



**SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE
EIGHTH REGULAR SESSION**

7-15 August 2012
Busan, Republic of Korea

Summary of Regional Observer Programme Audits

WCPFC-SC8-2012/ ST-IP-03

SECRETARIAT

1. The Convention of the Commission “*Article 28 Para 1*” directed that a Regional Observer Programme be developed; The Convention says in Article 28 Para 3 “*The regional observer programme shall consist of independent and impartial observers authorized by the Secretariat of the Commission*” It was realized that it would be difficult to authorize each individual observer, and therefore the Commission decided in *CMM 2007-01 Para 12 (b)* that observer providers would be authorized, and therefore Observers that they nominate as being trained to Commission standards are authorized to carry out Regional Observer Programme duties.
2. Observer programmes that wished to be part of the Regional Observer Programme (ROP) were asked to nominate an Observer Coordinators and provide materials on their programme to the Secretariat. The programmes were initially “Interim Authorised and to gain full authorisation were subject to an audit against a set of standards developed by the Commissions ROP Intersessional Working Group and later approved by TCC and the Commission. The Secretariat was tasked to complete the audits of all programmes before June 30th 2012.
3. The ROP section of the Commission Secretariat commenced its audits of Regional Observer Programme (ROP) interim authorised observer programmes in late 2010 and has completed audits of the 23 national and sub regional programmes that are part of the ROP by the due date June 30th 2012 - Programmes audited are in listed in Table 2
4. The purpose of the audits was to ensure that Commission standards are being applied and/or is being developed and maintained by the interim authorised programmes.
5. In most cases the programmes audited were well developed and were following the agreed Commission standards to the best of their ability. However there were standards that needed improvement in some programmes and before full authorisation occurred the Secretariat and the

programme worked on issues that needed to be resolved. The observations in this paper are for each standard, and the problems that some programmes were having with these standards.

6. TCC6 recommended that the “Final ROP Audit Report” be provided to the CCM involved, with notification only relayed to the TCC and Commission when a programme fully complied with Commission standards. This report is a summary of the audits carried out on the 23 observer programmes that have nominated to be part of the Regional Observer programme. To obtain a copy of an audit for a members observer programme; members would need to communicate directly with the programme they are interested in to get the final audit summary of that programme.

Audit of Standards adopted by the Commission

Minimum Data Fields

Standard

7. *The standard for “Data Fields, Management, Distribution and Use” will be that CCMs will use existing data field formats collected by their national or sub regional observer programmes and that also they will ensure that the Commission minimum data standard fields for the ROP are included in their data collection formats.*

Observation

8. The FFA/SPC formats which are used by most Pacific Island programmes were changed to include all the WCPFC approved data fields. The new format introduced contains all the WCPFC approved data fields. Formats used by other programmes not affiliated with FFA/SPC are either using the approved data fields in their formats or have undertaken to include all the approved data fields in their formats, some of these programmes have used a set of forms and formats that the Secretariat had developed as a guideline.

Observer Training

Standard

9. *Standard for “Observer Training” is that training programmes should be linked to the Commission’s decisions in place, available for review and training programme materials provided to the Secretariat*

Observation

10. During the audit process it was found that many programmes had their own standards for training and there was a great variation on what was thought to be an adequate standard. The Commission standard for observer training as shown above is reasonably broad and allows programmes to develop observer training formats to suit their situation. The programmes were checked against a list of parameters preferred as training subjects developed by the Secretariat Table 1. Programmes

were not required to have all these parameters as part of their training; however the audit has shown that most of the programmes had included training in most of these areas. Following the audit, some of the programmes undertook to include a couple of the subjects from the list that they are currently not using in their training program.

Table 1.

Guideline for Training Parameters.	
Training	should include but not be limited to
1.	Fisheries management;
2.	Understanding MCS;
3.	WCPFC Convention and related CMMs;
4.	Importance of observer programmes , understanding authority and responsibilities of observers;
5.	Safety at sea – emergencies at sea, survival at sea;
6.	First Aid;
7.	Species identification, including target, non-target, protected species, etc.
8.	Fishing vessel & Gear types
9.	Vessel identification & markings;
10.	Techniques of verification of catch logbooks;
11.	Techniques of estimating catch and species composition;
12.	Fish sampling, Measuring and Weighing techniques;
13.	Preservation of samples for analysis;
14.	Data collection codes and data collection formats;
15.	Use of digital recorders;
16.	Basic knowledge of navigation including latitude/longitude; compasses; bearings; chart work; plotting a position;
17.	Electronic equipment & understanding their operations ;
18.	The use of radios & communications;
19.	Verbal debriefing & Report Writing;
20.	Health at Sea issues;

11. The Pacific Island (PI) programmes are all using approved Pacific Island Regional Fisheries Observer (PIRFO) standards developed for observer training by FFA/SPC. The PIRFO standard has been developed over a number of years and is updated regularly.
12. Across all programmes there was no conformity on educational qualification for entrance to courses with some requiring passes in certain subjects at high school, while others required degree certification preferably in marine studies or science?
13. Courses also had variable pass criteria, with observer trainees in some courses requiring a pass of at least 75% in each subject, to other courses requiring a general overall pass of 50%.
14. The training venues varied, with some world class facilities being used for all aspects of observer training. Training sessions in some countries were limited to a single class room, with training in some areas such as sea safety being conducted elsewhere.

15. Training materials for the FFA/SPC training is standard across all FFA/SPC observer programmes; all other observer programmes had relevant training materials, some in their own language. Species ID guides were variable and because a couple of programmes were carrying out observation work on non-tuna vessels such as trawlers, etc. Species guides often included many species not caught in tuna fishing operations. The species ID guide produced by SPC was used by all PI programmes and was also popular with a couple of non FFA/SPC programmes who were also using this guide.
16. Some of the concerns detected during audits included the quality of observer trainees chosen for observer courses. In a couple of countries selection of trainees had initially been rushed to accommodate the need to have observers ready for the 100% purse seine coverage. It was noted that some participants struggled to pass the basic requirements of the training course and were given supplementary tests to get them qualified. Unfortunately this may be the partial cause to why an amount of poor quality data was collected by some observers. The education standards and variations in passing grades also may have contributed to some poor quality data being collected.

Observer Trainers

Standard

17. *The ROP standard for the Commission for “Observer Trainers is: “CCMs will use existing national and or sub-regional training standards. CCMs will develop trainer qualifications, available for review by the Secretariat.”*

Observation

18. During the audit the Secretariat checked for observer trainers that have been authorized by their sub regional and national observer programme to train observers on their behalf. It was found that observer trainers may be internal to the programme, or in some cases may be specialists brought in from other programmes or organisations.
19. Senior expert observers from PI and other programmes are generally selected to be taught the techniques used in observer training. Training for the PI observer programmes is carried out by FFA/SPC with the intention that PI programmes will eventually be able to use their own personnel to train their own observers. The PI programmes also use external experts in some of the subjects taught when available to enhance the training. Non FFA/SPC programmes use the coordinator to organise the training and have many different persons/experts to train observers on observer subject matters. In some programmes trainees are paired with an expert trainer for a few courses and then tested before they become a fully approved trainer. Other programmes have no experienced trainers and rely totally on outside assistance and experts to train their observers.

Code of Conduct

Standard

20. *The agreed standard for “Code of Conduct” is that each CCM should have a Code of Conduct in place, available to each observer, available for review and if not in place, to be developed.*

Observation

21. Code of Conduct should provide a set of guiding principles relating to accepted behaviour and standards of conduct while serving as an ROP Observer.
22. All programmes except one had a “Code of Conduct” in place; with assistance from the Secretariat this programme has since developed and adopted a Code of Conduct. It was found that in all cases the “Code of Conduct” is explained during training sessions for observers, and often includes protocols to investigate complaints or breaches. In a couple of programmes observers were only given the code at the beginning of their observer careers, these programmes were advised that the code should be more accessible and that reminding observers of its contents often was desirable. A numbers of programmes re-issue the code whenever contracts are signed, and some programmes gave a copy of the code to each observer as a standard issue for every trip. During the audit the Secretariat suggested to all programmes that there would be no harm if each programme issued the code as part of the materials given to the observers prior to each trip.

Sea Safety

Standard

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

Observation

24. Sea Safety involves the training of sea safety to international standards and procedures that observer receive before they are permitted to carry out duties on board a vessel at sea.
25. Most programmes used Maritime Colleges to assist in the training of their observer participants for “Sea Safety”. Many programmes had experts and world class facilities to train the observer in sea safety techniques, whereas some programmes only used a qualified lecturer in international “Sea Safety” standards in the class room, and then were taken to an external water sight for practical training. A couple of programmes did not have a college to issue certificates and relied on qualified navy patrol boat personnel to carry out this training.
26. In most Sea Safety training courses participants that passed the courses were given “Certificates of Sea Safety” indicating they have completed and passed the course to international standards. Many

programmes require observer to be continually refreshed in sea safety techniques after a designated time period; normally this was every 3-5 years.

Placement /Deployment

Standard

27. *The standard for “Coordinating Placement” is that the*
- *WCPFC National Observer Programme Coordinator should be in place,*
 - *There should be a system for observer placement administration and that documentation describing observer placement administration should be provided to the Secretariat.*
 - *Audit measures to check on deployment procedures will be developed by the Secretariat*

Observation

28. The provider of the observers will be responsible for the deployment of the observer and will ensure the selected observer is provided with all possible assistance to board a vessel.
29. There was a WCPFC ROP Coordinator in place for all programmes audited. Procedures in some programmes are documented and copies of the procedures were made available to the ROP section of the Secretariat; some programmes did not have direct documentation of placement procedures, but procedures were spread through general administration manuals. The procedures in the documents that were presented were acceptable. It was suggested to a couple of programmes to update documentation given 100% observer coverage of purse seiners, carriers and the 5 % coverage of long liners.
30. Problems of payment of observers and the collection of funds for observer programmes were detected during the audit and whilst outside the scope of the audit, there is a need to have a standard in place for collection of funds and payment of observers.
31. Behaviour of observers with observer placements and disembarkations are also not covered by the Commission ROP standards and it is suggested that additional standards should be developed by the Commission. Currently observer behaviour on placement or disembarkation is dealt with by Code of Conducts and is monitored by the sub regional and/or national observer programmes.

Debriefing & Briefing

Standard

32. *The standard for “Briefing and De-briefing of observers” is that there is a system for briefing and de-briefing of observers in place and documentation describing briefing and de-briefing available to the ROP section of the Commission Secretariat*

Observation

33. For the purposes of the Audit we accepted the observer to debriefer ratio to be satisfactory at approximately 10 observers to 1 debriefer.
34. The process of training debriefers has been developed and is in place for many countries. A debriefing format has been developed in most countries and is being used during the debriefing of all observers; unfortunately for some countries there are only a very small number of debriefers trained and qualified; these countries have the task of certifying more debriefers to what is accepted as a satisfactory ratio. The audit found that there is a current deficiency of the number of dedicated certified debriefers with proper facilities to operate in most PI countries; it will take time to get these programmes up to a satisfactory ratio level for debriefing.
35. The Observer Coordinators of all countries visited were aware of the needs to have a satisfactory ratio of debriefers to observers, however it was noted that in a couple of countries the administration had not assisted by allocating space or funds to allow for more debriefers to be trained and did not facilitate office space so debriefing could take place in a suitable environment.
36. There is continuous training of experienced observers to be debriefers to build up capacity and quality in PI countries, but it may take a couple of years to be able to get the required numbers for comprehensive and accurate debriefing of all observer trips.
37. Because of the unavailability of debriefers in some programmes it was reported that in a couple of programmes unqualified debriefers such as senior observers, the fisheries observer coordinator and others not connected to the programmes were assisting to debrief some of the trips.
38. Since starting the Audit process in 2010 many programmes were reported earlier as having insufficient debriefers, however these programmes have since been able to train more debriefers and have bolstered their numbers, the debriefing while still not a satisfactory ratio for some programmes, continues to improve. There are still further requirements for trained debriefers and in most cases it has been recommended that programmes be further audited in a couple of years 2014/2015 to ensure the debriefer ratio to observers is acceptable.
39. There are ramifications on the unavailability of debriefers, as it is proposed elsewhere that vessels have access to information of the observer's trip aboard their vessel after an observer has been debriefed. This will be difficult to comply with if the observer data and information hasn't been debriefed and checked for correctness and completeness, due to the lack of available debriefers.

Debriefing Training

Standard

40. *The Standard for qualification of observer debriefers is that debriefers will be experienced in observer matters and that CCMs will use existing national and sub-regional programme standards*

for debriefers. CCMs will prepare qualifications for a debriefer, available for review by the Secretariat.

Observation

41. Each programme uses their own standards for debriefer trainers; the PI programmes use the FFA/SPC debriefing standards developed as part of the FFA/SPC regional harmonization process. Other programmes have developed their standards using experienced observers. It was also noted that some programmes use persons for debriefing that are not directly observer experienced. In some programmes debriefing is carried out by more than one person usually the coordinator/administrator, scientist and/or a compliance officer. The ultimate goal of each programme is to have sufficient trained persons to be able to carry out full and comprehensive debriefings of all their observers.

Equipment and Materials

Standard

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

Observation

43. All programmes provided basic equipment for observers to carry out their tasks; however safety equipment is not distributed by a small number of programmes. These programmes rely on agreement with vessels to provide observers with safety equipment when they are on board carrying out observer duties, therefore observers may not have serviced or checked safety equipment made available when carrying out their duties on these vessels.
44. Budgets in some observer programmes did not include funding for materials including safety equipment; in a couple of programmes there was a reliance of assistance for these items from other organisations(e.g. FFA/SPC) to supply basic equipment including safety equipment. Equipment in a couple of programmes was found to be in poor order and was not properly monitored and maintained by observer programme staff before distribution. Observers should also take responsibility of the items issued to them and a system of reporting defects was not in place in a couple of programmes.
45. A number of programmes distributed an excellent range of basic and safety equipment for the observer and in some programmes observers were not permitted to board a vessel without all this equipment being checked and in order.

Communications

Standard

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

Observation

47. Radio communication protocols were included in nearly all of the observer training programmes audited. Regular communications are useful for many purposes, including regular observer reports and the safety and wellbeing of observers. Generally observers had no regular direct voice communications with their headquarters. Sometimes a “Satellite Phone” was used if supplied or available on vessels; however the majority of observers send regular weekly reports by Email or fax to their providers.
48. A few coordinators reported that depending on the individual vessel and the attitude of the captain some observers were denied access to communications and were unable to report regularly.
49. It was noted that many small long liners do not have any communication facilities other than HF/VHF radio and observers asked to carry out duties on these longliners will need to be refreshed with Radio Communication protocols from time to time.

Performance of Observers

Standard

50. *The standard for “Measuring Performance” is a means to report on the performance of the observer programme and a means to report on the performance of individual observers as part of the annual reporting requirements established by the Commission.*

Observation

51. Determining the performance of individual observers was different in just about every programme audited, this ranged from using data collected as the sole method of judging performance to some quiet complex procedures. Many government employed observers go through the same procedures as developed for all staff working for the government.
52. Most programmes intended to use the reports and the data collected from the debriefing of observers as a means to help determine performance of their observers; these are made available for each trip that is debriefed. Long term appraisal will rely on the programmes being able to debrief the observer properly and using opinions by data quality officers on the quality of the data collected by the observer. It was noted that a few observer coordinators interviewed indicated in some programmes, that they have dismissed and suspended observers for not attaining standards that they believe have not met their programme requirements for data collections.
53. Other areas of assessment such as behaviour and attitude are also used when making performance assessments and even if an observer collects excellent data but fails in the areas of behaviour and attitude they still may be dismissed or given heavy warnings.
54. Training or retraining of observers is important to ensure quality data is collected at all times. Ensuring that proper debriefing occurs from qualified debriefers for each observer returning from a

trip is also extremely important for observer's development and for the overall quality of information collected by the programme.

Dispute mechanism

Standard

55. *The standard for "Dispute Settlement" is a dispute resolution mechanism should be in place, and if not in place, to be developed, and a description of the dispute resolution mechanism provided to the Secretariat*

Observation

56. Most programmes audited had as part of their 'Code of Conduct' protocols on how to handle disputes and most also had a consultation process and some had suggested penalties for observer infringements. It was unclear in many programmes, other than a formal letter to the programme Director, whether there is a procedure or mechanism in place for vessels to complain about observer conduct and work ethic. Many programmes where observers were employed by the government also had access to the normal government dispute procedures.

Authorisation process

Standard

57. *The Secretariat will authorize national observer programmes, rather than individual observers; this is consistent with the Convention text. CMM-2007-01 Para 12(b) also states that the Secretariat will authorize observer providers.*

Observation

58. All requirements were found to be adequate for the "Interim Authorisation" of all observer programmes who applied for ROP Interim Authorisation, and therefore all were eligible to apply for full authorisation.

Coverage

Standard

59. *Commission determined observer coverage's are:*
- *purse seiners 20N to 20S -100% coverage (start Jan 2010)*
 - *outside this area 20% purse seine coverage*
 - *long liners coverage is 5% by June 2012*
 - *Carriers transshipping at Sea 100% (LL& P&L) (start Jan 2011) – Note that PS must still go to approved areas in Zones or ports to transship and long liners may need exemptions from certain countries to transship on the high seas.*

Observation

60. Because of the nature of the purse seine fishery being in the EEZ's of many PI countries, the majority of observers were sourced from PI countries. Many PI observer programmes audited were struggling to service the demand for observers when the 100% observer coverage of purse seiners commenced. Some programmes were required to use observers from other PI programmes to assist with a supply of observers that were essential to service the numerous vessels in their ports; with extra training since the commencement of the audits in 2010, observer numbers for purse seine coverage in 2012 are near adequate in most programmes audited. However a number of programmes interviewed stated they will still need extra observers for coverage of long liners, and the carriers, as well as replacements for the attrition of observers.
61. Most PI programmes cited different problems they were having with getting extra observers, including scheduling extra training because of lack of funds, the heavy commitments by FFA/SPC who have limited resources when it comes to supplying trainers. This is being resolved by additional trainers being trained to assist in the training sessions, however there still needs to be additional number of qualified trainers become available for each programme. Most non PI programmes audited believe they have adequate observers and carry out training when required.

Vessel Safety Certificate (VSC)

Standard

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

Observation

63. A few of the programmes audited, currently did not use a Vessel Safety Certificate (VSC) when placing an observer. Nor did they check a vessel for safety when an observer is placed on board. However all the PI programmes use the FFA/SPC pre boarding check list which does contain some aspects of vessel safety. A small number of non PI programmes audited had comprehensive vessel safety check lists in place.
64. Following discussion with the PI Coordinators at the SPC/FFA Regional Observer Coordinators Workshop held in 2011, it was agreed that the FFA/SPC pre boarding check will be redesigned at the next FFA/SPC Data Consultative Committee to include all aspects of Vessel Safety Checks. It was also agreed that a copy of the pre boarding report should be attached to the observer data and reports along with any briefing or debriefing reports. All programmes audited had a VSC in place and/or under took to develop a VSC; some programmes adopted the VSC guidelines developed by the IWG –ROP.

Insurance

Standard

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

Observation

66. Many programmes audited had limited insurance coverage for their observers; it was found that most observers are covered by national health and insurance schemes when on shore in their home countries, however when on board a vessel, observers are generally limited to the coverage given to them by the vessels insurance. The practise on purse seiners involves the observer being added to the crew list for insurance purposes. However with long line coverage many vessels do not insure their crews and therefore alternate insurance must be found for the observers. A couple of PI countries had comprehensive insurance coverage for their observers, however most did not have anything extra insurance other than what was available nationally. The programmes with the comprehensive insurance complained about the overall costs involved.
67. During the audit it was found that not all observers were covered for insurance, especially when on long line vessels or when traveling to or from a vessel. Some PI providers were not sure how to insure their observers or were put off by the costs involved.
68. It was suggested by a couple of providers that the Commission probably could get an overall insurance package cheaper for the all the ROP observers.

CMM adherence

Standard

69. *The providers are to ensure that all observers fully understand the content of the CMM's especially in relation to their roles and tasks in monitoring the CMM's*

Observation

70. Many programmes interviewed for the audits said they had problems with CMM adherence. The problem - coordinators said they were having, was on learning what has been changed, or what is a new, not only for CMM's but also for other observer requirements and issues. Many said this was caused by the lack of feedback from their senior staff on some of the issues after they attended relevant meetings; also they noted that circulars sent to official contacts on these issues were hardly ever forwarded to them for their information. They not only said this was a problem with WCPFC but was also a problem from other regional organisations as well.

71. Realizing that this an ongoing problem with many programmes, the WCPFC ROP section of the Commission Secretariat undertook to ensure all CMM's resolutions or directives that were relevant to observer operations or coverage would be compiled each year, as soon as practical after the WCPFC annual meeting, and would be sent directly to all ROP coordinators, observer trainers and other senior observers. This is currently being developed.

Summary

72. Since the introduction of the 100% observer coverage for purse seiners, most observer programmes have coped well in supplying observer numbers, but all programmes have said that they require continual training to upgrade the observers, and to ensure they have enough for all the demands put on them by the WCPFC different gear type coverage requirements.
73. It was noted, that many programmes (not all) have totally inadequate numbers of debriefers for their debriefing programmes, and this is a priority to be rectified. The process does not allow an overnight solution and time will be required to get a reasonable debriefer/observer ratio for programmes currently short on debriefers.
74. There is a need to increase the number of available observers for many programmes, as this will allow for some attrition of the "not so good" observers, as well as being able to satisfy long line and carrier observer coverage requirements.
75. The quality of the observers needs to be monitored carefully, as it has been reported that the data collections held by SPC indicated that a percentage of observer data is not useable, because it is collected incorrectly, or is not collected at all. This is clearly a waste of valuable resources, and shows the requirement for better trained and qualified observers, it also highlights that a suitable debriefing programme needs to be in place for all programmes.
76. The quality of observers is extremely important and an entrance criteria for training needs to be rigidly applied as does the initial selection process. It was found in a few programmes that some observer trainees were not well selected and that local politics were involved in the selection of some observers for training.
77. The sending of data to the SPC or WCPFC after each observer trip is extremely important and unfortunately many observer providers are not sending data in a timely manner. SPC and WCPFC ROP have been working hard to rectify this problem by supplying equipment, personnel and other means in transferring the data in a quick and timely manner. A couple of coordinators indicated they were too embarrassed to send some of the data collected by a few of their observers as they considered it was poorly collected.
78. There is a need to assure that observers are covered by insurance when travelling, on board vessels, and when working as an observer on shore. Many programmes had some insurance for observers but most observers were not covered for all the periods they worked as observers.

79. Health checks (Medicals) by programmes on their observers varied from being comprehensive to none at all. The Commission does not have a standard for health checks, however it is recommended given the issues that some programmes have had with observers being unfit to carry out trips on vessels because of health constraints, that all programmes adopt a standard that requires observers to have a full health check (medical) when first trained and then a regular check after this, suggested to be every 18 months to two years.
80. All programmes are authorised as some of the standards required through no fault of the programme are just not available in a timely basis, for example, debriefing and debriefer training – for PI and some other countries, this is under development with the help of FFA, SPC, WCPFC and NMFS and given another couple of years this problem should be rectified. The development of the debriefing should not hinder full authorisation, however a follow up check in a couple of years' time to ensure the standard has been reached is recommended.
81. The WCPFC ROP audited 23 programmes before June 2012, Table 2 indicates programmes dates that audits occurred. All programmes are fully authorised, however some of the observations in this summary indicates there needs to be a follow up with another audit in a couple of year's time. This will ensure that all programmes that have committed to improve their standards during this audit process have done so, and are fully compliant with the Commission requirements for the ROP.

Table 2.WCPFC member programmes audited by the ROP section of the Commission Secretariat.

Programme	Audited
Philippines	May 2010
USA	November 2010
Marshall Islands	March 2011
Korea	March 2011
Fiji	March 2011
Tonga	March 2011
Vanuatu	April 2011
Kiribati	May 2011
Solomon Islands	June 2011
US Treaty (FFA)	June 2011
FSM Arrangement (FFA)	June 2011
PNG	June 2011
Nauru	June 2011
FSM	July 2011
Chinese Taipei	Oct 2011
China	Oct 2011
Cook Islands	Sept 2011
Palau	Nov 2011
Australia	Jan 2012
New Zealand	May 2012
New Caledonia	May 2012
Tuvalu	May 2012
Japan	May 2012