

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	Partly X
-----	----	-----------------

Please explain further:

Partly and uneven across fisheries. The precautionary approach and other ecosystem considerations are incorporated almost fully in the management decisions of deepwater fisheries. The precautionary approach is also almost fully incorporated in the management decisions of the jack mackerel (*Trachurus murphyi*) fisheries, while other ecosystem considerations are taken into account only in part (e.g., some progress has been made with respect to documenting and reducing seabird interactions).

However, there are no or only very weak indications that the precautionary approach or other ecosystem considerations are being incorporated in the management decisions of the jumbo flying squid (*Dosidicus gigas*) fishery. In fact, even if this is the largest fishery in the Convention area, there are no fisheries management decisions being taken or being discussed within the Commission with respect to this fishery. Some discussions about this are starting to be held at the Scientific Committee.

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

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

Please explain further:

Yes. There are serious gaps in the provision and gathering of environmental, biological and fisheries data and information from the jumbo flying squid fishery in the Convention area. No precautionary fisheries management measures (e.g., in the form of precautionary catch or fishing effort limits) are being considered in the case of the jumbo flying squid fishery, even if it is recognized that this fishery has been expanding very rapidly and with little or no regulations and it is at present the largest fishery in the Convention area. The gathering of by-catch and other species interactions (e.g., with seabirds) could be improved in the jack mackerel fishery.

The strengthening, full implementation and a wider coverage of the Onboard Observers Programme shall significantly contribute to close these information gaps and may also contribute to improve monitoring and enforcement.

1.2 Data collection

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

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

Please explain further:

The agreed formats and specifications are as good as they could be. The timeframes for filling and reporting on those forms are also very good in most cases, although in the jumbo flying squid fishery these timeframes are a bit longer than desirable.

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

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

Please explain further:

Not all Members and CNCPs provide the required data and information in the timely and complete manner required. Please refer to the Executive summary of the Final Compliance Report (assessing 2016/2017)" in Annex 5 of the COMM6 Report for a more detailed description of the state of compliance with data provision (and other requirements) by Members and CNCPs.

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

Yes X	No	Some
--------------	----	------

Please explain further:

Yes, there are gaps in the data and information necessary for effective stock assessment of all three main fisheries in the Convention area: deepwater, jumbo flying squid and jack mackerel. The major gaps refer to the jumbo flying squid.

Most if not all the main gaps have already been identified by the Scientific Committee and to the best of its possibilities the Scientific Committee and its members are trying to

tackle them. These gaps and the commitment to tackle them are reflected in the Scientific Committee Multi-annual workplan (2018) available as Annex 3 of the COMM6 Report

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

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Some
-----	-------------------------------------	----	------

Please explain further:

Yes, same as above. Please refer to Annex 3 of the COMM6 Report.

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

Very	Not at all	Partly	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	------------	--------	-------------------------------------

Please explain further:

Partly. The SPRFMO is quite effective in collecting the data and information it has the mandate to gather and collect from Members and CNCPs, but finds itself with its hands tied up when the mandate is not crystal clear, or the data and/or information is to be provided voluntarily. Some gaps have to do with constraints and limitations at the root, at the level of participating Members or CNCPs that need to establish a proper sampling, data and information gathering systems and in other cases the gaps have to do with limitations in current knowledge in general, needing further research efforts. The main gaps are identified in the SC Multi-annual workplan (2018).

- 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Some
-----	-------------------------------------	----	------

Please explain further:

Yes, a better level of coverage of the sampling and observations onboard needs to be defined for the jack mackerel and jumbo flying squid fisheries.

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	------------	--------	-------------------------------------

Please explain further:

The effectiveness is satisfactory but can be improved, particularly in the case of the jumbo flying squid fishery. The effectiveness of the SPRFMO efforts are highly dependent on the preparedness and willingness of its Members and CNCPs to cooperate with the Secretariat

in the provision of adequate data and information and to jointly work within the Commission to improve the information and data that goes into the scientific advice and to act in a timely and effective manner on such advice. There is clearly some room for improvement in all of them, particularly with respect to the jumbo flying squid fishery. Please also refer to comments under section 1.2 above.

- 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 X
------	------------	-----------------

Please explain further:

The situation is similar to the one described in sections 1.3(i) above. The effects on the marine ecosystem are probably more effectively covered in the case of the deepwater fisheries, while it's less in the case of the jack mackerel fishery and even less so in the case of the jumbo flying squid fishery. Comments under sections 1.1(i) & (ii) also apply here.

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	Partly X
-----	----	-----------------

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

The answer will be a definitive "Yes" in the case of the deepwater and the jack mackerel fisheries, but it will be a "No" or at best a "Partly" in the case of the jumbo flying squid fishery for which there are no specific fisheries management measures and so far the measures adopted to improve the information and data reporting have been rather weak, although some improvements have been made in the last 2-3 years. Comments under sections 1.2(i) and (iii to vi) also apply here.

- 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	Partly X
-----	----	-----------------

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

Partly and uneven across fisheries. As explained under section 1.1(i) above, the precautionary approach has been incorporated fully or almost fully in the management decisions of the deepwater and the jack mackerel fisheries but no such approach is being applied in the case of the jumbo flying squid fishery. For gaps and suggested improvements please refer to comments under section 1.2(iii) above with further reference to the Scientific Committee Multi-annual workplan (2018) available as Annex 3 of the COMM6 Report.

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

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

Please explain further:

Partly and as above, the application of precautionary reference points could be improved although they are being adequately applied in the management decisions of the deepwater and the jack mackerel fisheries, but not in the case of the jumbo flying squid fishery.

- 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	Partly X
-----	----	-----------------

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

Partly. At least in the jack mackerel fishery the main criteria applied in the allocation of catch limits to Members and CNCPs have been those based on the "historical catches and past and present fishing patterns and practices in the Convention Area" in Art. 21(1) (a). The other nine criteria in article 21(1) have been taken into account only partially and in a far less explicit manner.

On the other hand, in the case of the jumbo flying squid fishery, none of the ten criteria established in article 21(1) of the Convention have been used. Currently, no total allowable catch or catch limits have been applied in this fishery.

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

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

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

Partly. CMM 01-2018 for *Trachurus murphy* and its predecessors have been very effective in regulating the jack mackerel fishery. Similarly, CMM 03-2018 for the Management of

Bottom Fishing in the SPRFMO Convention Area and its predecessors have been very effective in regulating bottom fisheries in the area. Also CMM 13-2016 on the Conservation and Management Measure for the Management of New and Exploratory Fisheries in the SPRFMO Convention Area has been very effective and the newly adopted CMM 14b-2018 on the Conservation and Management Measure for Exploratory Potting Fishery in the SPRFMO Convention Area is also expected to be effective.

However, it should be noted that the jumbo flying squid fishery in the Convention area has not been previously regulated and at present there are no provisions to regulate it, even if the total catch of jumbo flying squid in 2012, just prior to the first meeting of the SPRFMO Commission in Auckland, NZ, in January 2013, was 280 thousand tons and peaked to 346 thousand tons in 2014.

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

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

If Yes, or Partly: are these effective?

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

Partly. CMM 03-2018 for the Management of Bottom Fishing in the SPRFMO Convention Area does specifically address biological diversity and CMM 09-2017 for minimising bycatch of seabirds in the SPRFMO Convention Area partially addresses one aspect of it (the one referring to seabirds only). These two CMMs are relatively effective in tackling the biodiversity issues they are designed for. CMM 01-2018 for *Trachurus murphyi* does not address and is not design to address biodiversity issues. Other CMMs don't do it either. There is no CMM for jumbo flying squid, the other main fishery in the Convention area. Some of the main gaps with respect to biological diversity and suggested improvements or tasks to tackle them regarding are identified under the subheading Ecosystems in the SC Multi-annual workplan (2018).

- 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	Partly X
-----	----	-----------------

If Yes, or Partly: are these effective?

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

Partly. There are at least two CMMs that specifically aimed at minimising adverse impacts of harvesting (namely CMM 01-2018 for *Trachurus murphyi* and CMM 03-2018 for Bottom

Fishing) but it is hard to imagine that there could be a CMM specifically aimed at minimising adverse impacts of research, conservation and associated activities on fishery resources and its marine ecosystems.

- vii. 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	X
-----	----	--------	----------

If Yes, or Partly: are these effective?

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:
Partly, but their effectiveness is still uncertain and/or poorly documented.

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	X	Partly
-----	----	----------	--------

Please explain further:

No. So far the focus has been on setting catch limits, which so far seems to be working satisfactory well in those fisheries where catch limits are being applied (that is the bottom fishery and the jack mackerel fishery).

- 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:

This is not applicable. Please refer to comments on section 1.5(i) above.

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

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

Please explain further:

This is not applicable. Please refer to comments on section 1.5(i) above.

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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----------------------------

Please explain further:

Yes. it is considered that the text of the Convention is sufficiently clear with respect to the flag state duties. In this line, Members and CNCPs has not presented any non-compliance to the flag state duties established in the Convention.

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

Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	--

If yes, please explain further:

- 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:

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

Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	-----------------------------

If Yes, please explain further:

2.2 *Port State measures*

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

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----------------------------

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.):

It should be noted that [...] has ratified the Agreement on Port State Measures (PSMA) in September 2017, so currently we are in the process of implementation [...].

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

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
-----	-------------------------------------	----

If No, please explain further why not:

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

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
-----	-------------------------------------	----

If Yes, please explain further:

Yes. Always is possible to improve the existing management measures, for that it's necessary to carry out an evaluation that identifies the critical points where it is possible to incorporate some improvements.

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
-----	-------------------------------------	----

Please explain further:

Yes. So far it has permitted Members and CNCPs to properly implement these measures without major problems, which allows greater control of the fishing activities carried out in the Convention area.

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

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
-----	-------------------------------------	----

Please explain further:

Yes. especially those measures that allow or improve the identification of fishing vessels that carry out illegal activities in the Convention area.

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

Yes	No
-----	----

Please explain further:

iv. Are the SPRFMO MCS measures effective and integrated?

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
---	----

Please explain further:

Yes. So far Members and CNCs have been no major problems in the implementation of supervision and inspection actions in accordance with the duties established in the Convention and through the CMMs

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

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
---	----

Please explain further:

Yes. In our case through the implementation and monitoring of supervision, inspection and sanction actions.

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:

Yes. [...] the "*Network for the exchange of information and experiences between countries of Latin America and the Caribbean to discourage, prevent and eliminate illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing*", which allows generating a technical cooperation plan between these countries, in order to fight against IUU fishing. The SPRFMO can adhere to this network to strengthen the mechanisms to eliminate IUU fishing.

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 described 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:

2.6 Market-related measures

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

Yes	No
-----	----

If Yes, please describe the measures:

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	2 X	3	4	5	No answer

Please explain further:

ii. Are the processes and practices inclusive and transparent?

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

Please explain further:

To a great extent Yes, although this is not always reflected in the Commission's decision-making reports (COMM Reports)

iii. Could they be improved?

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

Please explain further:

Decision-making process and practices can always be improved. The question is whether they need to be improved and what will be the cost (for instance, in meetings and discussions time).

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

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

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

This is hard to tell and as above it all depends on whether there a need for it (to benefit from informal mechanisms of cooperation...) and what will be the cost of it, e.g. in informal 'cooperating' and/or consultation time and associated transparency and inclusiveness in the decision making process. On the other hand, there is a risk of losing transparency and inclusivity with a greater use of informal mechanisms of cooperation and/or discussion.

3.2 Dispute Resolution

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

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

Please explain further:

Yes, so far in the two cases where the Objection process in accordance with Art. 17 of the Convention has been called upon it has been effective and expeditious.

- ii. Has the SPRFMO dispute resolution process been expeditious?

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

Please explain further:

Yes, so far in the two cases if have been called upon.

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

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

Please explain further:

While the Objection process has been effective in solving the disputes that have been put forward by the Objecting Member (Russian Federation in 2013 and Republic of Ecuador in 2018) the secondary consequences or side effects to other Members or CNCs that may result from the Objection Resolutions are or have not been fully assessed or analyzed.

For instance, the resolution of the 2013 objection by Russia gave the reason to Russia and decided that the SPRFMO Commission shall allocate Russia a significant jack mackerel catch allocation in the Convention area starting in 2014. This led to an increase in Russia's jack mackerel catch allocation from 0 tons in 2013 to 13,445 tons in 2014. This increase was mostly achieved at the expense of reducing the allocations to other participants and in particular to Peru, who at that time was still not full member and as CNC had no right to vote on such decision which saw its jack mackerel catch allocation in the Convention area drastically reduced from 18,636 tons in 2013 to only 4,238 tons in 2014 (mainly to accommodate Russia's increased allocation). Since at that time Peru was only a CNC, it had no right to vote on such decision and no right to dispute such decision though an Objection in accordance to Art. 17 of the Convention.

More recently, the Objection by Ecuador presented in 2018 was found unsubstantiated and was not supported by the Review Panel. However, in the Review Panel Findings and Recommendations of 5 June 2018 the Panel provides strong support for some Participants views that *"Ecuador's aspirations could be accommodated at future Commission meetings provided Ecuador would submit a sufficiently compelling proposal in a timely manner, and would engage actively and constructively with other Members during Commission meetings and intersessionally"* suggesting *"...that the SPRFMO Secretariat might be in a position to provide assistance to Ecuador in this regard"*. It is noted here that Ecuador aspirations were set at having a jack mackerel catch allocation of 6,500 tons, which will represent a net increase of 5,123 tons with respect to their 2017 approved allocation. It is noted that any such increase in Ecuador's allocation would need to be granted at the expense of reducing (either voluntarily or through other mechanism to be discussed and agreed) the already existing allocation of one or more other Members or CNCs. This would lead to at least protracted discussions of the matter during future Commission meetings, in addition to probably extended informal consultations and discussions in the intersessional periods.

If Yes, what suggested improvements could be made?

More attention and further considerations needs to be given to the secondary consequences or side effects over Members or CNCs that may be affected by the results from the Objection Resolutions.

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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Partly
---	----	--------

Please explain further:

There is a fairly clear process through which relevant intergovernmental organisations and interested environmental organisations and fishing industry organisations can register to participate in SPRFMO meetings and some of them do in fact participate very actively and effectively.

- 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Partly
---	----	--------

Please explain further:

SPRFMO facilitates the spaces for the exchange of opinions either during the Commission meetings as in the intersessional period.

- 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Partly
---	----	--------

Please explain further:

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

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Partly
---	----	--------

Please explain further:

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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
---	----

Please explain further:

- ii. Do CNCPs voluntarily implement SPRFMO measures?

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Partly
---	----	--------

Please explain further:

Yes. Although as can be seen in the Final Compliance Report (COMM6 Report Annex 5) the degree of compliance is variable.

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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partly
-----	--	--------

Please explain further:

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

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Partly
---	----	--------

Please explain further:

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

Very <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not at all	Partly
--	------------	--------

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

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

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Partly
---	----	--------

Please explain further:

4.5 *Special requirements of developing States*

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

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Partly
---	----	--------

Please explain further:

- 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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	------------	--

Please explain further:

The level and type of assistance seems appropriate but whether it is sufficient is a bit uncertain. More and better assistance can probably be provided and certainly would be welcomed by some developing States but the question is whether providing assistance to developing States should be a primary goal of the SPRFMO.

It should be considered that the objective of the Convention (and the SPRFMO) 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".

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 X
-----	----	-----------------

Please explain further:

More funds are always needed and welcomed. However, current level of funding seems commensurate with the size and duties of the SPRFMO.

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

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

Please explain further:

Similarly to the case in section 5.1(i) above. More staff will always be needed and welcomed. However, current staffing level seems commensurate with the funding available and the size and duties of the SPRFMO.

- 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 X
-----	----	-----------------

Please explain further:

Similarly to the case in section 5.1(i) above. More funding resources will always be required/needed and could be used by the Secretariat. However, current funding level seems commensurate with the size and duties of the Organization.

5.2 Efficiency and cost-effectiveness

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

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

Please explain further:

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

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
-----	-------------------------------------	----

If No, how could this be improved?

iii. Is the SPRFMO schedule of meetings appropriate?

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
-----	-------------------------------------	----

If No, how could it be improved?

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

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
-----	-------------------------------------	----

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