

14TH MEETING OF THE SPRFMO COMMISSION

Panama City, Panama, 1 to 6 March 2026

COMM 14 – Doc 09_rev1

Report of the SPRFMO Performance Review 2 Intersessional Working Group (PR2IWG)

Chairperson of the PR2IWG

Summary and Recommendations

SPRFMO undertook its second performance review in 2024, which resulted in a set of recommendations aimed at enhancing the functioning of the Organisation and improving its overall effectiveness. The 13th annual meeting of the Commission agreed to establish an Intersessional Working Group (IWG) to draft an Implementation Plan for the recommendations arising from the Second Performance Review, in order to ensure that the relevant recommendations are effectively implemented.

This document presents the Report of the IWG, which needs to be considered in conjunction with the draft Implementation Plan (COMM14-Doc09.1 [Attachment A – SPRFMO PR2 Implementation Plan](#)) and draft Implementation Timeline (COMM14-Doc09.2 [Attachment B – SPRFMO PR2 Implementation Timeline](#)) both for comment and agreement by COMM14.

The Commission is invited to:

- **Note the Report;**
- **Note Attachment A – SPRFMO PR2 Implementation Plan and:**
 - *Assign agree/disagree to each recommendation;*
 - *Agree a level of priority for each recommendation;*
 - *Agree the assignment of each recommendation to a relevant responsible body(ies) for action*
 - *Comment on each recommendation as necessary;*
- **Note Attachment B – SPRFMO PR2 Implementation Timeline and:**
 - *Comment on the Implementation Timeline;*
 - *Agree to a timeline in which the recommendations can be achieved.*

Report of the SPRFMO Performance Review 2 Intersessional Working Group (PR2IWG)

1. Overview

This report integrates the findings of the Second SPRFMO Performance Review (PR2) with the full set of intersessional deliberations carried out by the PR2 Intersessional Working Group (IWG). It consolidates:

- an introduction to the IWG mandate;
- a high-level synthesis of PR2 findings;
- detailed recommendation-by-recommendation analysis incorporating IWG positions, priorities and commentary; and
- substantive comments from the intersessional working group meetings (Annex A)

The draft Implementation Plan for comment ([Attachment A](#)) and Implementation Timeline (Attachment B) are noted in this report but can be found separately on the SPRFMO website.

Background

The South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization (SPRFMO) is committed to the continuous improvement of its operational and governance frameworks. As part of this commitment, 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 an Intersessional Working Group (IWG) to draft an Implementation Plan to ensure that the relevant recommendations are effectively implemented, for the recommendations arising from the Second Performance Review. These Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the objectives, composition, tasks, and process for the Working Group.

Objectives

The primary objective of the IWG was to develop a draft Implementation Plan for the recommendations of the Second Performance Review, which included:

- Assigning each recommendation to the relevant responsible bodies (Commission, Compliance and Technical Committee (CTC), Scientific Committee (SC) and Finance and Administration Committee (FAC);
- Assessing and proposing the level of priority for each recommendation; and
- Proposing viable options for responding to the recommendations.

While the IWG assigned a suggested level of acceptance, acceptance (in full or in part) or rejection of each recommendation is ultimately a decision for the Commission. The work of the IWG outlined in this report is aimed at supporting the Commission to make this determination.

Composition

The IWG was comprised of SPRFMO Members, CNCPs and Observers who expressed interest in participating in the work and the Chairs and Vice Chairs of the Commission, CTC, FAC and SC. The Working Group was chaired by Australia, with the Secretariat providing coordination during the process. Participation of Observers in the IWG were in accordance with the SPRFMO Rules of Procedure.

Tasks and Responsibilities

The IWG considered all 24 recommendations of the Second SPRFMO Performance Review.



The IWG undertook the following tasks:

- Assigning Recommendations: The IWG assigned each of the relevant recommendations from the Second Performance Review (Annex A) to the relevant responsible bodies (Commission, CTC, FAC and SC) based on their area of expertise and responsibility.
- Prioritisation: The IWG assessed and proposed the level of priority for each recommendation, considering factors such as urgency, resource requirements and availability, and impact on the achievement of the objectives of SPRFMO. Recommendations will be classified a high, medium, or low priority.
- Responses to recommendations: The IWG have provided suggestions for responding to the recommendations, including advice on implementation where recommendations are accepted (partially or fully). These responses are intended to be developed in consultation with the relevant bodies (SC, CTC, FAC, COMM).

The IWG also considered the relevance of the recommendations of the first Performance Review (PR1) in developing responses to the recommendations of the Second Performance Review. Noting the significant number of recommendations from PR1, the PR2 agreed to focus on implementation of the PR2 recommendations and noted that the Panel's Report analysis provides a good overview for the assessment of PR1 recommendations.

The work of the IWG was undertaken electronically via email exchange, used the SPRFMO Microsoft Teams platform, and met virtually three times during the 2025 intersessional period to discuss the recommendations relevant to each subsidiary body. A summary of comments from the three meetings can be found at Annex 1.

Review of the Implementation Plan and Timeline

Now that the IWG work is complete, the review process for the draft Implementation Plan (Attachment A) will take place in CTC13 and FAC13, similar to how the review process was completed for SC13 in September 2025. Comments from SC13, CTC13 and FAC13 will then be consolidated into a rev1 of the Implementation Plan for COMM14's consideration. Once COMM14 has provided working comments on the rev1, the Commission will then be asked to review and update the draft Implementation Timeline accordingly (Attachment B).

Monitoring and Follow-up

In order to monitor progress and follow up on the status of recommendations, it is advised that the Implementation Plan and Timeline be considered a living document for consideration at each Commission meeting. If this is agreed, the Commission and its subsidiary bodies, including CTC, FAC and SC, will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the approved plan. Each body will track progress, review timelines, and ensure that tasks are being completed in line with the agreed priorities and make any necessary adjustments to the plan as the process unfolds.



2. High-Level Summary of PR2 Panel and PR2 IWG Findings

The Review Panel identified five strategic areas requiring strengthened organisational performance:

- (a) governance, particularly long-term planning and oversight;
- (b) Secretariat capability and internal systems;
- (c) data and information management;
- (d) fisheries management performance across jack mackerel, squid, deepwater, and exploratory fisheries; and
- (e) strengthened engagement, especially for developing States and Spanish-speaking Members.

The Review Panel emphasised the need for a forward-looking, integrated business plan and improved direction from the Commission to subsidiary bodies.

The PR2 IWG took the Panel’s analysis and used this as a basis to make an assessment of the recommendations.

High-level summary between PR2 panel findings and PR2 IWG findings	
Panel findings summary	PR2 Intersessional Working Group findings summary
<p>1. Governance - Planning, and Oversight</p> <p>SPRFMO’s governance structures function, but lack long-term strategic direction, integrated planning, and modern oversight systems.</p> <p>Key issues identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No strategic plan describing where SPRFMO aims to be in 5–10 years. - Fragmented annual work plans across subsidiary bodies. - Heavy workloads for the Scientific Committee and insufficient Commission guidance. - Weak oversight of Secretariat performance and insufficient monitoring of subsidiary body outputs. - Financial fragility linked to reliance on voluntary contributions. <p>Key conclusion: SPRFMO is at a governance crossroads, needing a unified long-term direction and integrated multi-year business planning.</p>	<p>The IWG overall agreed with the findings of the PR2 Panel which found that there is limited organisation-wide strategic planning and a limited integrated multi-year business planning. Work programmes are not well prioritised or aligned across bodies and oversight of performance is weak. It agreed that a Statement of Intent and an integrated Business Plan with a three-year horizon would help support the long-term direction and planning of SPRFMO.</p>
<p>2. Building a High Performing Secretariat</p> <p>The Panel finds serious internal problems in the Secretariat that pose risks to SPRFMO’s functioning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence of workplace dysfunction, poor culture, unresolved grievances, inconsistent HR practices, and excessive workloads. 	<p>The IWG agreed with the PR2 Panel findings which identified organisational deficits (leadership, HR systems, workplace culture, recruitment/retention and hosting constraints). It agreed with the recommendation to recruit a skilled Executive Secretary and developing a Secretariat Operational Plan with measurable KPIs. However, it also noted that careful consideration needs to be given to any significant overhaul of systems, which</p>



High-level summary between PR2 panel findings and PR2 IWG findings	
Panel findings summary	PR2 Intersessional Working Group findings summary
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recruitment and retention problems linked to hosting arrangements (e.g., visa restrictions for spouses, misinformation during hiring). - Lack of performance management systems, modern policies, or transparent administrative processes. - Insufficient resourcing and unclear future role of the Secretariat. <p>Key conclusion: Undertake an organisational overhaul and recruit an Executive Secretary with strong leadership, management, and reform capability</p>	<p>would put additional burden on an already constrained budget. To this end, the IWG noted it is important that the Commission prioritise certain work streams and be selective in the work that they decide to commission.</p>
<p>3. Data Collection and Information Management Systems</p> <p>Information is a strategic asset for SPRFMO, but current systems are not fit for purpose. Key concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No overarching information management strategy. - Underinvestment has resulted in piecemeal, inefficient systems based on unstructured spreadsheets. - Data access, analysis, and user-friendliness are major pain points. - CMM 02 (data standards) has never undergone substantive review. - Data Working Group’s mandate is too limited and progress slow due to lack of chairing. <p>Key conclusion: Develop a comprehensive Information Management Strategy and Data Management Plan, and elevate the Data Working Group to report directly to the Commission.</p>	<p>The IWG agreed that SPRFMO’s data collection and information management systems should be a key focus, noting SPRFMO’s data governance rules and systems are out-of-date and not fit for purpose. The IWG agreed with the recommendation by the PR2 Panel which calls for an Information Management Strategy and Data Management Plan (which is currently a work in progress), the Data Working Group reporting directly to the Commission, and a comprehensive review of CMM 02.</p>
<p>4. Fisheries Management</p> <p>Cross-cutting recommendation: Adopt a harvest strategy approach for all fisheries</p>	<p>The IWG found that performance is mixed when assessing how SPRFMO fisheries achieve the Conventions operational objectives. While there was consensus support for the development of an overarching harvest strategy framework, the specific data needs and management measures for each fishery should be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p>



High-level summary between PR2 panel findings and PR2 IWG findings

Panel findings summary	PR2 Intersessional Working Group findings summary
<p>Jack mackerel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A major SPRFMO success; biomass increasing. - But overshooting scientific advice and lack of coordination with national jurisdictions pose risks. - Ecosystem impacts insufficiently understood. 	<p>The IWG agreed that Jack mackerel is a success story but requires completion of the harvest strategy and better ecosystem/bycatch analysis.</p>
<p>Jumbo flying squid</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Substantial progress, but still “poorly managed”. - Critical gaps: stock assessment uncertainty, insufficient data, low observer coverage, no catch limits, and ecosystem impacts inadequately assessed. - Stock status remains uncertain. 	<p>The IWG acknowledged that while there have been slight increases in observer coverage, squid data remains poorly constrained amid assessment uncertainties and limited observer coverage. Many of the recommendations related to squid goes beyond the scope of the subsidiaries and require Commission-level discussion.</p>
<p>Deepwater fisheries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current CMM 03 is complex, costly, and may unintentionally harm industry viability. - Requirement to protect 70% of VME indicator taxa was not implemented in 2024. - Panel urges exploring alternative management approaches. 	<p>The IWG found that SPRFMO has progressed the management of deepwater fisheries (noting the 2023 review process of CMM03) but the implementation of CMM 03 remains complex. The IWG noted there may be scope for further review.</p>
<p>Exploratory fisheries</p> <p>Framework generally effective but:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cumulative ecosystem impacts not assessed. - No planning for the transition to established fisheries after 10 years. - Toothfish fisheries require greater cooperation with CCAMLR. 	<p>The IWG acknowledged that as SPRFMO exploratory fisheries near the 10-year mark, there is a requirement for SPRFMO to transition exploratory fisheries to established fisheries, and continuing to closely cooperate with CCAMLR for toothfish.</p>
<p>5. Improving Engagement</p> <p>Key participation barriers persist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spanish-speaking Members (35%+) face significant disadvantages due to English-only operations. 	<p>The IWG agreed with the PR2 panel findings that language and engagement barriers continue to limit participation in SPRFMO. The IWG noted the importance of a scalable plan to elevate Spanish as a working language.</p> <p>The IWG noted there are two tiers/elements of the fund. Technical assistance and capacity building and travel assistance. Travel assistance is currently being utilised.</p>



High-level summary between PR2 panel findings and PR2 IWG findings

Panel findings summary	PR2 Intersessional Working Group findings summary
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited translation, no interpretation at SC meetings, few Spanish-speaking Secretariat staff. - Developing States' needs under Article 19 are not fully met; fund underutilised. <p>Key conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gradually elevate Spanish to a working language. - Implement scalable translation/interpretation across meetings and documents. - Develop an Article 19 implementation plan and strengthen capacity-building support. 	<p>The technical capacity building element has been under-utilised.</p>

3. Key PR2 IWG Findings by Recommendation (1-24)

The below provides a breakdown summary of each recommendation and the IWG's key findings. The full suite of analyses and comments can be found at [Annex A](#).

Recommendation 1 — Annual Strategic Discussion & Statement of Intent

Key Findings

- SPRFMO lacks an organisation-wide strategic planning framework, resulting in fragmented direction and inconsistent long-term prioritisation.
- Subsidiary bodies develop annual workplans without a shared vision, causing misalignment and duplicated effort.
- IWG Members expressed concern about adding new processes without reducing existing burdens; appetite exists for strategic direction but not for additional bureaucracy.
- IWG noted strategic issues (e.g., climate change, BBNJ, labour standards) are increasingly raised, but without a structured home in the Commission agenda.
- IWG Members suggested that strategic discussions could be better integrated into existing workstreams (e.g., 3-year workplans) rather than creating a standalone Statement of Intent.

Recommendation 2 — Development of a 3-Year Business Plan and Headquarters Agreement Review

Key Findings

- IWG noted the absence of integrated, multi-year organisational planning across the Commission, Secretariat and subsidiary bodies.
- SC and CTC IWG discussions confirmed that their existing planning cycles are short-term, restricting continuity and long-term goal setting.
- FAC IWG discussions and the Executive Secretary acknowledged the need for structured resource planning, including clearer links between tasks, budgets and Secretariat capacity.



- IWG Members agreed on the high priority of establishing the Business Plan, but flagged the Headquarters Agreement component as more complex, requiring discussion of costs and national legal constraints.
 - Substantial preparatory work is already underway in SC, CTC and FAC, indicating readiness for a Commission-driven framework.
-

Recommendation 3 — Improving Direction to Subsidiary Bodies & Secretariat (separate workplans and Secretariat Operational Plan)

Key Findings

- Subsidiary bodies currently operate without a unified framework or performance expectations, resulting in siloed work and unclear tasking.
 - SC, CTC and FAC Chairs emphasised the need for clearer guidance from the Commission, especially regarding prioritisation and resourcing.
 - The Secretariat stressed that improved direction would also support meaningful performance evaluation and internal planning.
 - IWG agreed that workplans should be integrated through the Business Plan rather than be developed in isolation.
 - IWG Members emphasised caution about excessive complexity; the system must remain “fit for purpose.”
-

Recommendation 4 — Recruitment of a Competent Executive Secretary

Key Findings

- IWG noted the identified substantial leadership, management and HR system limitations within the Secretariat.
 - IWG Members agreed there is a need for a performance-based framework for the Executive Secretary to measure success and ensure accountability and alignment with Commission expectations.
 - IWG confirmed consensus that this recommendation should be implemented in full and treated as a high priority.
-

Recommendation 5 — Independent Review of the Headquarters Agreement

Key Findings

- IWG noted identified constraints within the Headquarters Agreement affecting visas, spousal employment rights and Secretariat recruitment.
- IWG Members expressed concern about the budgetary implications of a fully independent review.
- FAC IWG discussions recognised that improvements to Secretariat conditions are needed but questioned whether all issues require third-party review.
- The Executive Secretary highlighted the need to distinguish between treaty-level amendments and implementation corrections, as each carries different implications.
- IWG agreed that improvements are necessary but maintained mixed views on commissioning a full independent review.



Recommendation 6 — Secretariat Business Plan (3-Year Horizon)

Key Findings

- IWG noted significant issues in Secretariat workload management, organisational culture, HR systems and job structure.
- IWG Members emphasised the importance of a staffing plan and prioritised this element above others.
- IWG noted internal process reform must be paced carefully due to resource constraints and existing mandatory work.
- IWG agreed that the Business Plan is necessary but requires Commission direction on which components should be prioritised first.

Recommendation 7 — Develop an Information Management Strategy (IMS) & Data Management Plan (DMP)

Key Findings

- IWG acknowledged the current limitations with SPRFMO's data and information management systems, but also noted work is currently underway to resolve discrepancies.
- IWG noted the PR2 panel finding that SPRFMO treats information as an operational by-product rather than a strategic asset.
- IWG acknowledged the urgent need for standardisation, reliability and clarity in data workflows.
- Capacity constraints in the Secretariat and the absence of a DWG Chair are significant barriers.
- IWG Members agreed this is a high-priority recommendation, noting dependence of multiple fisheries and compliance tasks on robust information systems.

Recommendation 8 — Elevate the Data Working Group

Key Findings

- IWG found the DWG's current mandate is limited relative to the organisation-wide information management needs.
- IWG Members supported direct reporting to the Commission but did not decide on whether DWG should become a fully separate subsidiary body.
- IWG concerns focused on avoiding structural complexity while still empowering the DWG to lead data reform.

Recommendation 9 — Comprehensive Review of CMM 02 (Data Standards)

Key Findings

- IWG noted that CMM 02 has not undergone a full substantive review (but noted there is work underway), despite major changes in data needs.
- Both SC13 and CTC IWG discussions noted growing complexity in data collection, verification, and reporting, making CMM 02 outdated.
- IWG Members stressed that the review should improve efficiency as well as quality—not just increase data requirements.



- IWG recognised the urgency but emphasised sequencing with the IMS/DMP development.
-

Recommendation 10 — Cooperation on Jack Mackerel Across Jurisdictions

Key Findings

- IWG noted incompatible management between high seas and national jurisdictions risks undermining stock-wide sustainability.
 - SC13 discussions confirmed strong scientific cooperation but noted limitations on influencing management within national waters.
 - IWG Members recognised political sensitivities but acknowledged the long-term need for compatibility incentives.
-

Recommendation 11 — Ecosystem and Bycatch Analysis for Jack Mackerel

Key Findings

- IWG agreed that there is insufficient analysis of cross-species interactions (especially chub mackerel).
 - IWG noted SC has preliminary work underway, including MSE indicators for chub mackerel.
 - IWG noted practical limits on SC workload and broader ecosystem work may require careful prioritisation.
 - IWG Members supported progressing chub mackerel work but viewed broader ecosystem expansion as lower priority.
-

Recommendation 12 — Squid MSE, HCR and Alternative Management Approaches

Key Findings

- IWG noted the PR2 Panel's findings that the squid fishery is insufficiently constrained and poorly understood biologically.
 - SC13 noted it cannot progress without explicit Commission mandates and adequate resources.
 - IWG emphasised urgent need for structure: stock assessment, MSE, HCR or interim alternatives.
 - IWG Members agreed on full implementation but assigned medium/high priority depending on sequencing.
-

Recommendation 13 — Data Sharing for Squid (Including National Jurisdictions)

Key Findings

- IWG noted major gaps in data availability from coastal States, limiting SC's ability to progress assessments.
 - IWG Members noted that CMM 18 does not currently apply inside national waters without consent.
 - IWG agreed that improved data sharing is essential but acknowledged sovereignty sensitivities.
 - The IWG viewed this as high priority for stock assessment feasibility.
-

Recommendation 14 — Increased Observer Coverage in Squid



Key Findings

- IWG noted extremely low observer coverage relative to fishery scale.
 - IWG Members held diverging views: some emphasised the burden on fleets; others prioritised data needs.
 - Recent incremental increases under CMM 18 were acknowledged, but IWG recognised that gaps remain.
 - IWG noted that Commission guidance is needed, and that there may be alternative ways to achieve the overarching objective and data gaps.
-

Recommendation 15 — Precautionary Squid Effort Limitations

Key Findings

- IWG noted that existing effort limits exceed conservative scientific advice.
 - IWG had no consensus; several members support precaution, others prefer waiting for more biological certainty.
 - SC discussions highlighted that stock assessment progress is slow, suggesting precaution may be needed sooner, with guidance needed at the Commission level.
-

Recommendation 16 — Funding for External Scientific Expertise (Squid)

Key Findings

- IWG noted reliance on voluntary contributions.
 - SC discussions expressed support for increased funding but noted that FAC must allocate resources.
 - IWG viewed this as lower priority relative to other squid reforms unless tied directly to upcoming workshops or assessments and can be considered on a case-by-case basis.
-

Recommendation 17 — Alternative Approaches for Deepwater Management

Key Findings

- IWG agreed that further discussion is needed by the Commission on alternative approaches and implementation of the current measure.
 - Members could not agree on whether the current measure is “not fit for purpose” but acknowledge implementation challenges.
 - IWG supported exploring alternatives, especially in view of the 2026 UNGA bottom fishing review.
-

Recommendation 18 — Operational Triggers for Deepwater Species

Key Findings

- IWG agreed that operational triggers could be explored but did not agree that SPRFMO but should limit this recommendation to operational triggers as one approach.
- IWG Members felt triggers should be considered but tailored to species-specific contexts.
- IWG agreed that there is no urgency to prioritise catch limits for other deepwater species given effort is so low. However, noted that there is a work ongoing in the SC workplan.



- IWG agreed in part but viewed this as lower priority.
-

Recommendation 19 — Framework for Transitioning Exploratory Fisheries

Key Findings

- IWG noted that several exploratory fisheries are approaching the 10-year limit under CMM 13.
 - SC13 already proposed a workshop and ToR for toothfish transition planning.
 - IWG highlighted this as a high-urgency item due to looming regulatory deadlines.
-

Recommendation 20 — Cumulative Impact Review of Exploratory Fisheries

Key Findings

- IWG found that cumulative ecological impacts are not currently assessed.
 - IWG suggested sequencing after Recommendation 19, given dependencies.
 - SC noted the need for improved data inputs before such assessments can be robust.
-

Recommendation 21 — Strengthened RFMO Cooperation (especially CCAMLR)

Key Findings

- IWG emphasised biological linkages and overlapping management responsibilities for toothfish.
 - IWG Members agreed that cooperation already exists but can be enhanced, especially for transitions to established fisheries.
 - CTC discussions highlighted a compliance role in future frameworks.
-

Recommendation 22 — Harvest Strategy Framework for All Fisheries

Key Findings

- IWG agreed with the recommendation of an SPRFMO-wide harvest strategy (HS) approach to ensure consistency and transparency.
 - SC discussions emphasised the need for Commission guidance on whether an overarching HS framework is desired.
 - IWG Members see value in consistency but note each fishery will require tailored elements.
 - IWG placed high priority on this recommendation.
-

Recommendation 23 — Elevation of Spanish as a Working Language

Key Findings

- IWG noted language barriers significantly limit participation for Spanish-speaking Members.
- IWG strongly supported this recommendation; COMM13 already endorsed elevating Spanish.
- The IWG noted FAC is responsible for budget implications.
- Implementation can be a staged approach (once FAC has progressed next steps in scaling and implementation, the Commission would be responsible for endorsing next steps).



Recommendation 24 — Article 19 (Developing States) Implementation Plan

Key Findings

- IWG found the Developing States Fund is underutilised for technical assistance and capacity building.
- Travel support is functioning well; technical assistance is not accessed at all.
- IWG identified a lack of awareness and unclear processes as likely barriers.
- Members agreed that Commission-level discussion is needed to determine whether a comprehensive plan is required.



4. IWG Priority levels and indicative Timeline

Indicative timeline for recommendations	Has the work started?	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
High Priority						
Recommendation 2 — Development of a 3-Year Business Plan and HQA	No – needs COMM decision	COMM14 would need to agree to the Business Plan, and then agree to a timeline for the work to be carried out, and task the Plan to be developed internally or independently.	Draft brought to COMM15 as a working paper. Comments required by COMM15 and either agreed or tasked to continue to develop.	If not finished in 2027, brought forward to COMM16 in 2028 for agreement.		
Recommendation 4 — Recruitment of a Competent Executive Secretary (High priority)	Yes	Performance review conducted annually.	Performance review conducted annually.	Performance review conducted annually.	This recommendation is assessed this year coinciding with the ES four-year term.	
Recommendation 6 — Secretariat Business Plan (3 Year Horizon)	No – needs COMM decision (as per rec 2)	COMM14 would need to agree to the Business Plan, and then agree to a timeline for the work to be carried out, and task the Plan to	Draft brought to COMM15 as a working paper. Comments required by COMM15 and either agreed or	If not finished in 2027, brought forward to COMM16 in 2028 for agreement.		



Indicative timeline for recommendations	Has the work started?	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
		be developed internally or independently.	tasked to continue to develop.			
Recommendation 7 — Develop an Information Management Strategy (IMS) & Data Management Plan (DMP)	Yes	Commission to instruct subsidiaries to review the draft IMS and DMP.	IMS and DMP drafts brought to COMM15 series of meetings to be reviewed by subsidiaries and Commission. Potential to have these agreed at this meeting.	At the latest, final drafts brought forward to COMM16 for agreement.		
Recommendation 9 — Comprehensive Review of CMM 02 (Data Standards)	No – needs COMM decision	COMM14 may want to consider a review during the 2026 intersessional period, which will align with the IMS and DMP development timeline.	If 2026 intersessional work is agreed, review brought to COMM15 for consideration.	Amendments to CMM 02 proposed and implemented.		
Recommendation 13 — Data Sharing for Squid (Including National Jurisdictions)	No	Needs discussion at COMM on whether this is something SPRFMO and	If yes, then SC to instruct COMM on what data is needed to be able to facilitate	Ongoing.	Ongoing.	Ongoing.



Indicative timeline for recommendations	Has the work started?	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
		Members with squid fisheries in areas under national jurisdiction hope to achieve in the medium to long term.	assessments. COMM15 to consider ways to incentivise data sharing.			
Recommendation 19 — Framework for Transitioning Exploratory Fisheries	Yes – since SC13	Workshop to be held after SC14 (September 2026).	COMM15 to consider workshop recommendations.	New measure drafting.	New measure finalisation.	
Recommendation 22 — Harvest Strategy Framework for All Fisheries	No – needs COMM decision	Commission to agree to exploring a framework/and guide the work of the SC.	Harvest Strategy Framework development to occur.	Harvest Strategy Framework presented to COMM16 (2028)	Finalised by 2029.	
Recommendation 23 — Elevation of Spanish as a Working Language	Yes	Already agreed – the Secretariat and FAC to continue work		Spanish language is elevated by COMM15 (2026) (dependent on plan which is being developed)		
Medium Priority						



Indicative timeline for recommendations	Has the work started?	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
<p>Recommendation 3 — Improving Direction to Subsidiary Bodies & Secretariat (separate workplans and Secretariat Operational Plan)</p>	<p>No— needs COMM decision</p>	<p>Commission to agree to separate workplans and Secretariat Operational Plan at COMM14 – subsidiary Chairs to work during the intersessional period.</p>	<p>Workplans and Operational Plan presented to COMM15 series of meetings. Comments required by COMM15 and either agreed or tasked to continue to develop.</p>	<p>Full workplans agreed by COMM16. Operational Plan to potentially coincide with development of SPRFMO Business Plan)</p>		
<p>Recommendation 8 — Elevate the Data Working Group</p>	<p>No – needs COMM decision</p>	<p>COMM14 to discuss/agree in principle. COMM may need to task the revision of DWG ToR.</p>	<p>Revised ToRs brought to COMM15 for agreement.</p>			
<p>Recommendation 10 — Cooperation on Jack Mackerel Across Jurisdictions</p>	<p>No (but currently voluntary)</p>	<p>Needs review – COMM14/15 to confirm if the current data sharing and stock assessment work is not sufficient to achieve this recommendation.</p>	<p>If no, COMM15 discussion on ways to incentivise improved cooperation.</p>	<p>Any improvements noted at COMM16.</p>	<p>Any improvements noted at COMM17.</p>	<p>The completion of this recommendation is reviewed.</p>



Indicative timeline for recommendations	Has the work started?	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
<p>Recommendation 11 — Ecosystem and Bycatch Analysis for Jack Mackerel (Medium for Chubb Mackerel, low for other species)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Work planned for 2026 on chub mackerel bycatch. However, COMM will need to decide if a Commission would want SC to undertake a broader analysis on JM fishery impacts on other stocks and ecosystem impacts.</p>	<p>If yes, SC to bring forward a plan (develop into their workplan) for COMM consideration.</p>	<p>2028 dependent on SC's timeline.</p>	<p>2029 dependent on SC's timeline. Work potentially brought forward to SC16 and then to COMM17 for consideration.</p>	<p>Potential changes to CMM 01 to be considered/reviewed.</p>
<p>Recommendation 12 — Squid MSE, HCR and Alternative Management Approaches</p>	<p>No – needs COMM decision</p>	<p>MSE, HCR and alternative options to the stock assessment including their timing are already being considered as part of the SC multiannual workplan. COMM14 would need to consider these recommendations</p>	<p>If mandate is given to SC, SC to advise on appropriate timeline.</p>	<p>Work continues</p>	<p>SC to provide advice to COMM17. COMM17 to review findings and consider current management and if changes need occur based on SC advice.</p>	<p>Changes brought forward as a proposal to COMM18.</p>



Indicative timeline for recommendations	Has the work started?	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
		and provide a clear mandate to SC.				
Recommendation 14 — Increased Observer Coverage in Squid	No – not since the changes in 2023.				COMM to consider observer coverage requirements in 2029 to coincide with rec 12 management needs	
Recommendation 15 — Precautionary Squid Effort Limitations	No	Note there is one proposal to COMM14	COMM to review based on any new advice or proposals to COMM	COMM to review based on any new advice or proposals to COMM	COMM to consider effort limitations in 2029 to coincide with rec 12 and rec 14.	
Recommendation 17 — Alternative Approaches for Deepwater Management	No – needs COMM decision	Post COMM15 (February 2027)	COMM to consider after the outcomes from the UN Bottom Fishing Review and UNGA. If review is agreed, progress during the 2027 intersessional.	Any amendments brought to COMM17.		



Indicative timeline for recommendations	Has the work started?	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Recommendation 20 — Cumulative Impact Review of Exploratory Fisheries	No			Noting lower priority, to be considered in 2028 to make way for other high priority recs		
Recommendation 21 — Strengthened RFMO Cooperation (especially CCAMLR)	Yes	Ongoing – each year this is reviewed and COMM Members are invited to comment. this rec could be integrated into the work under recommendation 19.	Ongoing – reviewed annually. Potential stocktake of new measures which SPRFMO has taken to increase cooperation.	Ongoing – reviewed annually.	Ongoing – reviewed annually.	Ongoing – reviewed annually.
Recommendation 24 — Article 19 (Developing States) Implementation Plan	No – needs COMM decision		COMM15 to consider commissioning work to develop a draft plan	If agreed, draft plan brought to COMM16 as a working paper for comment and agreement.		
Low Priority						



Indicative timeline for recommendations	Has the work started?	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Recommendation 1 - Annual Strategic Discussion & Statement of Intent	No – needs COMM decision		COMM15 to consider a Statement of Intent and annual strategic discussion.			
Recommendation 5 — Independent Review of the Headquarters Agreement	No – needs COMM decision			If this rec is agreed, timeline will need to be determined. If agreed, suggest that discussions commence in 2028 noting the lower priority rating.	Independent work to occur in 2028 and brought forward to COMM17 for consideration.	
Recommendation 16 — Funding for External Scientific Expertise (Squid)	No	Ongoing (case-by-case)	Ongoing (case-by-case)	Ongoing (case-by-case)	Ongoing (case-by-case)	Ongoing (case-by-case)
Recommendation 18 — Operational Triggers for Deepwater Species	Yes	Ongoing (case-by-case)	Ongoing (case-by-case)	Ongoing (case-by-case)	Ongoing (case-by-case)	Ongoing (case-by-case)



Annex A – IWG Meeting Summaries

	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
1	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.	COMM	N/A	N/A	<p>Members recognised the intent of this recommendation, however, remain concerned on the practicality of implementing it.</p> <p>Members noted that instead of a statement of intent, discussions around strategic planning could feed into the 3-year workplans for subsidiary bodies and the commission.</p> <p>Noted the need to make it more trackable and referenced the work in other RFMOs with standing agenda items on critical issues. This would include information sharing and tasking to the secretariat to assist members.</p>	<i>To be discussed in Meeting 3 (COMM)</i>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-part</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): Low</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM: 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 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	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	COMM; SC; FAC; CTC	<p>IWG agreed to the recommended bodies including the addition of COMM, SC and CTC.</p> <p>The IWG agreed to the recommendation in full.</p>	The CTC chair advised the IWG of there is a plan to identify high-level priorities for CTC over the next three years, to bring forward to this year's annual meeting. The CTC chair noted the	<p>Member raised the need to minimise procedural work, which creates longer and harder processes.</p>	<p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): High</p> <p>IWG Comments to CTC: As per the comments from Meeting 1, CTC need</p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-part (agreement to Business Plan with three-year planning horizon, no consensus on review and HQA update).</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): Business Plan - High</p>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
	Headquarters Agreement with the New Zealand Government.		<p>The IWG noted that the Commission will likely need to develop a larger framework and task the work to the subsidiary bodies to provide their input and undertake their respective responsibilities in implementing the business plan.</p> <p>The IWG noted that the logical sequencing suggests that the work needs to start with the Commission, which would mean discussions around this recommendation would be postponed till the next annual commission meeting.</p> <p>Some members noted preparatory work can however be discussed by subsidiary bodies and requested clarity on what the SC can do at this stage of the process without a larger framework.</p> <p>The SC chair clarified that the SC currently plan their activities and budget over a one-year timeframe. Noted this is challenging when it comes to activities that will take longer than one year. The SC can start working</p>	<p>need for guidance and direction for the CTC.</p> <p>The CTC chair noted that the overarching CTC workplan won't be distinct but would feed into the business plan.</p> <p>The CTC Chair noted that instructions to frame out these discussions are still being developed and will be circulated to members in time for the annual meeting</p> <p>The FAC Chair noted that there is monthly engagement with the Executive Secretary to discuss some of the issues that FAC are dealing with this year. Noted they are currently working on a plan, and that this can be discussed further in the coming weeks.</p> <p>The FAC chair recommended that the FAC should review some of the key documents that govern the FAC and SPRFMO overall, which includes the human resources regulations and staff regulations. Noted that this activity would be included in the 3-year work plan. Noted the need for guidance of the</p>		<p>direction from the Commission.</p> <p>However, CTC may want to identify what compliance elements would need to be addressed by the Business Plan within a three year period, noting the larger workplan will include CTC priority areas.</p> <p>IWG Comments to FAC:</p> <p>As per the comments from Meeting 1, CTC need direction from the Commission.</p> <p>However, FAC may want to identify the finance and administrative elements that would need to be addressed by the Business Plan within a three year period, noting the larger workplan will include FAC priority areas.</p> <p>The IWG recommended FAC to review the Financial Regulations and Staff Regulations and all other relevant FAC key docs, with a view to enhancing the implementation of these key documents and capturing these in the three-year horizon plan.</p>	<p>HQA - Low</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM:</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>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>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
			<p>with three-year horizon which will facilitate with the development of business plan. This can be discussed at the next SC meeting.</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>commission, as these are preliminary thoughts.</p> <p>The Executive secretary supported the FAC chair recommendation.</p> <p>Highlighted the need to also review the wider financial situation in terms of the budget and contingency fund in a holistic or constructive way.</p>		<p>The IWG noted that preliminary discussions are already underway.</p> <p><i>Also to be discussed in Meeting 3 (COMM)</i></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 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</p>	<p>COMM; SC; FAC; CTC</p>	<p>The IWG noted the recommendation is for the Commission to give guidance to subsidiary bodies.</p> <p>The IWG agreed to include the subsidiary bodies at this stage.</p> <p>The IWG noted that the primary responsibility for this recommendation sits with the Commission and work related to this recommendation will eventually cascade down to the identified subsidiary bodies.</p> <p>A member raised the need to not identify the first three recommendations, as separate tasks, but rather integrated tasks that should</p>	<p>A member reiterated the need to not identify the first three recommendations as separate tasks, but integrated tasks. Noted that the recommendation points to a revised overarching framework which would be helpful to consider. Noted the points raised by the FAC and CTC chairs previously, with work underway for the development of plans for those respective bodies. Noted that based on experience in other organisations, the development and agreement of a workplan can be challenging as it teases out the difference in priorities. This can result in a workplan that fails to provide sufficient guidance</p>	<p>The Executive Secretary recognised the benefits of this recommendation in providing clarity to the Secretariat on the direction members want to achieve across various components. Noted this could feed into performance/work plans, and support members in providing feedback and guidance on the Secretariat's performance.</p> <p>Highlighted the need to ensure its fit for purpose and doesn't create excess bureaucracy. Suggested members are clear on the linkages, with a focus on outcomes.</p> <p>A member noted that the secretariat work plans</p>	<p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): TBD</p> <p>IWG Comments to CTC:</p> <p>As per the comments from Meeting 1, CTC need direction from the Commission. However, CTC may want to identify what key pieces of work are needed if a workplan was agreed, aimed at addressing any compliance gaps.</p> <p>The IWG noted there can be difficulties with developing different workplans for each subsidiary as there can be unintended consequences of competing priorities.</p> <p>The IWG also noted that the development of separate</p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</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>Development of an IMS and DMP – In-full (comments in recommendation 7) <u>High</u></p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM:</p> <p>The IWG noted Commission guidance is needed on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Commission agree with the development of separate workplans/programmes for SC, CTC and FAC? Does the Commission agree with the comments to improve the approach to the SC Work Plan? Noting the IWG



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
	Strategy and associated Data Management Plan.		<p>be developed over different time frames. They noted the need for consideration on how the subsidiary bodies could work cooperatively.</p> <p>To further clarify this, a member suggested to include 2026 next to the timeframes against the subsidiary bodies to reflect that no further action will be required from them this year.</p> <p>IWG also agreed in-full with this recommendation.</p> <p>The SC noted Flexibility is important within the 3 year workplan. SC would welcome prioritisation from Commission</p>	<p>as it is either too comprehensive or too high-level. Noted the importance of ensuring current discussions continue to progress. Noted the need to consider what can be done in the short and long term to achieve a refreshed governance framework.</p>	<p>should tie in with the subsidiary body plans.</p> <p>In terms of the SC multiannual workplan, note that the workplan could be clearer in terms of timeframes, milestones, deliverables and resources needed to execute planned activities. Need to also consider the scope for improvements.</p>	<p>workplans can still be discussed and planned separate to the Commission agreeing to this work.</p> <p>IWG Comments to FAC:</p> <p>Chair suggestion: As per the comments from Meeting 1, no further action needed by FAC until Commission have provided guidance. However, FAC may want to identify what key pieces of work are needed if a workplan was agreed, aimed at addressing any finance and administration gaps.</p> <p><i>Also to be discussed in Meeting 3 (COMM)</i></p>	<p>identified scope for improvement, particularly on timeframes, milestones, deliverables and resources needed.</p> <p>3. Does the Commission agree with the development of a Secretariat Operational Plan? 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	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 objectives. An understanding of the strategic importance of information management systems would also	COMM	N/A	N/A	<p>The Executive Secretary noted, that since the new process has been established, they are yet to complete a cycle to test it. Support the adoption of performance reviews to maintain accountability, without applying multiple processes or lines of governance.</p>	<p><i>To be discussed in Meeting 3 (COMM)</i></p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)</p> <p>In-full</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</p> <p>High</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM:</p> <p>The IWG noted the decision made at COMM13 on the staff regulations to meet this recommendation.</p> <p>The IWG supported the adoption of performance reviews to maintain accountability, but noted the need to avoid</p>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
	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>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	Carry out an independent review of the Headquarters Agreement to ensure it is fit for purpose.	FAC; COMM	N/A	<p>A member queried whether the independent review would be undertaken by a third-party and if that is the case, noted the need to consider the financial implications.</p> <p>The IWG noted that if an independent review is commissioned, there will need to be a discussion on funding and consideration of budget, which will warrant a FAC discussion. Noted the review would be aimed at making sure the headquarters is supporting the staff and effective operation of the commission. Noted the need to consider the review in the context of the broader</p>		<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-part</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): Medium</p> <p>IWG Comments to FAC: The IWG noted that commissioning an independent review of the HQA would require significant budget that FAC would need to factor into the operational budget, and could take a few years for a review, agree HQA changes and implementation.</p> <p>Outside of an independent review, is there anything FAC/COMM can do to resolve any current issues</p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-part (agree in principle that changes are needed to support Secretariat staff but not agree to an independent review of the HQA.</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): Low</p> <p>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.</p> <p>In saying this, the IWG agreed that improvements are needed to better support the Secretariat functions and Staff Members.</p>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
				<p>issues to pick up on. Consider the FAC recommendation on reviewing the financial and staff regulations, and whether the headquarters agreement should be reviewed in the context of that.</p> <p>Some members noted that while they are supportive of an independent review, they remain concerned on the potential implications on resources and financially. Members noted the potential for having preliminary scoping discussions in FAC or Commission to identify some of the current problems in the agreement, and scope out the ideal objectives for the review, to ensure the review is more targeted and focused. Could also consider alternatives to doing the review via a third-party.</p> <p>The Executive Secretary noted the breadth of the headquarters agreement and the role it plays in setting out the secretariat and organisation functions. Noted there is a need for a review in terms of both the</p>		<p>that need urgent attention, and can this be done through the staff regulations or financial regulations?</p> <p>The IWG noted that it would be good to understand the benefits of a review before commissioning one, noting the costs and resources involved. The IWG also noted the need to reduce the operational burden of the Commission.</p> <p>The IWG noted the importance of having a discussion at FAC on what FAC would like to see in an independent review, and whether there are any potential other alternatives to a formal review.</p> <p>The IWG noted there are two elements for review: the HQA itself and its implementation/eff.</p> <p>The IWG reaffirmed that commissioning this work would be a large undertaking and would involve consultation with the host country.</p> <p><i>Also to be discussed in Meeting 3 (COMM)</i></p>	<p>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 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>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
				implementation and wording of the agreement. The Executive secretary cautioned members, of the treaty status of the agreement. Noted that if a review is undertaken, there needs to be a clear understanding on the nature of the exercise. Raised that while any amendment is doable, it would require a resource component from the organisation and the host country, New Zealand.			
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"> • A staffing plan and associated organisational arrangements • Cultural improvement plan • 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. • Support for the Information Management Strategy and Data Plan 	FAC; COMM	N/A	N/A	<p>A member highlighted the importance of the staffing plan, which has been requested from the secretariat for some time. Noting this is critical, the member recognised that this work doesn't need to be commission as separate work.</p> <p>The Executive Secretary supported the recommendation and noted the need for further discussions around the specificities. Noted multiple elements as part of the Secretariat business plan. Noted mapping out what internal policies developed</p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In part</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): Medium</p> <p>IWG Comments to FAC: The IWG noted that FAC need to wait for the Commission to agree to this recommendation and review aspects of the Plan that need feedback from subsidiaries. However, FAC may wish to start thinking about the anticipated impact of this work on the budget, and if there are any other elements missing</p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? 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>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): High</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM: 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</p>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the Commission and its subsidiary bodies and the Data Working Group. Support for the independent review of the Headquarters Agreement with the New Zealand Government 				<p>over what time and establishing a process to review and update these.</p> <p>As part of this, need to consider what are the elements, and what will be done in what year. Highlighted the need to ensure there is some sequencing, noting competing priorities.</p>	<p>from this recommendation that would be useful to include in the Business Plan.</p>	<p>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	<p>The Commission should develop an Information Management Strategy and 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>SC; [Data Working Group (DWG)] ; CTC; FAC; COMM</p>	<p>The IWG agreed with the responsible bodies noting DWG is a subsidiary body that sits with the Commission.</p> <p>The IWG agreed to this recommendation and recognised the need for an Information Management strategy.</p> <p>The IWG noted the limited capacity of the secretariat, and the possible activities already scheduled under their work plan.</p> <p>The IWG also noted the current challenges in identifying a chair for the Data Working Group, and the expected hurdles from that.</p> <p>The IWG were interested in seeking advice from the subsidiary bodies on how</p>	<p>Executive Secretary noted that there is a lot of work currently being undertaken regarding this recommendation, with a focus on what we are instructing the CTC to do. Noted that the suggested text reflects the mood of the SC and where it's going. Noted the IWG could encourage the CTC to review the strategy and provide more direction.</p> <p>Note the role of FAC is to consider the budgetary implications and any relevance to FAC issues.</p>		<p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): High</p> <p>IWG Comments to CTC: The IWG encouraged CTC to review the draft Strategy and provide compliance related guidance.</p> <p>IWG Comments to FAC: The IWG noted that the FAC may wish to think about implications to budget and workplan as a result of commissioning the development of an IMS and DMP, in view of other recommendations and priorities.</p> <p><i>Also to be discussed in Meeting 3 (COMM)</i></p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-full</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): High</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM: 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>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
			<p>these recommendations could be prioritised considering capacity.</p> <p>The IWG identified action against this recommendation is a high priority. Noted that this recommendation is not limited to data collection and management but also standardisation of data, templates and tools to support stock assessments considering the number of species that require assessments is growing.</p> <p>No comments were provided by the SC.</p>				
8	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.	COMM	N/A	N/A	<p>A member noted that while reporting up to the Commission is acceptable, there is no need for the Data working group to be elevated to a separate subsidiary body.</p> <p>A member sought clarity on how this reporting will defer to the reporting already being done through the SC and Secretariat.</p>	<i>To be discussed in Meeting 3 (COMM)</i>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</p> <p>In-part (agree with the important role of the DWG that should report directly to Commission).</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</p> <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>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
9	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.	SC – Data Working Group (DWG); CTC; COMM	<p>The IWG agreed on the recommended bodies noting the primary responsibility sits with the Commission.</p> <p>The IWG agreed in part with this recommendation but recognised that this should not be dependent on the IMS or the DMP.</p> <p>The SC Chair noted that CMM 02-2022 was amended last year to CMM 02-2025.</p> <p>The IWG agreed that this recommendation is a medium priority.</p> <p>The IWG noted the need for further clarify on how the SC can support this recommendation. The IWG agreed to defer this recommendation for further advice on this.</p> <p>The IWG noted the need to consider other recommendations related to fisheries management which rely on data management.</p> <p>SC13 partially addressed this with advice to COMM14 on CMM02 changes. This could be further reviewed after</p>	<p>The CTC Chair welcomed the review of CMM 02, noting the continuing changes to data collection. Noted that CMM02 is a key piece of legislation or regulatory framework on collecting data. Highlighted that the review shouldn't focus on just data gaps, but also the data collection methodology. Noted that the review should identify opportunities for additional data but also focus on making current processes more efficient.</p> <p>A member agreed that given the issues being raised and noted the overarching significance of data. Noted the importance of making sure data utility and collection is fit for purpose. The reliance of the Commission on this, identifies this recommendation as a high priority, noting that it needs to be done in the context of other things in the recommendation. Noted that the review of this measure is an ongoing priority for the CTC and Commission. Reiterated the</p>		<p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): High</p> <p>IWG Comments to CTC: Irrespective of whether an IMS and DMP are agreed by Commission, the IWG requested the CTC to identify any compliance-related data gaps.</p> <p>The IWG noted that this recommendation is less about collecting new data and placed emphasis on improving efficiencies in the current CMM and the data SPRFMO currently collects.</p> <p><i>Also to be discussed in Meeting 3 (COMM)</i></p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-full</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): High</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM: 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>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>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
			development of a Strategy and Plan.	need to ensure the review is not a one-off activity but ongoing.			
10	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.	SC – Jack Mackerel Working Group (JM WG), COMM	<p>The IWG agreed to the responsible body.</p> <p>The SC Chair noted the different components of this recommendation, science and management.</p> <p>The SC Chair supported the need for collaboration across the science and management and recognised the potential for integrating these two components.</p> <p>The SC Chair however noted that the management level for implementation is beyond the scope and duties of the SC.</p> <p>The SC Chair noted the need for the SC to consider their responsibilities to identify where there are opportunities for cooperation and what work the SC can do to support this recommendation.</p> <p>The IWG agreed with this recommendation.</p>	N/A		<i>To be discussed in Meeting 3 (COMM)</i>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</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>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM:</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 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 JM WG.</p>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
11	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 necessary, with particular attention to chub mackerel, protected species and species of concern.	SC – JMWG, Ecosystem Working Group (EWG); COMM	<p>The IWG agreed to the responsible bodies.</p> <p>The IWG agreed in-part of this recommendation.</p> <p>The IWG noted the difficulty in identifying the priority levels between Jack mackerel and other species such as protected species and species of concern.</p> <p>The IWG noted that the SC will undertake the relevant technical advice and the scientific advice, and the Commission is responsible for the management.</p>	N/A		<i>To be discussed in Meeting 3 (COMM)</i>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</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>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</p> <p>Medium (for chub mackerel)</p> <p>Low – for other species</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM:</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>
12	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 Multiannual Workplan, which should be integrated into the broader Business Plan. This includes prioritising the development of management strategy evaluations (MSE) and harvest	SC – Squid Working Group (SWG); FAC; COMM	<p>The IWG noted that the SC do not have a clear mandate on this recommendation until instructed by the Commission. It is important that the Commission provide clear direction on the three elements of this recommendation.</p> <p>The IWG also noted that the completion of the stock</p>	Agreed to move the priority categorisation of this recommendation to Meeting 3.		<p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>IWG Comments to FAC:</p> <p>Although this work is dependent on the Commission mandating the work to SC, the IWG noted that FAC may wish to estimate approximate</p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</p> <p>In-full</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</p> <p>Medium/high</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM:</p> <p>The IWG noted the comments from the SC that they do not have a clear mandate on this recommendation until instructed by</p>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
	<p>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>assessment is part of the implementation of the SC workplan. SC may wish to continue to explore alternative options until a stock assessment is put forward. The IWG invites SC to provide any preliminary views on the feasibility of the different elements of the proposal which can help the IWG and ultimately the Commission in their consideration of this recommendation.</p>			<p>budgetary costs for each squid-related task (MSEs, HCRs, alternative options to stock assessments), in consultation with SC.</p> <p><i>Also to be discussed in Meeting 3 (COMM)</i></p>	<p>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>
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 sharing to facilitate the assessment.</p>	<p>SC – SWG, DWG; CTC; COMM</p>	<p>IWG agreed to responsible bodies including those suggestions.</p> <p>The IWG noted the need to be clearer on the duties of each of the recommended bodies.</p> <p>The IWG noted that this recommendation is more aligned to the responsibilities of the Commission and requested further clarity on the role of the SC outside of utilizing the data provided by the coastal states for relevant assessments.</p> <p>The IWG noted the main challenge for progressing stock assessments is data</p>	<p>A member noted that currently coastal states for squid have not yet provided their consent for the measure to apply in area under national jurisdiction. Noted the need for clarity on how this would work in terms of compliance. Suggested waiting for additional views from CTC on this recommendation.</p>	<p>A member highlighted the progress made at the 2025 SC meeting, with some coastal states agreeing to share data voluntarily on squid fisheries to support the squid stock assessment.</p>	<p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): TBD</p> <p>IWG Comments to CTC: The IWG noted that SPRFMO does not assess compliance in areas of national jurisdiction if Members do not provide their consent to apply the measure to their areas under national jurisdiction.</p> <p>The IWG also noted that this recommendation is more aligned to the responsibilities of the Commission and SC, but CTC may wish to consider what additional squid data (beyond what is reported in</p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-full</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): High</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM: 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</p>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
			<p>availability which is beyond the scope of the SC. Noted the duties of members in data reporting, however following through with this is something that should be discussed at the Commission level.</p> <p>One member raised the need to get advice and guidelines from SC on which data which will be shared by members to support the SC work on stock assessments.</p> <p>The IWG agreed with this recommendation.</p>			<p>national reports and compliance assessments) for the purpose of stock assessments would also be beneficial from a compliance perspective.</p> <p><i>Also to be discussed in Meeting 3</i></p>	<p>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 generate relevant data that supports the SC's work, addressing both the targeted squid fishery and its potential impact on associated species.</p>	<p>SC – SWG; COMM</p>	<p>The IWG agreed with the recommended bodies for this recommendation.</p> <p>One member noted the Commission adopted CMM 18-2025 for squid, and the outcomes of this for the fisheries. With this, they did not fully agree to this recommendation.</p> <p>One member noted the need for subsidiary bodies to further consider this recommendation and strongly supported the progression of this recommendation.</p>	<p>N/A</p>		<p><i>To be discussed in Meeting 3</i></p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</p> <p>In-part</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM:</p> <p>The IWG noted recent increases in observer coverage and the development of Electronic Monitoring (EM) standards, which have been reflected in CMM 18-2025.</p> <p>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</p>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
			<p>One member noted this measure isn't just about observer coverage but also the relevance for associated species. Noted the need for more work and strongly supported the need for this recommendation to be considered further.</p> <p>One Member noted the long-term work associated with this recommendation and noted this doesn't need to be given high priority.</p>				<p>coverage is the way to achieve this objective.</p> <p>The IWG noted that this recommendation requires further discussion in Commission.</p>
15	Squid - Given the uncertainties regarding the current fishing capacity, consider further precautionary measures, including strengthening fishing effort limitations.	SC – SWG; COMM	<p>The IWG agreed with the responsible bodies, noting the commission has primary responsibility for this recommendation.</p> <p>The IWG did not reach consensus on position for this recommendation. The IWG generally noted the recommendation and deferred to SC for further advice and consideration.</p> <p>SC looks to Commission for guidance on this recommendation</p>	N/A		<i>To be discussed in Meeting 3</i>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-part</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): Medium</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM: 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>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
							As a starting point, the IWG recommended that the Commission consider any previous SC 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.	SC – SWG; SCAF; FAC; COMM	The IWG agreed to responsible bodies, including SCAF. In line with previous recommendations, the IWG noted this recommendation and deferred to SC and Commission for further consideration. 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.	As per comments of Meeting 1		Priority (low, medium, high): TBD IWG Comments to FAC: The IWG noted that FAC could make room in the budget for additional expertise on a case-by-case basis, making sure that it aligns with the SC workplan and the implications to financial contributions are understood. The IWG also noted that FAC, in consultation with SC would need to play a proactive role here and could anticipate when and where expertise/additional funding is needed (i.e. for an upcoming workshop, allocation reviews). <i>To be discussed in Meeting 3</i>	Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-part IWG Priority (low, medium, high): Low IWG Comments to COMM: 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.
17	Deepwater - Investigate alternative approaches to managing these fisheries to explore whether it is possible to maintain a viable fishery in a way	COMM	N/A	N/A	Members noted that while they don't agree that the measures are not fit for purpose, they are open to exploring alternative	<i>To be discussed in Meeting 3</i>	Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-part (The IWG do not fully agree with the rec but support that alternative approaches need to be investigated)



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
	that is consistent with the Convention's objective.				<p>approaches to overcome the current situation which is not ideal. Noted the joint responsibility to find ways to move forward. Noted there is no consensus at this stage on the overall bottom fishing framework.</p> <p>A member highlighted that the priority of this recommendation is dependent on what the Commission agrees to do with the implementation of the current measure.</p> <p>Members noted the need further discussions at the Commission.</p>		<p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): Medium overall High (if current CMM/framework is not implemented).</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM: 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	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.	SC – Deepwater Working Group (DWWG); COMM	<p>IWG agreed with the body responsible, noting that the primary responsibility sits with the Commission. In line with previous recommendations, the IWG noted this recommendation and deferred to SC and Commission for further consideration.</p> <p>SC noted that work for hapuku and blue eye trevella is on the workplan.</p>	N/A	<p>A member noted the need to consider how this is operationalised and raised that this should be tailored to each species. Noted the SC could initiate discussions on this.</p>	<i>To be discussed in Meeting 3</i>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? 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>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): Low</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM: The IWG noted the work that is currently ongoing in the SC multiannual workplan on fish species captured in CMM 03a.</p>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
							<p>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 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>SC – DWWG ; COMM</p>	<p>The IWG agreed with the recommended bodies.</p> <p>In line with previous recommendations, the IWG noted this recommendation and deferred to SC and Commission for further consideration.</p> <p>The SC noted that the toothfish workshop for SC14 will begin to address this recommendation.</p>	N/A		<p><i>To be discussed in Meeting 3</i></p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-full</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): High (if exploratory fisheries have already hit 10 years).</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM: The IWG noted the need to consider other exploratory fisheries in this recommendation (outside of toothfish). The IWG noted that SC13 report has two recommendations associated with this recommendation for the Commission to consider and agree:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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,



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
							<p>once the 10-year limit has been reached.</p> <p>2. Agree the terms of reference (SC13-04 Attachment 1), with an additional terms of reference to produce a standardised data collection plan.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
20	Exploratory Fisheries - The SC should conduct review of the cumulative impacts of exploratory fisheries on both target stocks and the broader ecosystem.	SC – DWWG	<p>The IWG agreed to the recommended bodies.</p> <p>The IWG noted that it is too early to say whether this recommendation needs to happen, however agreed with the need for it to be considered. Not an immediate priority. Requested further advice from the SC.</p>	N/A		N/A	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-full</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): Medium (noting the logical sequencing is rec 19).</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM: see above.</p>
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	SC – DWWG ; CTC; COMM	The IWG noted the recommended bodies and identified the Commission as the body to hold primary responsibility. The IWG Meeting 1 noted the role of the SC, and did not agree to	A member noted there is a role for CTC in terms of the transition from exploratory fisheries to established fisheries in terms of compliance and alignment. The future framework would be in the remit of the CTC. Noted the need for all of the		<p>IWG comments to CTC</p> <p>The IWG noted that CTC can start thinking about the compliance elements of this recommendation, including thinking about alignment with CCAMLR and other RFMOs (SIOFA).</p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-full</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): Medium</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM:</p>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
	fisheries and the process to transition these into established fisheries.		<p>include CTC as a recommended body.</p> <p>The IWG considered this recommendation and noted the need for further discussion.</p> <p>The SC 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</p>	<p>subsidiary bodies to consider how this work is undertaken in the future.</p>		<p>The IWG Meeting 2 agreed that there are compliance elements for exploratory fisheries, particularly in terms of transitioning exploratory fisheries to established fisheries, and future alignment with other RFMOs and agreed to retain CTC as a responsible body.</p> <p><i>To be discussed in Meeting 3 (COMM)</i></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>
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>	SC; COMM	<p>The IWG agreed on the responsible bodies.</p> <p>The IWG noted this recommendation suggests the need for an overarching framework that applies to all fisheries, rather than adopting individual harvest strategies for each of the fisheries.</p> <p>The IWG agreed that further clarity is required from the commission on the work required for this recommendation and agreed to discuss this further at a later stage.</p> <p>SC noted that this would require Commission</p>	N/A	<p>A member supported this recommendation and highlighted the benefit in having an overarching framework for the harvest strategy approach to ensure a level of consistency.</p> <p>Noted that this doesn't necessarily mean that ever harvest strategy would be the same and recognised that each harvest strategy will have different levels of information that will require different approaches. However, the overarching framework would maintain consistency where appropriate.</p>	<p><i>To be discussed in Meeting 3 (COMM)</i></p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</p> <p>In-full</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</p> <p>High</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
			<p>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>		<p>Noted there will be nuances on how this will be implemented and will require further discussions at Commission on how this will be framed, implemented and what are the objectives.</p>		
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 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>	FAC; COMM	N/A	<p>The FAC chair noted that this is an ongoing discussion, and there are aspects that can be addressed at the next FAC meeting. Noted this is a high priority for some of the members.</p>		<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-full</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): High</p> <p>IWG Comments to FAC: The IWG noted the discussions at COMM13 and the support for the elevation of Spanish as a working language in SPRFMO. The IWG also noted the revision of SPRFMO's Financial Regulations (Regulation 5a) which adopted a fund for Spanish interpretation.</p> <p>The IWG noted that the FAC would be responsible for including contributions into the budget.</p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-full</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): High</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM: 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>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
						<p>The IWG noted that this is an ongoing discussion and next steps on scaling and implementation is something that can be discussed at the next FAC.</p> <p><i>Also to be discussed in Meeting 3 (COMM)</i></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 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>	FAC; COMM	N/A	<p>The Executive Secretary noted there are two tiers/elements to the developing state fund. One tier is for technical assistance and capacity building, and another tier for travel assistance to attend the annual meeting, and scientific meetings and workshops.</p> <p>The Executive Secretary noted that the travel assistance fund is functional and works quite effectively, with annual allocation from the budget that goes into the DS fund for this purpose.</p> <p>The Executive Secretary raised concerns however that the technical assistance and capacity building fund has never been used or accessed by members. Noted there is no history of members putting forward to use this fund and noted that</p>		<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</p> <p>There are two parts to this recommendation: 1 - do we agree that the Developing States Fund is being under-utilised. 2 – do we agree that there needs to be the development of a comprehensive plan for Article 19 implementation?</p> <p>TBD in Meeting 3</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>IWG Comments to FAC:</p> <p>The IWG noted there are two tiers/elements of the fund. Technical assistance and capacity building and travel assistance. Travel assistance is currently being utilised. The technical capacity building element has not been utilised.</p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</p> <p>In-full</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM:</p> <p>As per comments to FAC, which are relevant for COMM.</p>



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
				<p>this is the focus of this recommendation.</p> <p>The Executive Secretary agrees with the recommendation and the need for further discussions. Possible reasons could be that members are not aware of the fund, or there could be practical barriers. Noted this can be part of a Commission discussion to identify the issues for accessing the fund. Need to understand what questions are surrounding the fund, and what we are instructing the Commission to do.</p> <p>A member agreed that the discussion should be undertaken at Commission. Highlighted the importance of ensuring participation and consultation with developing states to consider their interests. Raised concerns on the possibility of spending more time developing a plan without looking into how we can utilise the existing mechanisms. Noted a discussion at Commission could also identify whether a comprehensive plan is needed or whether there</p>		<p>The IWG noted it is the role of the FAC to ensure that the fund remains at a sufficient level to be accessed. However, the IWG noted that primary responsibility for the implementation of this recommendation lies with the Commission.</p> <p>The Commission are responsible for considering whether there is benefit in developing a comprehensive plan, and how Developing States can better access the capacity building element of the fund.</p> <p>The IWG noted that not all Members were present in the IWG and noted there is real benefit in having a broader discussion on the two issues above at Comm</p> <p>The IWG noted that the FAC also plays an important role in promoting the DSF.</p> <p>The IWG noted that as of 30 June 2025, the fund balance was NZD \$196, 327 which is considered a healthy number for Developing States to access travel costs to meetings. So while there is a ongoing role here for FAC to ensure the fund remains at a healthy level,</p>	



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
				<p>any support mechanisms that we can use.</p> <p>Member noted based on engagement in other fora, that it's not surprising that the travel component of the fund is utilised better compared to the capacity building funds. Noted the need to ensure funding sources to the technical and capacity building fund is maintained. Consider developing a mechanism for strengthening the utilisation of the fund with developing state consultation.</p> <p>The Executive Secretary noted the complexities around these issues and noted this recommendation could be progressed with the Commission. Highlighted the existing mechanism to discuss the fund through the annual reporting and discussions at FAC. Provided the most recent paper from last year for IWG's reference. Noted the Secretary is working with the FAC chair to improve papers, to ensure detail around key issues are</p>		<p>the Commission play an important role in understand the issues of accessing the technical capacity element, and how the Commission can assist.</p> <p><i>Also to be discussed in Meeting 3 (COMM)</i></p>	



	Recommendation	Responsible Body	IWG Meeting 1 (SC) Summary	IWG Meeting 2 (CTC/FAC) Summary	IWG Meeting 3 (COMM) Summary	Comments for CTC and FAC	Comments for COMM
				captured clearly, along with recommendations.			

