

## South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation Performance Review Questionnaire

### Comment on the answers contained in this questionnaire:

The following answers have been built taking into account the comments and opinions of several [...] representatives of the public agencies involved in the assessment, management and control of the SPRFMO fisheries.

The answers are focused on the [...] experience of SPRFMO management of Chilean Jack Mackerel and Squid. [...] does not undertake bottom fishing operations in SPRFMO area, so our answers regarding these fisheries are limited.

### 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	<b>Partly</b>
-----	----	---------------

Please explain further:

The incorporation of the ecosystem approach is partial, because management decisions are still made based in a monospecific fishery approach. The bottom fisheries do consider the vulnerable marine ecosystems. The jack mackerel fishery has more progress in the application of ecosystem approach, although the management decision is still taken in a monospecific manner, assessment hypotheses assume a single stock, fishing quotas are decided based on scientific recommendations and there is a control over the catches.

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

<b>Yes</b>	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

Incorporate economic and social variables in fisheries management. Incorporate environmental variables of short, medium and long term in the decisions of catch quotas, improve research on the topics of interaction with birds, mammals and protected species, and improve the coverage of information of observers on board.

#### 1.2 Data collection

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

Formats:	Excellent	<b>Good</b>	Acceptable	Inadequate
Specifications:	Excellent	<b>Good</b>	Acceptable	Inadequate
Timeframes	Excellent	<b>Good</b>	Acceptable	Inadequate

Please explain further:

Formats, specifications and timeframes are good enough.

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

Members:	Very	Not at all	<b>Partly</b>
CNCPs:	Very	Not at all	<b>Partly</b>
SPRFMO:	Very	Not at all	<b>Partly</b>

Please explain further:

It is not sufficiently clear if Members and CNCPs are providing complete data to the Secretariat. Secretariat does inform of the data of Members and CNCPs has been received after deadline, but is not clear if the data is complete and accurate.

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

<b>Yes</b>	No	Some
------------	----	------

Please explain further:

The information for the stock assessment of Jack mackerel is quite complete. The case of the squid is very different. There are many information gaps to even try to perform a stock assessment.

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

<b>Yes</b>	No	Some
------------	----	------

Please explain further:

In the Jack mackerel case, information on habitat and ecosystem could be valuable for improving scientific advice. Also, as indicated before, short, medium and long-term environmental variables could be incorporated into the decisions on catch quotas, as well as improving research on the interaction with birds, mammals and protected species and the coverage of observer information on board.

In the case of squid, Commission has detected information gaps that need to be addressed, indicated in the current SC Workplan.

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

Very	Not at all	<b>Partly</b>
------	------------	---------------

Please explain further:

The Jack mackerel Subgroup has agreed on its own formats to provide data, which serve as input for stock assessment. Although this is very useful for Jack mackerel purposes, there is a duplication of efforts, since in addition to the format agreed by the Jack mackerel Subgroup, Members and CNCPs shall also deliver the scientific observation information required in the Data Standard CMM. It is not clear whether or not the Scientific Committee uses the information collected on the basis of the Data Standard when carrying out the stock assessment of Jack mackerel.

In the case of squid, it is clear that there are many information gaps, as evidenced by the Work and Scientific Program that the Commission adopted at the meeting in Lima. There is lack of historical, biological and fishing information. According to the Data Standard, this type of information should have already been collected on the high seas, but it is not clear whether the fleets that operate on the high seas provide this information.

Finally, there could be some thinking about of the Data Standard required to be amended, in order to adjust it to the information needs of the Scientific Committee and the Commission.

- 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	<b>Some</b>
-----	----	-------------

Please explain further:

It is difficult to assess at this time what type of information is missing, since the Observer Programme CMM still lacks of the criteria for certifying national programs. CMM 16-2018 indicates that the information required in the Standard Data must be compiled. As indicated before, it may be useful to review if CMM 02-2018 needs to be updated, so that the required information has adequate utility.

### 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	<b>Partly</b>
------	------------	---------------

Please explain further:

To answer this question, it is important to distinguish between the fishery resources that SPRFMO manages. In the case of Jack mackerel, SPRFMO has made great efforts to understand and recover this fishery, which have given favourable results, by achieving this goal during 2017. The next steps in this fishery include better understanding the habitat and the relationship of the Jack mackerel with its ecosystem. In the case of squid, the available information is scarce and each one of the countries that participate in this fishery has its own vision on its status and the Scientific

Committee isn't still in position to reach a consensus. There would be some evidence that this fishery may be declining, but SPRFMO has not taken any specific measures to monitor or manage this fishery so as to ensure its sustainability.

- 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	<b>Partly</b>
------	------------	---------------

Please explain further:

Please take into account the previous comments.

#### 1.4 Adoption of conservation and management measures

- i. Has SPRFMO 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	<b>Partly</b>
-----	----	---------------

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

As indicated above, we must distinguish between the fishery resources that SPRFMO manages. The jack mackerel fishery has a specific conservation measure for this fishery, which establishes mechanisms for administration, participation and control of the fishery. Other measures, such as transshipment, also give greater attention to the jack mackerel fishery, by establishing higher standards in its control. The future work for this fishery includes making the decision on catch quotas compatible with information related to the ecosystem. The information on habitats and the relationship with associated species (birds, mammals and other species) and their future incorporation in management decisions will improve this indicator.

The case of the squid fishery is very different, since there are important gaps in information, little scientific recommendation on its management and no conservation measure adopted by the Commission that administers this fishery in a particular way.

- 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	<b>Partly</b>
-----	----	---------------

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

The precautionary approach has been applied in the jack mackerel fishery, given that the recommendation of the Scientific Committee of the TAC has taken precautions on

the state of the fishery. It is not the same case of the squid, in which no action has been taken to regulate this fishery, even with the absence of sufficient scientific information.

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

Yes	No	<b>Partly</b>
-----	----	---------------

Please explain further:

The jack mackerel fishery has defined reference points. The Scientific Committee has worked to establish a Catch Control Rule.

The reference points are not defined in the 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	<b>Partly</b>
-----	----	---------------

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

Allocation has been decided for the Jack mackerel fishery and during these discussions the use of different criteria has been raised. We believe that criteria included in Article 21 (1) have been incorporated in the decision of Jack mackerel allocation. The discussion on the application of the allocation criteria for this fishery was addressed by the Panel of Experts that reviewed the objection presented by Ecuador after the meeting of the Sixth Commission Meeting. The Panel's conclusions indicate that more criteria than historical capture have been used. It is difficult to quantify the way or weighting in which each of the criteria has been applied in the allocation process, but it is evident that many of them have been applied.

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

<b>Very</b>	Not at all	Partly
-------------	------------	--------

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

CMM 13-2016 is quite detailed on the steps and revisions necessary for the approval of an exploratory fishery. So far, SPRFMO has adopted two exploratory fisheries. The first on toothfish, which was quite precautionary, and the second on pot fishing, which will begin during 2018. The initial proposal of this requirement was not precautionary enough, establishing catch limits without any scientific basis that would safeguard the sustainability of this operation. Based on what was indicated by CMM 13-2016 and in particular the need to apply the precautionary principle, the Commission adopted the proposal of pot fishing, lowering the catch limit and limiting the fishing effort and

requiring the Scientific Committee to review the fishing plan, including the collection of information.

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

Yes	<b>No</b>	Partly
-----	-----------	--------

If Yes, or Partly: are these effective?

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

No, the Commission hasn't adopted CMMs that specifically address the conservation of marine biological diversity.

- 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	<b>Partly</b>
-----	----	---------------

If Yes, or Partly: are these effective?

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

CMM 09-2017 aims to minimize seabird bycatch from trawling and longline fisheries in SPRFMO. It seems to be effective, although no specific assessment on its effective has been done.

- 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	<b>No</b>	Partly
-----	-----------	--------

If Yes, or Partly: are these effective?

Please explain further, noting any gaps or suggested improvements:

No CMM that specifically addresses those issues has been even discussed during Commission meetings. The catch of non-target fishery resources and impacts on associated or dependent species are addressed in CMM 02-2018, were the collection and exchange of this kind of data is requested.

### 1.5 Capacity management

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

Yes	<b>No</b>	Partly
-----	-----------	--------

Please explain further:

In the case of the jack mackerel fishery, CMM 01-2018 establishes limitations on fishing effort, which exceed the fishing effort that is currently deployed. This limitation of effort was the first management action of this fishery, long before establishing a TAC.

In the case of the squid fishery, there is no limitation of fishing capacity.

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

Very	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>Partly</b>
------	-------------------	---------------

Please explain further:

The limitation of fishing capacity in the case of the jack mackerel fishery does not seem to be entirely effective in preventing or eliminating overcapacity and fishing effort, since it exceeds the current fishing effort.

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

Very	Not at all	<b>Partly</b>
------	------------	---------------

Please explain further:

Members and CNCPs that participate in the SPRFMO fisheries shall provide an annual report to the Scientific Committee, reporting, among other aspects, the level of fishing effort. Additionally, monthly reports on the vessels fishing in the high seas are provided.

## Section 2: Compliance and Enforcement

### 2.1 Flag State duties

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

<b>Yes</b>	No
------------	----

Please explain further:

Generally speaking, Members and CNCPs seem to clearly understand their duties as flag state, according with Article 25 of the Convention.

- 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:

Situations where a Member or CNCP has not fulfilled its flag state duties have been identified and addressed during the process of establishing a list of vessels presumed to have carried out IUU fishing, according to CMM 04-2017.

- 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 capacity and lack of knowledge of its duty has been identified as reasons in some cases. Also, a reason to not fulfil the duties is the lack of capacity or will from the flag State to establish proper and timely penalizing actions when a vessel of its flag has undermined the CMMs or Convention provisions.

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

Yes	No
-----	----

If Yes, please explain further:

When reiterate lack of compliance has been identified, the Secretariat or other Members had offered support to the relevant Members or CNCP.

## 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:

The percentage of inspection indicated in paragraph 15 of CMM 07-2017 is very low. That percentage could be increased significantly to effectively implement the provisions of that CMM.

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	No
-----	----

Please explain further:

Yes in general. There are some monitoring measures that need to be applied also to squid fishery, such a monthly catch report and transshipment notifications and report.

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:

It seems that enough MCS measures are in place. As said before, the already adopted measures need to be also applied to squid fishery.

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

Yes	No
-----	----

Please explain further:

It seems to be good MCS measures.

iv. Are the SPRFMO MCS measures effective and integrated?

Yes	No
-----	----

Please explain further:

In general, we would say that MCS measures are effective and integrated.

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.):

In recent years, there has been an increase in the overall level of compliance of the CMM. The cases of incompliance has been detected and addressed by CTC and Commission.

#### 2.4 Follow-up on infringements

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

Yes	No
-----	----

Please explain further:

- ii. If Members and CNCPs 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.):

Lack of capacity or lack of understanding has been identified in some cases.

- iii. Is there something that could be done to improve efforts to follow up on alleged infringements? Please explain:

Some of the commitment requested in CMMs needed to be clarified, in order to an adequate accomplishment of them. When this kind of misclarifications has been identified, Commission has discussed them and address the way to make them clear.

#### 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:

CMM 10-2018 establishes a complete Compliance and Monitoring Scheme, which allows a detailed process to monitor the compliance and to stablish plans in those cases where non-compliance has been detected.

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?

<b>Yes</b>	No
------------	----

If No, please explain:

- iii. Are the cooperative mechanisms being used effectively?

<b>Yes</b>	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	<b>No</b>
-----	-----------

If Yes, please explain:

There could be additional cooperative measures that could improve the whole process, but the current measures seem to work well enough.

### 2.6 Market-related measures

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

Yes	<b>No</b>
-----	-----------

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.):

The need for a market tool to manage or control a fishery has not been highlighted.

## Section 3: Decision-making and Dispute Settlement

### 3.1 Decision-making

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

Good					Poor	
<b>1</b>	2	3	4	5	No answer	

Please explain further:

In our view, the most important achievement of the Convention is to establish the possibility to vote once all efforts at consensus are exhausted. Important measures and reforms through consensus have been obstructed.

In this line, we have seen few instances in which voting have been reached, only when efforts have been effectively exhausted at consensus and no other meeting has been necessary to make progress in these subjects.

In other opportunities, in order to accomplish regulations in which all the parties may cooperate and seek the success of the objective of such regulations, a year or two have passed, for example, regulations regarding VMS, visits and inspections at sea, Vanuatu measure on quota utilization.

ii. Are the processes and practices inclusive and transparent?

<b>Yes</b>	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

Effectively, we believe that the process is inclusive and transparent. In this sense, we highlight that the documents and new or existing measure proposals are communicated to all Members and CNCPs with enough time as notice period before each meeting. Likewise, we highlight the fact that most of the working documents are included on the website with the same notice period.

Exceptions have to do with measures that may affect third parties, for example, all the previous process to include a vessel in the IUU lists (which we agree with) and those financial or administrative aspects that have to be addressed with the appropriate reserve.

On his part, most of the decisions adopted in sessions with all the participants in the meeting, including observers present. There are exceptions where conversations or voting are conducted among heads of delegations, but those are processes related to administrative aspects, estimating that they do not affect transparency and inclusion.

iii. Could they be improved?

Yes	No	<b>Partly</b>
-----	----	---------------

Please explain further:

Surely process and practices could be improved. A formula to increase the participation of the Member States during the intersessional period should be promoted, in order to avoid duplicity of work and efforts.

It would also mean the better use of the different resources we have, including the improvement in the results of every Commission meeting, because it would allow to discuss matters that were not analyzed intersessionally.

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

<b>Yes</b>	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

If Yes, what form might such an informal mechanism take? Please explain further:  
 The response to this question could be linked with our previous answer. A good number of CMM require from us more discussion and accuracy that could be resolved intersessional and in an informal process. The simple discussion and sharing the different ideas and point of views would improve the discussions during the meetings and could take us to adopt measures easily and with a better understanding for every delegation.  
 This kind of procedure was implemented in the past, but with no enough representation.

### 3.2 Dispute Resolution

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

<b>Yes</b>	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

As a previous matter we should remember that only objections have been submitted against CMM adopted by the Commission, it pursuant to article 17 and Annex II of the Convention. No binding settlement of disputes had been taken into effect.  
 In that order of ideas, we can consider that both Review Panel procedures that took place in the past were effectively resolved. In our view, the Convention and rules of procedures established from every Panel were correctly followed.

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

<b>Yes</b>	No	Partly
------------	----	--------

Please explain further:

Yes, both process followed previously were in the frame of the timetable established by the Convention and the rules established by every Panel.

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

Yes	No	<b>Partly</b>
-----	----	---------------

Please explain further:

If Yes, what suggested improvements could be made?

It could be explained by the Secretariat if the cost should be paid in advance or it is paid during or after the procedure. In these cases, is there any warranty? What happen if after initiated the process the Member who present an objection does not pay the agreed amounts. We are not clear regarding this topic.

## 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:

Several NGOs, IGOs and fishing industry organisations has been participating in the Commission and committees meetings, and they have been able to address to the plenary.

- 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:

During the discussions of conservation and management measures in the Commission and committees meetings, NGOs, IGOs and representatives of the fishing industry are able to express their opinions on the matters that are addressed.

- 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:

All of those report and documents are available in the SPRFMO website.

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

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

Please explain further:

For someone that enters the SPRFMO website for the first time, it might be not so easy to find some information, particularly those reports that were made several years ago. People that uses the SPRFMO website more frequently, has less difficulties to find the information. Reports on previous meetings and CMMs are easy to find.

### 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:

As far as we know, CNCPs have not been encouraged to become SPRFMO Members. This request has not been made during Commission meetings.

- ii. Do CNCPs voluntarily implement SPRFMO measures?

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

Please explain further:

There have been some problems with compliance with CMMs, particularly in relation to the delivery of information and/or compliance reports from some CNCPs, even reaching deep discussions about accepting the renewal of their status. And although they have been renewed, that renewal has been conditional, subject to compliance with said requirements for the following periods.

#### 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:

In our knowledge, this has been done in the past. Bolivia was informed, in response to news that a vessel of its flag had been authorized to operate in the SPRFMO area, of the need to obtain the status of Member or CNCP to carry out operations in the SPRFMO area, also was invited to participate of the Commission meeting and request such status.

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

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

Please explain further:

As we noted previously, this was done in the past with Bolivia. However, we do not know if this work has been undertaken with respect to other States. We believe that it would be appropriate and convenient to know if it has been carried out and, if it has not been done, we consider it appropriate to do or explore the possibility of doing so, if applicable.

4.4 *Cooperation with international organisations*

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

Yes	No	<b>Partly</b>
-----	----	---------------

Please explain further:

SPRFMO has made progress in cooperation, through some memoranda of cooperation with other regional organizations, such as with CCAMLR. The Secretariat has also been asked to explore other cooperation options, such as the case of the Permanent Commission of the South Pacific.

- 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	<b>Partly</b>
------	------------	---------------

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

SPRFMO and CCAMLR signed a Memorandum of Understanding to cooperate with each other. As far as we know, some communications has been exchanged with each other, particularly regarding Toothfish and information regarding a vessel that was inspected in CCAMLR having on board a licence to fish in the South Pacific, without been Member or CNCP of SPRFMO.

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

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

Please explain further:

It is not clear to us whether SPRFMO is cooperating with other organisations of address IUU fishing.

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:

We do not have enough information to assess whether SPRFMO has appropriate mechanisms in this regard. We do know though that financial support to attend SC meetings is provided to those Members that need so.

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

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

Please explain further:

We do not have enough information in this regard.

## 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:

In our view, the available funding is enough.

- 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:

The staff of the Secretariat has increased in recent years and it seems that they have enough people to address the different tasks.

- 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:

It seems that the necessary financial resources are available to the SPRFMO Secretariat

### 5.2 Efficiency and cost-effectiveness

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

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

Please explain further:

In general, resources appear to be used efficiently and effectively.

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?