

South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation Performance Review Questionnaire

Section 1: Conservation and Management

1.1 Ecosystem approach

- i. Do SPRFMO decisions fully incorporate the ecosystem approach to fisheries management in accordance with Article 3(2) of the SPRFMO Convention?

Yes	No XX	Partly
-----	--------------	--------

Please explain further:

The SPRFMO Convention in article 3(2)(b) requires that “[a]n ecosystem approach shall be applied widely to the conservation and management of fishery resources through an integrated approach under which decisions in relation to the management of fishery resources are considered in the context of the functioning of the wider marine ecosystems in which they occur to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable use of those resources and in so doing, safeguard those marine ecosystems.” This puts ecosystems at the centre of fisheries management. This is particularly important since it reflects the objective of the Convention in Article 2, which is “through the application of the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach to fisheries management, to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable use of fishery resources and, in so doing, to safeguard the marine ecosystems in which these resources occur.”

The bottom fishing measure 03-2018, however, is long overdue for revision. Paragraph 8(h) allows an exemption, in effect, for New Zealand: “a Member or a CNCP may exclude part of its bottom fishing footprint from the application of sub-paragraph (g) by dividing its footprint into areas open to bottom fishing, areas closed to bottom fishing and areas to which subparagraph (g) would apply. These exclusions must have the purpose of preventing significant adverse impacts to VMEs.”

In the heavily fished areas open to bottom fishing, New Zealand does not apply a move-on rule or any other conservation measures to protect VMEs. The rationale New Zealand used to allow fishing in the ‘heavily fished’ areas with no measures to protect VMEs is provided in the 2009 Impact Assessment report: “given the existing evidence about the substantial impact of bottom trawling, it is likely that most pre-existing VMEs in these areas have already been significantly impacted.”

Firstly, the UNGA resolutions addressing bottom trawling do not provide for any exemption for VMEs that have already been impacted: indeed, recent scientific reports indicate that there is value in allowing such areas to recover. Secondly, far from being confined to fishing in areas already ‘heavily’ impacted by

bottom trawling in the past, New Zealand vessels apparently have been fishing primarily on seamounts and in other areas within the 'footprint' where bottom trawling had not previously taken place. None of the fisheries in these areas have been assessed for potential significant adverse impacts on VMEs as far as the DSCC is aware. In a 2013 review of the Australian and New Zealand footprints in the SPRFMO area, Penny provided estimates of the extent unfished areas located within the footprint, noting that "estimates of the 'fished area' generated using any mapping resolution other than actual trawl tracks substantially exaggerate the areas within the footprints that have been impacted, with inclusion of substantial unfished areas within these 'fished footprint' maps". He concluded that some 95% to 96% of a footprint mapped using 20-minute degree blocks, as SPRFMO has done, would not have been previously fished. He went on to state that predictive habitat modelling studies indicated that there would be a "high probability of occurrence of vulnerable scleractinian corals and octocorals in unfished areas contained within the 'fished footprint'" and that under UNGA resolutions, the expectation would be that VMEs occurring within 'previously fished' areas will be protected from significant adverse impacts, necessitating measures to protect these VMEs "irrespective of whether they occur within or outside 'previously fished areas'" Thus, rather than closing all areas where VMEs are known or likely to occur unless fisheries are assessed New Zealand has chosen to attempt to provide "adequate and representative protection" from trawling impacts by closing approximately 40% of its bottom fisheries 'footprint' and allow New Zealand vessels to continue to bottom fish in the remaining areas with limited (a move-on rule in some areas) or no measures in place to prevent SAIs on VMEs.

Even where the move-on rule is applied, SPRFMO has yet to adopt uniform regulations on the threshold levels that would constitute an "encounter" with a VME. New Zealand and Australia currently have different rules and only the Australian requirements mean a potentially impacted VME is protected from other vessels.

This unsatisfactory situation was exacerbated at the 2018 Commission Meeting where New Zealand and Australia withdrew support for a proposed measure which had been developed following extensive consultations, after the New Zealand deepwater fishing industry threatened legal action.

- ii. Are there gaps or changes which would improve implementation of the ecosystem approach?

Yes xx	No	Partly
----------------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

The failure to apply measures to avoid significant adverse impacts on VMEs and to ensure the sustainable management of deep-sea stocks and bycatch for sustainability is a significant failure of the SPRFMO management regime. Instead of this clearly unsatisfactory situation, there are a number of steps which need to be taken to implement the ecosystem approach:

1. Any areas open to bottom fishing should only be open after an impact assessment has been done and determined that bottom fishing will be managed to prevent SAIs on VMEs in the area covered by the assessment, and conservation measures, including a move-on rule, should apply to all areas open to bottom fishing.

2. The bottom fishing footprint should be redrawn to correspond to areas where bottom fishing has previously occurred during the 2002–2006 reference period and eliminate, to the maximum extent practicable, the large areas within the current footprint where bottom fishing has not previously occurred.

3. A SPRFMO-wide move-on rule in the SPRFMO area should be established and consistently applied to vessels from all flag States fishing in the region, apply to all areas where vessels are permitted to bottom fish, with a scientifically derived and uniformly applied threshold protocol. Move on rules need to apply to all methods bottom fishing eg trawling, potting and bottom longlining.

4. The Scientific Committee should complete stock assessments of all target species, and, in addition, assessments of the impacts on at least “low-productivity” species taken as bycatch, as is called for in the FAO Guidelines. It should implement sustainable management strategies or plans for fishery resources based on scientifically derived limit and target reference points, and analyses of conservation and management alternatives, such as the establishment of total allowable catch or total allowable fishing effort at different levels, that estimate the extent to which each alternative would achieve the objective or objectives of any management strategy or plan adopted, or under consideration, by the Commission.

Consultations on the deep sea fishing measure have been restarted this year, and it is essential that they conclude with a measure which is consistent with the UNGA resolutions 61/105, 64/72 and following, the 2008 FAO Deep Sea Guidelines and the best available scientific information.

1.2 Data collection

- i. How effective are the SPRFMO data collection formats, specifications and timeframes?

Formats:	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Inadequate XX
Specifications:	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Inadequate XX
Timeframes	Excellent	Good	Acceptable XX	Inadequate

Please explain further:

The VME encounter protocol needs to be developed and the forms rewritten in a clear and effective way.

ii. How accurate, timely and complete is the collection of data by Members and CNCPs individually or through SPRFMO?

Members:	Very	Not at all	Partly
CNCPs:	Very	Not at all	Partly
SPRFMO:	Very	Not at all	Partly

Please explain further:

The VME encounter protocol needs to be developed and the forms rewritten in a clear and effective way.

Observer coverage in non-trawl fisheries has been low and unrepresentative.

Cameras need to be placed on nets and data uploaded to SPRFMO.

iii. Are there any gaps in data collection necessary for effective stock assessment?

Yes XX	No	Some
---------------	----	------

Please explain further:

Stock assessments need to be carried out for all target and non-target stocks.

Acoustic surveys need to be carried out for all target stocks.

Independent observer coverage in non-trawl fisheries has been low and unrepresentative. This means adequate biological information has not been collected for stock assessment purposes.

iv. Are there any gaps in data collection necessary for ensuring best scientific advice is available?

Yes	No xx	Some
-----	--------------	------

Please explain further:

See above: gaps in assessing both target and non-target fish stocks, and in VME encounters.

v. How effective are SPRFMO's efforts in addressing any gaps in data collection?

Very	Not at all	Partly XX
------	------------	------------------

Please explain further:

While the Scientific Committee has made efforts to address data deficiencies, the Commission has not taken strong enough steps to prevent unsustainable fishing and damage to VMEs carried out by fishing vessels in the absence of such data. United Nations General Assembly resolution 64/72 calls on flag States and RFMOs in paragraph 120 “to adopt and implement measures in accordance with paragraphs 83, 85 and 86 of its resolution 61/105, paragraph 119 of the present resolution, and international law, and consistent with the Guidelines, and not to authorize bottom fishing activities until such measures have been adopted and implemented.”

Yet fishing on VMEs with no stock assessments and no controls on bycatch has continued unabated since the inception of SPRFMO.

- vi. Are there any gaps in CMM 16-2018 (Observer Programme) which need to be filled to fully reflect the requirements of Article 28 (1) of the SPRFMO Convention?

Yes	No XX	Some
-----	--------------	------

Please explain further:

There are three clear problems with the current observer system:

1. Apart from the bottom trawl fishery (with 100% vessel coverage) the level of observer coverage has been low and unlikely to be representative of the fisheries it is supposed to be monitoring.
2. There is no system for observers designated by parties other than the flag State. In contrast, CCAMLR has a well-developed system of international observers designated by a member other than the flag state. International observer system increases the transparency in the observer system and increases better performance consistency between observer programmes.
3. There are no clear health and safety protections in the observation CM. Observers are an essential element of fisheries science and management and they can be subject to threats, unhealthy working conditions and some observers have been killed at sea.

1.3 *Quality and provision of scientific advice*

- i. How effective are SPRFMO's efforts to receive and act on best scientific advice relevant to the fishery resources it covers?

Very	Not at all	Partly XX
------	------------	------------------

Please explain further:

SPRFMO has had challenges in both receiving (meaning acquiring) and acting on scientific advice. These have been discussed above: deficiencies in data and failures to act to protect VMEs and target and non-target fish stocks.

- ii. How effective are SPRFMO's efforts to receive and act on best scientific advice relevant to the effects of harvesting, research, conservation and associated activities on the marine ecosystem?

Very	Not at all	Partly XX
------	------------	------------------

Please explain further:

As noted above, the failure to acquire adequate data on fish stocks and VMEs and its failure to develop an effective measure on bottom fishing consistent with the UNGA resolutions has hampered SPRFMO's ability to implement sustainable management measures.

1.4 *Adoption of conservation and management measures*

- i. Has SPRFMO has adopted an effective range of Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs) for fishery resource management that ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable use of those resources and are based on the best scientific evidence available?

Yes	No xx	Partly
-----	--------------	--------

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

The failure to develop and implement an effective bottom fishing measure based on good and sufficient scientific information has meant that it has not ensured the long-term conservation and sustainable use of its resources.

It should develop and implement such a measure or require its flag States to stop their vessels from bottom fishing.

The Fish Stocks Agreement requires in Article 5 that States "(d) assess the impacts of fishing, other human activities and environmental factors on target stocks and species belonging to the same ecosystem or associated with or dependent upon the target stocks; and (e) adopt, where necessary, conservation and management measures for species belonging to the same ecosystem or associated with or dependent upon the target stocks, with a view to maintaining or restoring populations of such species above levels at which their reproduction may become seriously threatened."

SPRFMO has done none of this with respect to target fisheries for bottom longline and non-target stocks (bycatch) for all fisheries.

- ii. Has SPRFMO sufficiently applied a precautionary approach in line with the requirements of Article 3 (2) of the SPRFMO Convention and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries?

Yes	No XX	Partly
-----	--------------	--------

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

Its failure to require all States to assess VMEs before fishing, apply the move-on rule and implement data-based limit and target reference points and a harvest control rule before fishing is contrary to the precautionary approach. It should have, under Article 3(2), (i) been more cautious when information is uncertain, unreliable, or inadequate; and (ii) not used the absence of adequate scientific information as a reason for postponing or failing to take conservation and management measures.

The approval of the Cook Islands exploratory fishing proposal was not precautionary in the catch limit applied or the approach take to the science, technical and compliance issues.

There was no assessment prior to fishing, such as could have been conducted with cameras and ROVs. The 1000 tonne catch limit suggested by the Commission was sheer guesswork and not precautionary. The CMM refers to stock indicators but there are no details on what they might be or how they will be monitored and assessed. The process for undertaking assessments was unclear and not specified.

- iii. Has SPRFMO sufficiently applied precautionary reference points as called for in Article 20 (2) of the Convention?

Yes	No XX	Partly
-----	--------------	--------

Please explain further:

SPRFMO has not developed target or limit reference points for target stocks. While it is endeavouring to do so now, it has allowed fishing to continue since SPRFMO was concluded in 2009: for nearly 9 years.

- iv. Has SPRFMO sufficiently incorporated the criteria established under Article 21 (1) of the SPRFMO Convention, in the adoption of measures relating to the allocation of the total allowable catch or total allowable fishing effort?

Yes	No xx	Partly
-----	--------------	--------

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

No, because it has not developed either a total allowable catch or a total allowable fishing effort for orange roughy or any other deepwater target or non-target species.

- v. How effective are the SPRFMO CMMs adopted to cover previously unregulated fisheries, including new and exploratory fisheries?

Very	Not at all	Partly XX
------	------------	------------------

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

SPRFMO dropped the ball at its 6th Meeting with respect to the proposal for Crab and Lobster fishing by the Cook Islands.

The measure fell short of the procedures and standards required by CMM-13-2016 on exploratory fisheries. That called for:

- 1) a Fisheries Operation Plan to be submitted to the Scientific Committee (para 5), for the Scientific Committee to consider the Plan (para. 6), and
- 2) the Scientific Committee to provide recommendations on the items listed from paragraph 8(a) to 8(h), such as an appropriate precautionary catch limit, reference points and advice and recommendations in accordance with paragraph 12 of CMM 03-2017 (Bottom Fishing).
- 3) the Compliance and Technical Committee to consider any Fisheries Operation Plan submitted pursuant to paragraph 5 and any advice of the Scientific Committee thereon and provide advice and recommendations to the Commission on appropriate management arrangements, including in light of the obligations in CMM 03-2017 (Bottom Fishing), if applicable. (para 11)

Instead, the Scientific Committee indicated that it could not support the proposal in its current form and agreed that it could consider a revised proposal that provides more information on how the data collected through a gradual development of the fishery could be used to assess and manage the stocks appropriately. The CTC did not consider any Fisheries Operation Plan because there wasn't any. Then a Scientific Committee intersessional meeting took place without notice to DSCC and does still not satisfy CMM 03-2017 or CMM 13-2016. With the subgroup agreeing to prepare advice regarding the

revised proposal, “to the best of their ability noting that the timeframes for the upcoming Commission meeting were getting very tight and that drafting an exploratory fishing CMM in time for the Commission meeting was going to be a significant task (for the Cook Islands)”, the subgroup did not apply the procedures in CMM 13-2016 or a precautionary approach. There was still no assessment prior to fishing, such as could have been conducted with cameras and ROVs. The 1000 tonne catch suggested by the Commission was sheer guesswork. The CMM refers to stock indicators but there are no details on what they might be or how they will be monitored and assessed. The process for undertaking assessments was unclear and not specified.

In short, neither CMM 13-2016 nor CMM 03-2017 (as it then was) were followed.

- vi. Has SPRFMO adopted CMMs which specifically address the conservation of marine biological diversity?

Yes	No xx	Partly
-----	--------------	--------

If Yes, or Partly: are these effective?

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

The current CMs are weak in the conservation of biodiversity. As indicated above there is still no comprehensive measure to protect VMEs or non-target species.

- vii. Has SPRFMO adopted CMMs which specifically aim to minimise adverse impacts of harvesting, research, conservation and associated activities on fishery resources and its marine ecosystems?

Yes	No XX	Partly
-----	--------------	--------

If Yes, or Partly: are these effective?

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

SPRFMO has yet to adopt a comprehensive suite of measure to minimise adverse effects. There are still no comprehensive measures to minimise adverse impacts on:

- non-target species in bottom fisheries;
- VMEs;
- Sharks – in particular deepwater sharks; or
- EBSAs.

The current measure to minimise adverse effects of seabirds does not meet ACAP best practice requirements.

- viii. Has SPRFMO adopted CMMs which specifically aim to minimise pollution, waste, discards, catch by lost or abandoned gear, catch of non-target fishery resources, and impacts on associated or dependent species?

Yes	No	Partly
-----	----	---------------

If Yes, or Partly: are these effective?

SPRFMO’s measure on gillnet fishing (CMM 22-04)(2010) was an effective measure to stop ghost fishing due to gillnets.

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

As discussed earlier, SPRFMO should have addressed bycatch in accordance with Article 3(1)(a)(ii) (“fishing shall be commensurate with the sustainable use of fishery resources taking into account the impacts on non-target and associated or dependent species and the general obligation to protect and preserve the marine environment”) and Article 20(1)(c) “maintain or restore populations of non-target and associated or dependent species to above levels at which their reproduction may become seriously threatened”.

1.5 Capacity management

- i. Are SPRFMO fishing capacity levels appropriate to support long-term conservation and sustainable use of its fisheries resources?

Yes	No	Partly
-----	-----------	--------

Please explain further:

No precautionary or target reference points or TAC has been set for orange roughy.

- ii. How effective have been actions taken by SPRFMO to prevent or eliminate excess fishing capacity and effort?

Very	Not at all	Partly
------	------------	---------------

Please explain further:

There are no effort controls on orange roughy fishing; only footprint requirements.

- iii. How effective are efforts made by SPRFMO to monitor levels of fishing effort?

Very	Not at all	Partly
-------------	------------	--------

Please explain further:

Section 2: Compliance and Enforcement

2.1 Flag State duties

- i. Do Members and CNCPs have a clear understanding of their flag state duties?

Yes	No
-----	-----------

Please explain further:

The explanations about bottom fishing, including crab and lobster fishing, make it clear that the Convention has not been properly applied.

- ii. Have there been any situations where a Member or CNCP has not fulfilled its flag state duties?

Yes	No
------------	----

If yes, please explain further:

By allowing fishing in the absence of effective VME controls and fishing measures, Members have not fulfilled their duties under the Convention or the Fish Stocks Agreement.

- iii. If a Member or CNCP has not fulfilled its flag state duties, what do you think the reason for this is? (e.g., lack of capacity, lack of knowledge of its duty, lack of political will, etc.)

Please explain:

Lack of political will due to domestic pressure by New Zealand's bottom fishing industry.

- iv. Are there ways that Members and CNCPs could better fulfil their flag state duties?

Yes XX	No
---------------	----

If Yes, please explain further:

By supporting and implementing effective measures compliant with the Convention, Fish Stocks Agreement and UNGA resolutions.

This includes measures on requiring that all transshipments are observed.

2.2 Port State measures

- i. Have Members implemented the SPRFMO port state measure fully?

Yes	No
------------	----

If No, please explain further why they have not been fully implemented (e.g., lack of capacity, lack of knowledge of its duty, lack of political will, measure not clear, too complicated or too onerous, etc.):

- ii. Is the port state measure adopted by SPRFMO effective?

Yes	No
------------	----

If No, please explain further why not:

Not all members or co-operating non-parties have designated **Ports and Points of Contact** (in accordance with CMM 07 [Inspections in Port], paragraphs 5 to 10).

- iii. Are there additional port state measures that are needed?

Yes	No
-----	-----------

If Yes, please explain further:

2.3 Monitoring, control and surveillance

- i. Are SPRFMO's MCS measures well-tailored to enable monitoring of and ensure compliance with SPRFMO's conservation and management measures?

Yes xx	No
---------------	----

- ii. Are there additional MCS measures that are needed to enable monitoring of and ensure compliance with SPRFMO's conservation and management measures?

Yes	No
------------	----

Please explain further:

Improvements that should be applied:

- Greater observer coverage and ensuring all transshipments are observed.
- Cameras on nets and vessels would be an improvement;
- A catch documentation scheme to monitor whether fish on the marker has been legally caught.

- iii. Are there improvements that should be made to the existing MCS measures?

Yesxx	No
--------------	----

Please explain further:

Improvements that should be applied:

- Greater observer coverage and ensuring all transshipments are observed.
- Cameras on nets and vessels would be an improvement;
- A catch documentation scheme to monitor whether fish on the marker has been legally caught.

In addition, a public list of vessels that have been authorised to fish in SPRFMO waters, in addition to the current list for jack mackerel vessels.

- iv. Are the SPRFMO MCS measures effective and integrated?

Yes	No
------------	----

Please explain further:

- v. Have Members and CNCPs implemented the SPRFMO MCS measures fully?

Yes	No
------------	----

If No, please explain further why they have not been fully implemented (e.g., lack of capacity, lack of understanding, lack of political will, measure not clear, too complicated or too onerous, etc.):

2.4 *Follow-up on infringements*

- i. Do Members and CNCs follow up on alleged infringements of conservation and management measures?

Yes	No
------------	----

Please explain further:

- ii. If Members and CNCs do not follow up on alleged infringements, please explain what is the reason or reasons (e.g., lack of capacity, lack of understanding, lack of political will, etc.):
- iii. Is there something that could be done to improve efforts to follow up on alleged infringements? Please explain:

2.5 *Cooperative mechanisms to detect and deter non-compliance*

- i. Has SPRFMO established cooperative mechanisms to monitor compliance, detect and deter non-compliance and remedy compliance issues?

Yes	No
------------	----

If Yes, please describe those cooperative mechanisms:

If No, please describe what cooperative mechanisms are needed:

- ii. If there are cooperative mechanisms, are they effective in monitoring compliance, detecting and deterring non-compliance and remedying compliance issues?

Yes	No
------------	----

If No, please explain:

iii. Are the cooperative mechanisms being used effectively?

Yes	No
------------	----

If No, please explain what could be done to improve their effective use and what you think the reason is for their lack of effectiveness:

iv. Are there additional cooperative mechanisms needed?

Yes	No
------------	----

If Yes, please explain:

Trade related measures in the form of a catch documentation scheme.

Public list of vessels that have been authorised to fishing in SPRFMO waters in addition to the current list for jack mackerel vessels.

2.6 Market-related measures

i. Are there market-related measures that SPRFMO should adopt?

Yes	No
------------	----

If Yes, please describe the measures:

A catch documentation scheme to monitor whether fish on the marker has been legally caught.

ii. Please explain why SPRFMO has not adopted market-related measures (e.g., not necessary, lack of capacity, lack of political will, measure not clear, too complicated or too onerous, etc.):

Section 3: Decision-making and Dispute Settlement

3.1 Decision-making

i. How do you assess SPRFMO decision-making process and practices?

Good

Poor

1	2xx	3	4	5	No answer
---	------------	---	---	---	-----------

Please explain further:

In general SPRFMO's decision-making processes and practices are good. The decision-making around the Cook Islands crab and lobster potting measure however was not.

ii. Are the processes and practices inclusive and transparent?

Yes	No	Partly
-----	----	---------------

Please explain further:

Discussions around the Cook Islands crab and lobster potting measure did not include observers who learned about them when they were presented at the end of the 6th Commission meeting.

iii. Could they be improved?

Yes	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

Discussions on measures should include observers, at least those that have expressed interest in them.

iv. Would SPRFMO benefit from the greater use of informal mechanisms of cooperation in its decision-making?

Yes	No	Partly
-----	-----------	--------

If Yes, what form might such an informal mechanism take? Please explain further:

3.2 *Dispute Resolution*

i. Has the dispute resolution process used by SPRFMO been effective in resolving disputes?

Yes	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

The SPRFMO opt-out and dispute resolution process in Article 17(5) and Annex II has been very effective in the two cases in which it has been tested.

ii. Has the SPRFMO dispute resolution process been expeditious?

Yes	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

The process has ensured a decision within the fishing season and without delay to a another fishing year.

iii. Do you have any concerns with the SPRFMO dispute resolution process, such as procedures or cost?

Yes	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

If Yes, what suggested improvements could be made?

Observers were not informed at all, and were not involved. This is inconsistent with the otherwise transparent nature of SPRFMO's procedures. Observers should have been informed, and should have been given an opportunity to file a brief, in the two arbitrations to date. Procedures should be improved accordingly.

Section 4: International Cooperation

4.1 Transparency

i. Are relevant intergovernmental organisations and interested environmental organisations and fishing industry organisations able to effectively participate in all SPRFMO meetings?

Yes	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

SPRFMO's transparency is excellent with the exceptions noted (informal consultations not involving observers and not involving observers in Annex II dispute resolution procedures).

- ii. Does SPRFMO facilitate consultations with non-governmental organisations, representatives of the fishing industry, and other interested bodies on SPRFMO conservation and management measures?

Yes	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

The consultations around the bottom trawling measure have been good.

- iii. Are all SPRFMO reports, conservation measures and scientific advice and other relevant non-commercial sensitive information made publicly available in a timely manner?

Yes	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

- iv. How effective is the SPRFMO website making relevant information publicly available and easily accessible?

Yes	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

I think the question means "is it effective" and the answer is "yes".

There is currently no list of authorised vessels fishing in SPRFMO apart from the jack mackerel fishery.

4.2 *Relationship with Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CNCP)*

- i. Have there been efforts by SPRFMO to encourage CNCPs, either individually or collectively, to become SPRFMO Members?

Yes	No
------------	----

Please explain further:

ii. Do CNCPs voluntarily implement SPRFMO measures?

Yes	No	Partly
-----	----	---------------

Please explain further:

The TCC has addressed instances of non-compliance.

4.3 Relationship with non-Members or non-CNCPs undermining the objectives of the Convention

i. Does SPRFMO take effective measures to deter the activities of non-Members and non-CNCPs that undermine SPRFMO conservation and management measures?

Yes	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

ii. Does SPRFMO encourage non-Members and non-CNCPs to become Members or CNCPs of SPRFMO?

Yes	No	Partly
-----	----	---------------

Please explain further:

4.4 Cooperation with international organisations

i. Does SPRFMO have appropriate cooperation links with other international and regional fisheries management organisations?

Yes	No	Partly
-----	----	---------------

Please explain further:

Closer links with similar organizations such as SIOFA and CCAMLR would be advantageous and may produce efficiencies. Proposals to fish for toothfish mean that SPRFMO needs to have closer ties with CCAMLR.

- ii. How effective is the cooperation with other regional fisheries management organisations which have competency over stocks located in the Convention Area?

Very	Not at all	Partly
------	------------	---------------

If Not at all or Partly, how can this be improved?

More consultation with WCPFC would be advantageous.

- iii. Does SPRFMO cooperate with relevant fisheries organisations specifically on the reduction and elimination of IUU fishing?

Yes	No	Partly
-----	----	---------------

Please explain further:

There should be greater co-operation with CCAMLR.

4.5 *Special requirements of developing States*

- i. Does SPRFMO have appropriate mechanisms for recognising the special needs of developing States?

Yes	No	Partly
-----	----	---------------

Please explain further:

These measures have yet to be implemented.

- ii. How appropriate and sufficient is the assistance that is provided to developing States by Members or CNCPs either individually or through SPRFMO?

Very	Not at all	Partly
------	------------	---------------

Please explain further:

Section 5: Financial and Administrative Issues

5.1 *Availability of resources for activities*

- i. Is the level of funding available to the Secretariat sufficient to achieve the aims of SPRFMO and implement its decisions?

Yes	No	Partly
-----	----	---------------

Please explain further:

A levy on fishing vessels on a user-pays basis would be an advantage.

- ii. Does the Secretariat have the requisite number of personnel to achieve the aims of SPRFMO and implement its decisions?

Yes	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

Capacity is limited in science management if SPRFMO was to develop more co-operative holdings of fisheries research information.

- iii. Does the SPRFMO budget process lead to the necessary financial resources being available to the SPRFMO Secretariat? If not, why not?

Yes	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

5.2 *Efficiency and cost-effectiveness*

- i. Does SPRFMO efficiently and effectively manage the resources available to it?

Yes	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

- ii. Does SPRFMO have the right organisational structure and working groups to efficiently undertake its work?

Yes	No
------------	----

If No, how could this be improved?

- iii. Is the SPRFMO schedule of meetings appropriate?

Yes	No
------------	----

If No, how could it be improved?

iv. Is the organisation of SPRFMO meetings effective in achieving SPRFMO's objectives?

Yes	No
------------	----

If No, are there any suggestions you have for improvement?