

## 14<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE SPRFMO COMMISSION

*Panama City, Panama, 1 to 6 March 2026*

COMM 14 – Doc 09.1

PR2IWG Report - Attachment A

Working paper to respond to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Performance Review recommendations

*Chairperson of the PR2IWG*

SPRFMO undertook its 2nd performance review in 2024 which resulted in a set of recommendations aimed at enhancing the functioning of the Organization and improving its overall effectiveness. The 13th session of the Commission agreed to establish a Working Group to draft an Implementation Plan to ensure that the relevant recommendations are effectively implemented, for the recommendations arising from the Second Performance Review. This working paper is the Implementation Plan.

The Commission is asked to:

- **Consider, amend and adopt** the draft Implementation Plan, which includes:
  - *Confirming that the Commission agree with each recommendation;*
  - *Confirming the Commission's level of priority for each recommendation;*
  - *Confirming the assignment of each recommendation to the relevant responsible body(ies) for appropriate action;*
  - *Agreeing a timeline in which the recommendation can be achieved; and,*
  - *Proposing viable options for responding to each recommendation.*

Acceptance (in full or in part) or rejection of each recommendation is a decision for the Commission – the work of the Working Group outlined in this section was aimed at supporting the Commission to make this determination.



**SPRFMO Performance Review Recommendations (on screen for comment)**

| № | Recommendations   | PR2 IWG Summary  | SC Recommendation<br><i>(informed by SC13- DOC14)</i> | CTC Recommendation<br><i>(to be informed by CTC13 DOC )</i> | FAC Recommendation<br><i>(to be informed by FAC13 DOC)</i> | Agree/<br>disagree | COMM Priority<br>H/M/L | Implementing party(ies) / body(ies) | Proposed Timeline at COMM14 | COMM14 Decisions and Notes |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|--------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | <p>The Review Panel recommends facilitating an annual strategic discussion aimed at producing a Statement of Intent that outlines where the Commission wants to be in 5 to 10 years and signals how it intends to get there. This should include how the Commission plans to address emerging issues such as climate change and BBNJ, among others.</p> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b><br/>In-part</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b><br/>Low</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b><br/>While the IWG noted the benefit of a Statement of Intent, the IWG were mindful of not creating another process and agreed that this is a low priority and aspirational, noting the other priorities the Commission has on hand.</p> <p>The IWG noted that instead of a statement of intent, discussions around strategic planning could feed into the 3-year workplans for subsidiary</p> | N/A   | N/A   | N/A  |                    |                        | COMM?                               |                             |                            |



|   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |                            |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|----------------------------|--|--|
|   |   | <p>bodies and the Commission, or the Business Plan.</p> <p>Regarding addressing emerging issues such as climate change and BBNJ etc, the IWG suggested that this could be captured in other business or as standing agenda items.</p>   |  |  |  |  |  |                            |  |  |
| 2 | <p>The Review Panel recommends the development of a Business Plan with a three-year planning horizon and an associated budget. The first Business Plan should include a review and enhancement of the Headquarters Agreement with the New Zealand Government.</p> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b></p> <p>In-part (agreement to Business Plan with three-year planning horizon, no consensus on review and HQA update).</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b></p> <p>Business Plan - High<br/>HQA - Low</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b></p> <p>The IWG noted the comments from the IWG Meeting 1 and 2. As a first step, the Commission will need to agree to this recommendation and an indicative timeline for this work.</p> | <p>SC has started thinking about how its workplan can be translated into a three-year planning horizon including consideration of resources.</p> | <p><i>To be completed during CTC</i></p> | <p><i>To be completed during FAC</i></p> |  |  | <p>COMM, FAC, CTC, SC?</p> |  |  |



|   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |                            |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|----------------------------|--|--|
|   |   | <p>The IWG also noted that there should be opportunity for Members to comment on a draft Business Plan.</p> <p>The IWG noted that Commission guidance is needed on whether this is developed internally by the Secretariat with Members feedback or independently), noting that the IWG raised the need to minimise procedural work. Either option would ultimately need to be considered in view of budgeting and resourcing.</p> |  |  |  |  |  |                            |  |  |
| 3 | <p>The Review Panel recommends that the Commission improve its direction to subsidiary bodies, the Data Working Group, and the Secretariat by approving their work plans/programmes through the proposed integrated business plan, with a three-year planning horizon and associated budget/funding model. Commission oversight can</p> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b></p> <p>Separate workplans for subsidiaries– in-full - <u>Medium</u></p> <p>Improving the approach to SC Multiannual Work Plan – in-full – <u>Medium</u></p> <p>Development of a Secretariat Operational Plan – In-full <u>Medium</u></p>  | <p>Flexibility is important within the 3 year workplan.</p> <p>SC would welcome prioritisation from Commission</p> | <p><i>To be completed during CTC</i></p> | <p><i>To be completed during FAC</i></p> |  |  | <p>COMM, FAC, CTC, SC?</p> |  |  |



|  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>be strengthened by assessing the performance of the subsidiary bodies and Secretariat against their components of the proposed Business Plan. This would involve developing a Workplan for the CTC and FAC, improving the approach to the SC Multiannual Work Plan, and developing an Operational Plan for the Secretariat, as well as an Information Management Strategy and associated Data Management Plan.</p> | <p>Development of an IMS and DMP – In-full (comments in recommendation 7) <u>High</u></p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b></p> <p>The IWG noted Commission guidance is needed on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Does the Commission agree with the development of separate workplans/programmes for SC, CTC and FAC?</li><li>2. Does the Commission agree with the comments to improve the approach to the SC Work Plan? Noting the IWG identified scope for improvement, particularly on timeframes, milestones, deliverables and resources needed.</li><li>3. Does the Commission agree with the development of a</li></ol> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|



|   |  |  |     |     |     |  |  |       |  |  |
|---|--|--|-----|-----|-----|--|--|-------|--|--|
|   |  | <p>Secretariat Operational Plan?<br/>Noting that there is benefit here for the Secretariat internally and an opportunity for Members to give guidance on how to improve internal processes.</p> <p>The IWG also noted that the focus should be on keeping it fit for purpose, targeted and not to overengineer the process, while ensuring the Secretariat Operational Plan is aligned with other documents.</p> |     |     |     |  |  |       |  |  |
| 4 | <p>Recruit a competent Executive Secretary with proven leadership, executive management, organisational development, and results-oriented skills that can drive the necessary internal reforms to improve the Secretariat's operational performance and support the Commission's strategic</p> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)</b><br/>In-full</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b><br/>High</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b><br/>The IWG noted the decision made at COMM13 on the staff regulations to</p>   | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  | COMM? |  |  |



|   |  |   |     |     |                                   |  |  |            |  |  |
|---|--|---|-----|-----|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------|--|--|
|   | <p>objectives. An understanding of the strategic importance of information management systems would also be an advantage to the organisation. The Executive Secretary should be provided with a performance agreement linked to Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in the approved Business Plan.</p> | <p>meet this recommendation.</p> <p>The IWG supported the adoption of performance reviews to maintain accountability, but noted the need to avoid applying multiple processes or lines of governance.</p> <p>Note that in other RFMOs like in SIOFA, an annual performance evaluation form has been agreed and developed to assess Secretariat staff performance. Commission guidance is needed on whether they agree with this recommendation (including priority level) and the development of a performance evaluation doc, or if an evaluation document is covered under the COMM13 staff regulations decision.</p> |     |     |                                   |  |  |            |  |  |
| 5 | <p>Carry out an independent review of the Headquarters Agreement to ensure it is fit for purpose.</p>  | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b></p> <p>In-part (agree in principle that changes are needed to support Secretariat staff but not agree to an</p>  | N/A | N/A | <i>To be completed during FAC</i> |  |  | FAC, COMM? |  |  |



independent review of the HQA.

**IWG Priority (low, medium, high):**

Low

**IWG Comments to COMM:**

The IWG reaffirmed the comments in Meeting 2, that commissioning an independent review of the HQA would have significant budget considerations and could take a few years for a review, agree HQA changes and implementation.

In saying this, the IWG agreed that improvements are needed to better support the Secretariat functions and Staff Members.

The Commission to provide guidance on whether they agree with commissioning an independent review. If agree, then this would need to be factored into the budget by FAC for

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|



|   |   |   |     |     |                                   |  |  |            |  |
|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------|--|
|   |   | <p>consideration at next COMM. If disagree, then the Commission's guidance on whether the objective of supporting Secretariat staff can be achieved through other alternatives such as a review/update of the Staff Regulations and Financial Regulations, which might be a more swift and reactive way to resolve any immediate issues.</p> <p>The IWG noted that a member would likely need to volunteer to submit a proposal for consideration at next COMM.</p> |     |     |                                   |  |  |            |  |
| 6 | <p>Develop a Secretariat Business Plan with a three-year planning horizon and an associated budget. The first Business Plan, with specific and measurable KPIs, should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A staffing plan and associated organisational arrangements</li> <li>• Cultural improvement plan</li> </ul> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b></p> <p>In-part (the IWG agree with the development of a Business Plan including a staffing plan. However other elements of this recommendation need further discussion).</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b></p> <p>High</p>   | N/A | N/A | <i>To be completed during FAC</i> |  |  | FAC, COMM? |  |



|   |  |  |                                   |                                   |                                   |  |  |                         |  |  |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|--|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of systems and processes to implement the staffing and financial regulations to meet international best practice and in a fair and consistent manner.</li> <li>• Support for the Information Management Strategy and Data Plan</li> <li>• Support for the Commission and its subsidiary bodies and the Data Working Group.</li> <li>• Support for the independent review of the Headquarters Agreement with the New Zealand Government</li> </ul> | <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b></p> <p>The IWG noted there is support for a Business Plan which should include a Staffing Plan, and noted that other elements of the Plan can be further explored and discussed. However, the specifics of these elements need guidance from the Commission. The IWG also noted that a focus should be placed on an indicative timeline for this work (i.e. what needs to be done in which year and when).</p> <p>As a first step, the Commission should provide guidance on whether they agree with the development of a Business Plan which includes a staffing plan, in which the other listed elements can be discussed as part of the Commission tasking the work to the relevant responsible area.</p> |                                   |                                   |                                   |  |  |                         |  |  |
| 7 | The Commission should develop an Information Management Strategy and   | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b></p> <p>In-full</p>  | Refer to PR2 IWG comments to COMM | <i>To be completed during CTC</i> | <i>To be completed during FAC</i> |  |  | SC; [Data Working Group |  |  |



|   |   |   |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | <p>Data Management Plan, placing a high priority on improving its overall approach to information management. This could draw on the SC's existing progress through SC12-Doc12.</p>                               | <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b><br/>High</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b></p> <p>The IWG noted there is already a lot of work underway and the Commission has emphasised the importance of improving SPRFMO's data collection and information management systems.</p> <p>The IWG also noted that the Commission may wish to instruct the subsidiary bodies to review the draft IMS and DMP to ensure all scientific, compliance, financial and administrative elements are considered.</p> |     |     |     |  |  | <p>(DWG)];<br/>CTC; FAC;<br/>COMM?</p> |  |  |
| 8 | <p>The Commission should elevate the Data Working Group to a standalone body reporting directly to the Commission and reconsider its title and mandate in light of the issues identified by the Review Panel.</p> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b></p> <p>In-part (agree with the important role of the DWG that should report directly to Commission).</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b></p>   | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  | COMM?                                  |  |  |



|   |  |  |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|--|
|   |  | <p>Medium</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM:</p> <p>The IWG noted the importance of the current data collection process.</p> <p>The IWG noted that elevating the Data Working Group so that it reports directly to Commission would be beneficial, allowing the DWG to put up recs for the Commission's considerations.</p>                        |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | <p>The Commission should work towards conducting a comprehensive review of CMM 02-2022, following the development of the Information Management Strategy and Data Management Plan, as part of the Business Plan.</p> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b></p> <p>In-full</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b></p> <p>High</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b></p> <p>The IWG noted that it is for the Commission to consider and agree a review of CMM 02-2022.</p> <p>The IWG requested guidance from the Commission on an indicative timeline.</p> | <p>SC13 partially addressed this with advice to COM14 on CMM02 changes. This could be further reviewed after development of a Strategy and Plan.</p> | <p><i>To be completed during CTC</i></p> | <p>N/A</p> |  |  | <p>SC – Data Working Group (DWG); CTC; COMM?</p> |  |



|    |  |  |  |     |     |  |  |   |  |
|----|--|--|--|-----|-----|--|--|---|--|
|    |  | <p>The IWG noted this can be carried out by the DWG.</p> <p>The IWG also noted that a review should not just focus on data gaps, but also the data collection methodology. The IWG noted that the review should identify opportunities for additional data but also focus on making current processes more efficient.</p>  |  |     |     |  |  |   |  |
| 10 | <p>Jack mackerel - Continue discussions and actions toward full cooperation with the jack mackerel fishery occurring in adjacent national jurisdictions. The Commission should explore ways to incentivise improved cooperation and compatibility.</p> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b></p> <p>In-part? (agree with in principle of sharing data and cooperation but no consensus on whether coastal states should be required to share data)</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b></p> <p>Medium</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b></p> <p>The IWG noted the SC's comments that there is scientific cooperation in relation to high seas and adjacent national jurisdictions through data</p> | <p>It was noted that there is scientific cooperation in relation to high seas and adjacent national jurisdictions through data sharing and stock assessment. This could be enhanced for example through MSE processes.</p> | N/A | N/A |  |  | <p>SC – Jack Mackerel Working Group (JMWG), COMM?</p> |  |



|    |  |   |   |     |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|----|--|---|---|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
|    |  | <p>sharing and stock assessments. This could also be enhanced through processes such as MSE.</p> <p>The IWG noted that achieving compatibility between high seas and national jurisdictions is a complex challenge. The IWG note that the Commission should confirm if the current data sharing and stock assessment work is not sufficient to achieve this recommendation. If not, then the Commission should discuss ways to incentivise improved cooperation and compatibility, or request this guidance off the SC or JMWG.</p> |   |     |     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | <p>Jack mackerel - Undertake analysis of the jack mackerel fishery's impact on other fish stocks and the broader ecosystem. Provide scientific recommendations based on these reviews and adopt relevant management decisions as</p> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b></p> <p>In-part (agree in principle with improving SPRFMO's understanding of potential ecosystem impacts but need to consider this rec in view of other SC priorities).</p>   | <p>It was noted that there is work underway and planned on chub mackerel bycatch. The MSE could include chub mackerel bycatch</p> | N/A | N/A |  |  | <p>SC – JMWG, Ecosystem Working Group (EWG); COMM?</p> |  |  |



|    |  |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|    | <p>necessary, with particular attention to chub mackerel, protected species and species of concern.</p>  | <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b></p> <p>Medium (for chub mackerel)</p> <p>Low – for other species</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b></p> <p>The IWG noted the SC’s comments that there is work underway and planned on chub mackerel bycatch, and that there may be scope in the MSE to include chub mackerel bycatch as a performance indicator.</p> <p>Beyond the already planned chub mackerel bycatch work, the IWG noted that the Commission would likely need to request the SC to undertake a broader analysis on JM fishery impacts on other stocks and ecosystem impacts.</p> | <p>as a performance indicator.</p>   |            |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | <p>Squid - To ensure effective and timely management of the squid fishery, it is essential to execute all tasks related to squid as outlined in the SC’s</p> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b></p> <p>In-full</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b></p>  | <p>The planning and timelines for these three elements are important and the subject of the SC</p> | <p>N/A</p> | <p><i>To be completed during FAC</i></p> |  |  | <p>SC – Squid Working Group (SWG);</p> |  |  |



|    |   |   |   |                                   |     |  |  |                           |  |  |
|----|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----|--|--|---------------------------|--|--|
|    | <p>Multiannual Workplan, which should be integrated into the broader Business Plan. This includes prioritising the development of management strategy evaluations (MSE) and harvest control rules (HCR), ensuring that work is directed and resourced in a more thoughtful and strategic manner, as part of an overall effort to achieve SPRFMO's long-term objectives.</p> <p>The Commission shall also consider alternative options if the stock assessment cannot be completed or if it is not suitable for management purposes.</p> | <p>Medium/high</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b></p> <p>The IWG noted the comments from the SC that they do not have a clear mandate on this recommendation until instructed by the Commission, but MSE, HCR and alternative options to the stock assessment including their timing are already being considered as part of the SC multiannual workplan.</p> <p>The IWG recommends that the Commission provide clear instructions on progressing the development of one or all of the elements.</p> | multiannual workplan.   |                                   |     |  |  | FAC; COMM?                |  |  |
| 13 | <p>Squid - Participants of the fishery, including Members with squid fisheries in areas under national jurisdiction, should fully cooperate with the Commission and the SC through data</p>   | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b></p> <p>In-full</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b></p> <p>High</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b></p>   | <p>Data sharing is a feature of the SC multiannual work plan, which would include meta data and analysis.</p> | <i>To be completed during CTC</i> | N/A |  |  | SC – SWG, DWG; CTC; COMM? |  |  |



|    |   |  |                                 |            |            |  |  |                        |  |  |
|----|---|--|---------------------------------|------------|------------|--|--|------------------------|--|--|
|    | <p>sharing to facilitate the assessment.</p>          | <p>The IWG reaffirmed the importance of data from areas under national jurisdiction to support squid stock assessments.</p> <p>The IWG noted the main challenges for progressing squid stock assessments is data availability, which is beyond the scope of the SC, also noting coastal states for squid have not provided their consent for CMM 02-2025 and CMM 18-2025 to apply in areas under national jurisdiction.</p> <p>The IWG noted that this goes beyond the scope of the subsidiaries and requires Commission discussion on whether this is something SPRFMO and Members with squid fisheries in areas under national jurisdiction hope to achieve in the medium to long term, noting that this is dependent on coastal states in sharing the data.</p> |                                 |            |            |  |  |                        |  |  |
| 14 | <p>Squid - Increase the observer coverage rate to</p> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b></p>   | <p>Members noted the recent</p> | <p>N/A</p> | <p>N/A</p> |  |  | <p>SC – SWG; COMM?</p> |  |  |



|  |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>generate relevant data that supports the SC's work, addressing both the targeted squid fishery and its potential impact on associated species.</p> | <p>In-part<br/><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b><br/>Medium<br/><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b><br/>The IWG noted recent increases in observer coverage and the development of Electronic Monitoring (EM) standards, which have been reflected in CMM 18-2025.<br/>The IWG noted that discussions during the Intersessional meetings reflected the comments in COMM13 Meeting Report Paragraph 152, and there was a divergence of views. While there was broad agreement to addressing squid data gaps, there was no consensus on whether increasing observer coverage is the way to achieve this objective.<br/>The IWG noted that this recommendation requires further discussion in Commission.</p> | <p>increases in observer coverage and development of EM standards</p> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|



|    |   |   |                           |     |     |  |  |                 |  |  |
|----|---|---|---------------------------|-----|-----|--|--|-----------------|--|--|
| 15 | <p>Squid - Given the uncertainties regarding the current fishing capacity, consider further precautionary measures, including strengthening fishing effort limitations.</p> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b><br/>In-part</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b><br/>Medium</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b><br/>The IWG noted the logical sequencing for this recommendation starts with completing the stock assessment and then exploring this recommendation. However, it was noted that this recommendation should not be fully dependent on the stock assessment.</p> <p>The IWG supported in principle that a precautionary approach should be applied across all of SPRFMO's fisheries.</p> <p>The IWG would ultimately need to be a Commission decision.</p> <p>As a starting point, the IWG recommended that the Commission consider any previous SC</p> | Refer to PR2 IWG comments | N/A | N/A |  |  | SC – SWG; COMM? |  |  |
|----|---|---|---------------------------|-----|-----|--|--|-----------------|--|--|



|    |  |  |  |     |                                   |  |  |                            |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|-----|-----------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|--|--|
|    |  | recommendations associated with this recommendation that have not been implemented.  |  |     |                                   |  |  |                            |  |  |
| 16 | Squid - The Commission should ensure adequate funding and resources, including financial support, to involve scientists from academic institutions with relevant expertise. Additionally, Members and Observers should be encouraged to maintain their cooperation through both in-kind and financial contributions. | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b></p> <p>In-part</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b></p> <p>Low</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b></p> <p>The IWG noted that the FAC would need to option into the budget an ongoing fund to engage scientists, particularly on this recommendation which is related to squid, in view of other competing budget priorities and resourcing. These options would need to be brought forward to the Commission for decision.</p> | SC noted that funding and resourcing is reliant on FAC and Commission. It further noted the potential to increase financial contributions to balance with in-kind resourcing. This could be considered as part of the wider business planning. | N/A | <i>To be completed during FAC</i> |  |  | SC – SWG; SCAF; FAC; COMM? |  |  |
| 17 | Deepwater - Investigate alternative approaches to managing these fisheries to explore whether it is possible to maintain a viable fishery in a way that  | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b></p> <p>In-part (The IWG do not fully agree with the rec but support that alternative</p>  | N/A  | N/A | N/A                               |  |  | COMM?                      |  |  |



|  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>is consistent with the Convention's objective.</p> | <p>approaches need to be investigated)</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b></p> <p>Medium overall</p> <p>High (if current CMM/framework is not implemented).</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b></p> <p>The IWG noted that further discussion is needed by the Commission on alternative approaches and implementation of the current measure.</p> <p>The IWG noted the obligations under UNGA and noting the upcoming UN Bottom Fishing Review scheduled for 2026.</p> <p>The IWG do not fully agree that CMM 03 is not fit for purpose. However, the IWG noted the role of the Commission in investigating alternative options to overcome the current situation which is not ideal.</p> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|



|    |  |   |   |            |            |  |  |   |  |  |
|----|--|---|---|------------|------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| 18 | <p>Deepwater - With respect to all other fish species captured by paragraph 11 of CMM 03a, implement an operational trigger which, if met, would activate the development of more specific fisheries management measures, for example, catch limits.</p> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b><br/>           In-part (the IWG agree that there needs to be mechanisms explored but do not think SPRFMO should limit this recommendation to operational triggers as one approach).</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b><br/>           Low</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b><br/>           The IWG noted the work that is currently ongoing in the SC multiannual workplan on fish species captured in CMM 03a.<br/>           The IWG agreed that there is no urgency to prioritise catch limits for other deepwater species given effort is so low. However, the IWG noted that the catch is spread across a number of species and consideration should be given to where the species are caught and the catch mix overall when</p> | <p>Work for hapuku and blue eye trevella is on the workplan</p> | <p>N/A</p> | <p>N/A</p> |  |  | <p>SC – Deepwater Working Group (DWWG); COMM?</p> |  |  |
|----|--|---|---|------------|------------|--|--|---|--|--|



|    |  |   |   |     |     |  |  |                  |  |  |
|----|--|---|---|-----|-----|--|--|------------------|--|--|
|    |  | <p>considering management measures.</p> <p>The IWG noted that while this recommendation is specific to deepwater, this recommendation has relevance for SPRFMO's other fisheries.</p>   |   |     |     |  |  |                  |  |  |
| 19 | <p>Exploratory Fisheries - The Commission and its relevant subsidiary bodies should initiate discussions to clarify how to apply Article 28 of CMM 13. This includes identifying fisheries approaching the ten-year mark and establishing a framework for transitioning them into established fisheries.</p> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b><br/>In-full</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b><br/>High (if exploratory fisheries have already hit 10 years).</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b><br/>The IWG noted the need to consider other exploratory fisheries in this recommendation (outside of toothfish).<br/><br/>The IWG noted that SC13 report has two recommendations associated with this recommendation for the Commission to consider and agree:</p> | <p>Noted that the toothfish workshop for SC14 will begin to address this recommendation</p> | N/A | N/A |  |  | SC – DWWG; COMM? |  |  |



1. Endorse holding a workshop immediately prior to SC14 to initiate the process of developing a framework that would assist with the transitioning of exploratory toothfish fisheries to established fisheries, once the 10-year limit has been reached.
2. Agree the terms of reference (SC13-04 Attachment 1), with an additional terms of reference to produce a standardised data collection plan.

The IWG also noted this recommendation is linked to recommendation 20, and noted that the workshop would look to address the cumulative impacts on toothfish.

The IWG noted that the Commission would need to agree to recommendation 19 and instruct SC to host

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|



|    |  |  |   |                                   |     |  |  |                       |  |  |
|----|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----|--|--|-----------------------|--|--|
|    |  | a workshop and agree the terms of reference.   |   |                                   |     |  |  |                       |  |  |
| 20 | Exploratory Fisheries - The SC should conduct review of the cumulative impacts of exploratory fisheries on both target stocks and the broader ecosystem.   | <p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</p> <p>In-full</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b></p> <p>Medium (noting the logical sequencing is rec 19).</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b></p> <p>see above rec 19.</p>   | It was noted that the workshop described above will begin to address the accumulative impacts on toothfish  | N/A                               | N/A |  |  | SC – DWWG?            |  |  |
| 21 | Exploratory Fisheries - The Commission should work to strengthen cooperation with adjacent RFMOs, particularly regarding the management of toothfish fisheries. Engaging with CCAMLR can provide valuable insights and support for the effective management of these fisheries and the process to transition these into established fisheries. | <p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</p> <p>In-full</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b></p> <p>Medium</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b></p> <p>The IWG noted the work that has already occurred and the cooperation with CCAMLR.</p> <p>The IWG noted that this recommendation could be integrated into the work under recommendation 19.</p> | Noted that the workshop will begin the process to transition exploratory fisheries to established fisheries. It was noted that there is already a strong cooperative SPRFMO/CCAMLR relationship | <i>To be completed during CTC</i> | N/A |  |  | SC – DWWG; CTC; COMM? |  |  |



|    |  |  |  |     |                                   |  |  |               |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|-----|-----------------------------------|--|--|---------------|--|--|
| 22 | <p>All fisheries - To ensure the consistent application of the precautionary principle, the Commission should adopt a defined harvest strategy approach for all SPRFMO fisheries. This approach will provide a clear framework for decision-making, ensuring that measures are based on scientific advice, aligned with the Convention objectives, and adaptable to changing conditions.</p> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b><br/>In-full</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b><br/>High</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b><br/>The IWG noted this recommendation suggests the need for an overarching framework that applies to all fisheries, which would support consideration of individual harvest strategies.<br/><br/>The IWG noted that the SC need guidance from the Commission on whether an overarching framework would be useful, and could consider drawing on approaches taken in other RFMOs including SIOFA.</p> | <p>SC noted that this would require Commission guidance including on how to approach this recommendation e.g. whether this might be done through an overarching framework that applies to all fisheries, or adopting individual harvest strategies for each of the fisheries. SPRFMO could draw from approaches taken in other RFMOs including SIOFA</p> | N/A | N/A                               |  |  | SC;<br>COMM?  |  |  |
| 23 | <p>The Commission should prioritise addressing barriers to participation by considering elevating Spanish to the status of at least a Working Language. This implementation can be scalable in both time</p>   | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b><br/>In-full</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b><br/>High</p>  | N/A  | N/A | <i>To be completed during FAC</i> |  |  | FAC;<br>COMM? |  |  |



|    |  |  |     |     |                                   |  |  |            |  |  |
|----|--|--|-----|-----|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------|--|--|
|    | <p>and scope. The Commission could explore various options to fund interpretation and translation, such as partnerships with other institutions, formalising interpretation as a condition of hosting meetings, utilising the Developing States fund, and identifying additional options through the FAC workplan.</p>                                 | <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b></p> <p>The IWG noted that COMM13 has already supported the elevation of Spanish as a working language.</p> <p>No further action is needed from the Commission but to note the actions required from FAC. Once FAC has progressed next steps on scaling and implementation, the Commission would be responsible for endorsing the next steps.</p> |     |     |                                   |  |  |            |  |  |
| 24 | <p>The Commission should maintain a continuous and diligent focus on fulfilling Article 19 of the Convention. This includes ensuring that the Developing States Fund is appropriately utilised, and that CMMs consider the special requirements of Developing States. To ensure full implementation of Article 19, the Commission should develop a</p> | <p><b>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</b></p> <p>In-full</p> <p><b>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</b></p> <p>Medium</p> <p><b>IWG Comments to COMM:</b></p> <p>As per comments to FAC, which are relevant for COMM.</p>  | N/A | N/A | <i>To be completed during FAC</i> |  |  | FAC; COMM? |  |  |



|  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>comprehensive plan for Article 19 and ensure it is discussed annually. The first iteration of this plan could be informed by bilateral consultations led by the new Executive Secretary in 2025.</p> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|