number” or WIN number and use this as the vessel identifier. In most cases, the IRCS and WIN are the same identifier.  If required should be checked when placing the observer on the vessel.
IMO’ or Lloyd’s Register number ‘LR”	Observer asks to check vessel documentation	This information is available and collected in the RFV	This information could be collected by a placement officer on a placement format. Therefore, removing the field

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
			from observer forms which give more space to add new required fields
<p>PNA Office comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We generally support the proposals to remove fields that are redundant because the information can be sourced elsewhere, including on the WCPFC RFV. At the same time, we think it essential that there should be sufficiently robust fields retained in the MSDF so that an observer record can be reliably linked to a vessel. In that respect, we don't consider a Vessel Name alone is sufficient for that purpose because Vessel Names are often spelled in different ways. For that reason, we support retaining either the WIN or the IMO number, or both.</li> <li>We don't support the rationale that removing fields from observer forms gives more space to add new required fields because the Commission should be planning for electronic reporting of observer data. We think it is sufficient to note that redundant fields should be removed from the MSDF because the information can be sourced elsewhere.</li> <li>We don't see the collection of data by a placement officer on a placement format as an alternative to inclusion of data fields in the MSDF because placement data is not provided as Commission data to our knowledge</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Data Fields in this section recommended to be retained.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Name of Vessel</li> <li>International Radio Call Sign</li> <li>Hull markings consistent with CMM 2004-03</li> </ul>			<b>Retain - No suggested changes</b>
<p><b>Data field in this section recommended to be added.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>WCPFC RFV VID</b></li> </ul>			Using a vessel identifier field ("VID") removes the redundancy of including all vessel attributes with each trip record and ensures standardisation and consistency through referencing the main Vessel Registry database.

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<b>VESSEL TRIP INFORMATION</b>			
<p><b>Data Fields in this section recommended to be retained.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Date and time of departure</li> <li>• Port of departure</li> <li>• Date and time of return</li> <li>• Port of return</li> </ul>			<p><b>Retain - No suggested changes</b></p>
<b>OBSERVER INFORMATION</b>			
<p><b>Data Fields in this section recommended to be retained.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observer name</li> <li>• Nationality of Observer</li> <li>• Observer Provider- Country or organisation</li> <li>• Date Time &amp; Location of observer Embarkation</li> <li>• Date, time and location of Disembarkation</li> </ul>			<p><b>Retain - No suggested changes</b></p> <p><b>Retain - No suggested changes</b></p>



CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<p><b>Data Fields in this section recommended to be added:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EMBARK_LAT</li> <li>• EMBARK_LON</li> <li>• DISEMBARK_LAT</li> <li>• DISEMBARK_LON</li> </ul>			<p>EMBARK_LAT is the actual depart LAT position for the observer trip (if embarking AT SEA)</p> <p>EMBARK_LON is the actual depart LON position for the observer trip (if embarking AT SEA)</p> <p>DISEMBARK_LAT is the actual depart LAT position for the observer trip (if disembarking AT SEA)</p> <p>DISEMBARK LON is the actual depart LON position for the observer trip (if disembarking AT SEA)</p>
<b>CREW INFORMATION</b>			
<p>Identification document-Captain</p>	<p>Observer either asks the captain for his passport or ID details, or if available can get this information from a crew list.</p>	<p>Observers should not need to record what document was used to prove nationality?</p> <p>Many observers do not ask to see nationality proof.</p>	<p>Crew lists are made up for immigration purposes and have these details for all crew which could be collected at time of placement. This may also help the crewing issues being discussed as can be compared at the beginning and end of trip.</p>
<p>Identification document-Fishing Master.</p>	<p>Observer either asks the fishing master for his passport or ID details, or if available can get</p>	<p>Observers should not need to record what document was used to prove nationality?</p>	<p>If needed could be collected on placement, noting that crew lists made up for immigration purposes will sometimes have these details for all</p>

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
	this information from a crew list.	Many observers do not ask to see nationality proof.	crew. which could be collected at time of placement. This may also help the crewing issues being discussed as can be compared at the beginning and end of trip.
<p>PNA comment: (as above for vessel identifiers)</p> <p>USA comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• support the suggested changes to crew attributes, vessel attributes, and vessel electronics that would remove fields from the current WCPFC at sea form streamlining it and requiring the form to be updated accordingly,</li> <li>• support having further discussion on the specific fields being considered for placement officers' collection. In some cases, this will require an update to the SPC/FFA Regional Purse-Seine Fisheries Observer Workbook version "REV.2018" - Observer Placement Meeting Record that is used to place WCPFC observers on purse seine vessels, and</li> <li>• seek guidance and further discussion on how the following Alternative would result in streamlining "removing the field from observer forms which give more space to add new required fields."</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Data Fields in this section recommended to be retained.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name of Captain</li> <li>• Nationality of Captain</li> <li>• Name of Fishing Master</li> <li>• Nationality of Fishing Master</li> <li>• Other Crew (Nationality)</li> <li>• Total Crew on board</li> </ul>			<p><b>Further work required – refer to IWG-ROP workplan 2023-2025 priority task 1c.</b></p> <p>Additionally in respect of crew information the IWG-ROP will also need to take into consideration the outcome of work being undertaken by the Intersessional Work on Crew Labour Standards</p>
<b>VESSEL ATTRIBUTES</b>			

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
Length (specify unit)	<p>Observer asks to check vessel documentation or the vessel plan.</p> <p>Observer cannot verify if length is correct.</p>	This information is available and collected in the RFV	This information could be collected by a placement officer on a placement format. Therefore, removing the field from observer forms which give more space to add new required fields
Tonnage (specify unit)	<p>Observer asks to check vessel documentation or the vessel plan.</p> <p>Observer cannot verify if tonnage is correct</p>	This information is available and collected in the RFV	This information could be collected by a placement officer on a placement format. Therefore, removing the field from observer forms which give more space to add new required fields
Engine power (Specify unit)	Observer can get this in several ways, can get it from engine model number info online if available. Most observers ask the engineer who will tell them the HP.	This information is available and collected in the RFV	This information could be collected by a placement officer on a placement format. Therefore, removing the field from observer forms which give more space to add new required fields
<p>PNA comment: (as above for vessel identifiers)</p> <p>USA comment: (as above for crew attributes)</p>			

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
Vessel fish hold capacity		<p>PNA Comment:</p> <p>Could be also considered for removal, because this information is also available on the RFV, although we note that the units for this field in the RFV are volume or weight, whereas the units for the MFSD field are weight.</p>	<p>We also notice that there is specific and different comment on this measurement for pole and line vessels, and we are not sure why.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For vessels generally “The total maximum amounts in metric Tons (mT.) that the vessel freezers, wells and other fish storage areas on a vessel can hold.”</li> <li>- For pole and line vessels “Record in metric tonnes the total capacity of the fish holds of the vessel.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Data Fields in this section recommended to be retained.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vessel Cruising Speed</li> <li>• Freezer Type</li> </ul>			<b>Retain - No suggested changes</b>
<b>VESSEL ELECTRONICS (Indicate “Yes or No)</b>			
Global Positioning System (GPS) (Yes/ No)	Observers view instrument and copy details of units.	All vessels have GPS. This field was introduced when GPS was taking over from Sat-Nav.	All vessels have GPS in some way. Not needed to be collected as GPS is on about every piece of electronic equipment on a vessel, phones, etc.
Weather Facsimile	Observers view instrument and copy details of units.	Introduced when Telex was still being used on board vessels.	Most vessels have a mechanism determining weather, many subscribe to online weather services.

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
Sea Surface Temperature (SST) gauge	Observers view instrument and copy details if required.	This was introduced when SST was changing from a paper format to electronic format. SST is included as an add on in different electronic devices.	SST is an application on different marine electronic devices on a vessel.
Expendable Bathythermograph (XBT)	Observers view instrument and copy details if required	Very few vessels use this device.	This equipment is rare and if recorded could come under the field "Other Electronic Equipment" therefore allowing more space for other fields.
Satellite Communications Services (Phone/Fax/Email addresses and Numbers. )	Observers view instruments; documentation; asks captain/ radio operator; for numbers etc.	This information is available and collected in the RFV	This information should be collected on placement so both the observer and onshore office have the latest vessel communication numbers.
Vessel Monitoring System	Observers are asked to identify the system used and the make and model of the units on board	Collected in RFV as well as VMS Registers. Field was introduced to observer collection when VMS started to be placed on vessels.	All vessels have VMS on board and information is available elsewhere. This information could be collected by a placement officer on a placement format. Therefore, removing the field from observer forms which give more space to add new required fields
<b>Data Fields to be considered for possible removal.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Radar</li> <li>• Track Plotter</li> <li>• Doppler Current Monitor</li> </ul>	Observers view instrument and copy details where required	Most vessels that take observers have this all or some of this equipment, These instruments are not being considered for definite removal, but should be considered	This information could be collected by a placement officer on a placement format. Therefore, removing the field from observer forms which give more space to add new required fields

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<p>PNA comment: (as above for vessel identifiers)</p> <p>USA comment: (as above for crew attributes)</p>			
<p><b>Data Fields in this section recommended to be retained.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depth Sounders</li> <li>• Sonar</li> <li>• Radio /Satellite Buoys</li> <li>• Fishery Information Service</li> <li>• Other Electronic Equipment</li> </ul>			<p><b>Retain - no Changes</b></p> <p>Additionally in respect of vessel electronics the IWG-ROP may consider requesting advice from the Scientific Committee about data fields or information that observers could collect to support fishing effort standardization analyses.</p>

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<b>LONGLINE INFORMATION</b>			
<b>VESSEL ATTRIBUTES</b>			
<b>Data Fields in this section recommended to be retained.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refrigeration Method</li> </ul>			Retain - no Changes
<b>GENERAL GEAR ATTRIBUTES</b>			
<b>Data Fields in this section</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mainline length</li> <li>Mainline Material</li> <li>Mainline diameter</li> <li>Branch line Materials</li> </ul>			Further work required – refer to IWG-ROP workplan 2023-2025 priority task 1b.
<b>SPECIAL GEAR ATTRIBUTES</b>			
<b>Data Fields in this section</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wire Trace</li> <li>Line Shooter</li> <li>Automatic Bait Thrower</li> <li>Automatic Branch Line attached.</li> <li>Hook Type</li> <li>Hook Size</li> <li>Tori line*</li> <li>Side setting with bird curtains</li> <li>Weighted branch Lines*</li> <li>Shark Lines</li> <li>Blue Dyed Bait</li> <li>Distance between Weight and Hook</li> <li>Deep Setting Line Shooter</li> </ul>			Further work required – refer to IWG-ROP workplan 2023-2025 priority task 1b.  New Zealand supported additions for tori lines, night setting, weighted branch lines ((in addition to trip level data collected), and hook shielding devices (see below)

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Management of Offal Discharge</li> <li>Strategic Offal Disposal</li> </ul> <p><b>Fields that could be considered for removal.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mainline hauler</li> <li>Branch line hauler</li> </ul>			<p><b>Further work required – refer to IWG-ROP workplan 2023-2025 priority task 1b.</b></p>
<p><b>New Zealand suggested additions</b></p>	<p><u>Additional Data Field Description</u>          - additions primarily relate to enhancing observer data being collected for seabird mitigation measures on the surface longline fleet</p>		
<p><b>For tori lines:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Condition of Tori Line(s)</li> </ul>	<p>Record whether or not the vessel will use at least one tori line <b>at the trip level</b> (Yes or No). If yes, measure the length of all overall tori lines to be used, length and number of streamers (both long and short, if applicable), and if streamers cover minimum aerial extent.</p>		



CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tori line aerial extent</li> </ul>	<p>Where a tori line is recorded to be used at the set level, estimate the total aerial extent during the duration of setting of fishing lines.</p>		
<p><b>For Night Setting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Time of Nautical Dawn</li> <li>Night Setting</li> </ul>	<p>Where night setting is used (Yes or No), record the time of nautical dawn in UTC for the location recorded under [Latitude and Longitude of start of Set].</p> <p><b>At the set level</b>, record whether or not (Yes or No) if fishing lines were set after nautical dawn and before nautical dusk.</p>		
<p><b>For Weighted Branch Lines (in addition to trip level data collected)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weighted brand lines (set level)</li> </ul>	<p>Record whether or not the vessel uses weighted branch lines <b>at the set level</b>, including coverage of gear using weighted branch lines (Yes – 100% of lines, Yes, mixed - specify percentage of overall gear, or No)</p>		
<p><b>For Hook Shielding Devices</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hook Shielding Devices</li> </ul>	<p>Record whether or not the vessel uses Hook Shielding Devices <b>at</b></p>		

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
	<p>the set level, including percentage of overall branch lines with hook shielding devices (Yes – 100% of lines, Yes, mixed – specify percentage of overall gear, or No</p>		
<b>LONG LINE SET INFORMATION</b>			
<p><b>Data Fields in this section</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Date and time of start of set</li> <li>• Latitude and Longitude of start of Set</li> <li>• Date and Time of end of set</li> <li>• Latitude and Longitude of end of Set</li> <li>• Total number of baskets or floats</li> <li>• Number of hooks per basket, or number of hooks between floats</li> <li>• Total number of hooks used in a set.</li> <li>• Line shooter speed</li> <li>• Length of float-line</li> <li>• Distance between branch-lines</li> <li>• Length of branch-lines</li> <li>• Number of light-sticks</li> <li>• Target species</li> <li>• Bait Species</li> <li>• Date and time of start of haul</li> <li>• Date and time of end of haul</li> </ul>			<p><b>Further work required – refer to IWG-ROP workplan 2023-2025 priority task 1b.</b></p>

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total amount of baskets, floats monitored by observer in a single set</li> </ul>			
<b>INFORMATION ON CATCH FOR EACH SET</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Data Fields in this section</b></li> <li>Hook number, between floats</li> <li>Species code</li> <li>Length of fish</li> <li>Length measurement code</li> <li>Gender</li> <li>Condition when caught</li> <li>Fate</li> <li>Condition when released</li> <li>Tag recovery information</li> </ul>			<p>Further work required – refer to IWG-ROP workplan 2023-2025 priority task 1b.</p>
<b>PURSE SEINE INFORMATION AND DATA</b>			
<b>VESSEL AND RELATED ATTRIBUTES</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of onboard support vessels</li> <li>Aircraft Make/Model, /Colour/Call-sign/Registration</li> </ul>			<p><b>Retain - No suggested changes</b></p> <p>The IWG-ROP may consider requesting advice from the Scientific Committee about data fields or information that observers could collect to support fishing effort standardization analyses.</p>
<b>GEAR ATTRIBUTES</b>			
MSDF in this section are retained.			<b>Retain - No suggested changes</b>

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brailer capacity sizes</li> </ul>			
Max Depth of Net	Get information from engineer, or if available from net diagram configuration	There is no way the observer can measure this and must ask the engineer or captain.	As the vessel knows this information could be put on Vessel logs to be supplied by vessel or could be collected at placement of observer.
Max length of Net	Get information from engineer, or if available from net diagram configuration	There is no way the observer can measure this and must ask the engineer or captain.	As the vessel knows this information should be put it on Vessel logs to be supplied by vessel or could be collected at placement of observer
Net Mesh Size	Observer measures main body of the net mesh size.	Observers can measure this but unless there are mesh size restrictions why do they need to measure.	As the vessel knows this information put it on Vessel logs to be supplied by the vessel the observer could be asked to verify the log entry by measuring the net mesh size, also a net plan can be collected at placement
Net Strips	FFA & PNA Observer calculates this from info given or asks the engineer	Field not is not a MDSF. But is on many Forms	Why is this field required if net depth is given, observer has no way of verifying his answer. Could also be put on Vessel log sheet if really required?
<b>INFORMATION ON DAILY ACTIVITIES</b>			
MSDF in this section are retained. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Date and time of start of daily activities</li> <li>Time of activity</li> <li>Latitude and longitude of activity</li> </ul>			<b>Retain - No suggested changes</b>

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<p>Numbers of school floating objects sighted per day</p>	<p>Observer is asked to record every free school or floating object sighted during the day when searching, also record all activities involved with free schools and floating objects. For this to be accurate the observer would need to be on constant watch from 0430 to 1930 every day 15/16 hrs. a day</p>	<p>Information is not reliable as observers do not stay on the bridge all day looking for schools or floating objects. Therefore, figures collected are erroneous and not a true indication.</p>	<p>There are problems with the collection of this field. Observers do not sit on the bridge all day while searching and therefore can miss several school /floating object sightings.</p> <p>Observers tend to count the number and type of schools they investigate or set on during the day, this information is already included in their daily activity columns.</p> <p>If fields are needed a time in hours the observer spent looking for these objects should be added</p>
<b>SCHOOL INFORMATION</b>			
<p>All MSDF in this section are retained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Method of detection of school</li> <li>• Type of school association</li> </ul>			<p><b>Retain - No suggested changes</b></p> <p>The IWG-ROP may consider requesting advice from the Scientific Committee about data fields or information that observers could collect to support fishing effort standardization analyses</p>

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<b>SET INFORMATION</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Data Fields in this section</b> Observer's record of date and time of start of set</li> <li>• Observers record of date and time of end of set</li> <li>• Vessel's record of date and time of start of set</li> <li>• Retained catch, by species</li> <li>• Discards, by species</li> <li>• Tag recovery information</li> </ul>			<p><b>Further work required – refer to IWG-ROP workplan 2023-2025 priority task 1b.</b></p>
<b>INFORMATION ON CATCH FOR EACH SET</b>			
<p>All MSDF in this section are retained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Species code</li> <li>• Length measurement code</li> <li>• Length</li> </ul>			<p><b>Retain - No suggested changes</b></p>

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<b>POLE-AND-LINE INFORMATION AND DATA</b>			
<b>VESSEL ATTRIBUTES</b>			
MSDF in this section are retained <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vessel fish hold capacity</li> </ul>			<b>Retain - No suggested changes</b>
<b>GEAR ATTRIBUTES</b>			
MSDF in this section are retained <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Automatic poling devices</li> </ul>			<b>Retain - No suggested changes</b>
<b>INFORMATION ON DAILY ACTIVITIES</b>			
MSDF in this section are retained. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Date and time of start of daily activities</li> <li>• Time of activity,</li> <li>• Latitude and longitude of activity</li> <li>• Type of activity</li> <li>• Numbers of school sighted per day</li> </ul>			<b>Retain - No suggested changes</b>

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<b>BAITFISHING INFORMATION</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All MSDF in this section are retained</li> <li>• Bait species caught</li> <li>• Bait Species purchased</li> <li>• Estimated weight or quantity of bait caught or used</li> </ul>			<b>Retain - No suggested changes</b>
<b>SCHOOL INFORMATION</b>			
<p>All MSDF in this section are retained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Type of school association</li> <li>• Method of detection of school</li> </ul>			<b>Retain - No suggested changes</b>
<b>INFORMATION ON CATCH PER SCHOOL FISHED</b>			
<p>All MSDF in this section are retained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of crew poling</li> <li>• Time of start of spraying, chumming and poling</li> <li>• Time of end of spraying, chumming and poling</li> <li>• Retained catch, by species</li> </ul>			<b>Retain - No suggested changes</b>



CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discards, by species</li> <li>Tag recovery information</li> <li>Species code</li> <li>Length measurement code,</li> <li>Length</li> </ul>			

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<b>SPECIES OF SPECIAL INTEREST</b> <b>Marine Reptiles, Marine Mammals, Seabirds, Designated Shark Species, Mobulid Rays</b>			
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>			
<b>Data Fields in this section</b> Type of interaction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Latitude and longitude of interaction</li> <li>Date and time of interaction</li> <li>Species code of marine reptile, marine mammal, or seabird.</li> </ul>			<b>Further work required – refer to IWG-ROP workplan 2023-2025 priority task 1b.</b>  <i>USA suggestion: it would be useful to request a notation on how much gear (eg, 0.5 m line) may be left on a released animal</i>

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<b>LANDED ON DECK</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Data Fields in this section</b>Length</li> <li>• Length measurement code</li> <li>• Gender</li> <li>• Estimated shark fin weight by species.</li> <li>• Estimated shark carcass weight by species.</li> <li>• Condition when landed on Deck</li> <li>• Condition when released</li> <li>• Tag recovery information</li> <li>• Tag release information</li> </ul>			<p><b>Further work required – refer to IWG-ROP workplan 2023-2025 priority task 1b.</b></p> <p>Additionally in respect of shark data fields the IWG-ROP will also need to take into consideration that TCC19 highlighted there were interpretation issues related to CMM 2019-04 paragraph 9, and specifically around rules and monitoring for any alternative measures to fins naturally attached.</p>
<b>INTERACTION WITH VESSEL OR GEAR ONLY</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Data Fields in this section</b> Vessel’s activity during interaction</li> <li>• Condition observed at start of interaction</li> <li>• Condition observed at end of interaction</li> <li>• Description of interaction</li> <li>• Number of animals sighted</li> </ul>			<p><b>Further work required – refer to IWG-ROP workplan 2023-2025 priority task 1b.</b></p> <p>Additionally in respect of shark data fields the IWG-ROP will also need to take into consideration that TCC19 highlighted there were interpretation issues related to CMM 2019-04 paragraph 9, and specifically around alternative measures to fins naturally attached.</p>

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<b>VESSELS &amp; AIRCRAFT SIGHTINGS</b>			
<b>VESSELS &amp; AIRCRAFT SIGHTINGS</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All MSDF in this section are retained.</li> <li>• UTC. Date &amp; Time of sighting</li> <li>• Observers Vessel Latitude and Longitude position</li> <li>• Where possible sighted vessel or aircraft Name</li> <li>• Where possible sighted vessel or aircraft call-sign</li> <li>• Flag of sighted vessel if possible</li> <li>• Other vessel markings</li> <li>• Type of Vessel (i.e. Purse-seine - Long line, etc.)</li> <li>• Compass bearing from observers vessels to sighted vessel</li> <li>• Estimated distance from observers vessels to sighted vessel</li> <li>• Activity of sighted vessel i.e., Fishing, Drifting, Steaming etc.</li> </ul>			<p><b>Retain - No suggested changes.</b></p>

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<b>OBSERVER TRIP MONITORING SUMMARY</b>			
<p><b>Data Fields in this section</b></p> <p>Vessel trip summary</p> <p>Code indications (ie SPC/FFA GEN 3 codes)</p>		<p>PNA comment: Much of the vessel trip monitoring summary data are not useful for the purpose of the CCFS. Only RS-a to RS-d, WC-c, PN-a, and perhaps LC-a to LC-f are sufficiently useful for the CCFS. All other vessel trip data in this form is not relevant towards the CCFS purposes. But this not relevant data are useful and can be used to inform the effectiveness and review of certain CMMs implementation</p>	<p><b>Further work required – refer to IWG-ROP workplan 2023-2025 priority task 1a.</b></p> <p>PNA provided some suggestions on this area</p>
<p><b>PNA suggested alternative fields to be added</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new check box beside the page no. column to indicate that the checked Y by observers on the form has been verified.</li> <li>• Whether the report has been debriefed;</li> <li>• A summary text box option for the debriefer to provide</li> </ul>	<p>Comment: the checkbox will confirm the conclusion that either it was a false positive/ or is a case where compliance actions need to be considered. In doing so, it will provide a level of certainty of whether a case needs to be on the CCFS.</p> <p>The purpose of these fields is so that the debriefer can indicate that the trip data is being reviewed or cleared for CCFS use. If the provided</p>		

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
comments	comments suggest for compliance actions, then that will be taken note of and enter into the CCFS. But if it indicates that the data is cleared with no further consideration, that comments need to be taken note of and not entered in the CCFS.		

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<b>FAD Data Fields</b>			
<b>Data Fields</b>			<p><b>Further work required – refer to IWG-ROP workplan 2023-2025 priority task 1b.</b></p> <p>Additionally in respect of FAD data fields the IWG-ROP will also need to take into consideration the outcome of discussions on the Chairs Consultative Draft for CMM 2022-01, and work being undertaken by FAD Management Options IWG.</p>

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
<b>Minimum Data Fields for Observer Transshipment Monitoring - 2023</b>			

CURRENT FIELD	HOW COLLECTED **	RATIONALE FOR REMOVAL	ALTERNATIVE AND/OR COMMENT
Data Fields			<p>Further work required – refer to IWG-ROP workplan 2023-2025 priority task 1c and 1e.</p> <p>Additionally, the IWG-ROP will also need to take into consideration the outcome of the Transshipment IWG.</p>

---