

13TH MEETING OF THE FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Panama City, Panama, 26 to 27 February 2026

FAC 13 – Doc 15

PR2 Recommendations Allocation to FAC – Implementation Plan

Chairperson of the PR2IWG

The Second Performance Review (PR2) of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation was undertaken in 2024, which resulted in a set of 24 recommendations aimed at enhancing the functioning of the Organisation and improving its overall effectiveness.

At its 13th Annual Meeting, the Commission agreed to establish an Intersessional Working Group (PR2 IWG) tasked with drafting an Implementation Plan to ensure the effective follow-up of the relevant PR2 recommendations.

This document focuses specifically on the nine recommendations identified as relevant to the Finance and Administration Committee (FAC).

The FAC is therefore asked to:

- ***consider*** the comments provided by the PR2 Intersessional Working Group in relation to each of the nine FAC-relevant recommendation, and
- ***provide practical and viable options*** for addressing each recommendation.



SPRFMO Performance Review Recommendations (on screen for comment)

No	Recommendations	PR2 IWG Summary	PR2 IWG Comments to FAC	FAC Recommendation (provide viable options for responding to each recommendation)
2	<p>The Review Panel recommends the development of a Business Plan with a three-year planning horizon and an associated budget. The first Business Plan should include a review and enhancement of the Headquarters Agreement with the New Zealand Government.</p>	<p>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 HQA - Low</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM: 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. The IWG also noted that there should be opportunity for Members to comment on a draft Business Plan. 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>	<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>The IWG noted that preliminary discussions are already underway.</p>	<p><i>To be completed during FAC</i></p>
3	<p>The Review Panel recommends that the Commission improve its direction to subsidiary bodies, the Data Working</p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? IWG Priority (low, medium, high): Separate workplans for subsidiaries– in-full - <u>Medium</u> Improving the approach to SC Multiannual Work Plan – in-full – <u>Medium</u></p>	<p>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</p>	<p><i>To be completed during FAC</i></p>



	<p>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 Strategy and associated Data Management Plan.</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"> 1. Does the Commission agree with the development of separate workplans/programmes for SC, CTC and FAC? 2. Does the Commission agree with the comments to improve the approach to the SC Work Plan? Noting the IWG identified scope for improvement, particularly on timeframes, milestones, deliverables and resources needed. 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>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>	<p>workplan was agreed, aimed at addressing any finance and administration gaps.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>Carry out an independent review of the Headquarters Agreement to ensure it is fit for purpose.</p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</p> <p>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):</p> <p>Low</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM:</p>	<p>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 that need urgent attention, and can this be done through the staff regulations or financial regulations?</p>	<p><i>To be completed during FAC</i></p>



		<p>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> <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>	<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>	
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 	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</p> <p>In-part (the IWG agree with the development of a Business Plan including a staffing plan. However other elements of this recommendation need further discussion).</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high):</p> <p>High</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM:</p> <p>The IWG noted there is support for a Business Plan which should include a Staffing Plan, and noted that other elements of the Plan can be further explored and discussed. However, the specifics of these elements need guidance from the Commission. The IWG also noted that a focus</p>	<p>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 from this recommendation that would be useful to include in the Business Plan.</p>	<p><i>To be completed during FAC</i></p>



	<p>and financial regulations to meet international best practice and in a fair and consistent manner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the Information Management Strategy and Data Plan • 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>should be placed on an indicative timeline for this work (i.e. what needs to be done in which year and when).</p> <p>As a first step, the Commission should provide guidance on whether they agree with the development of a Business Plan which includes a staffing plan, in which the other listed elements can be discussed as part of the Commission tasking the work to the relevant responsible area.</p>		
7	<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>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>	<p>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>To be completed during FAC</i></p>
12	<p>Squid - To ensure effective and timely management</p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)?</p>	<p>Although this work is dependent on the Commission mandating the work to SC, the IWG noted that FAC</p>	



	<p>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 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>In-full</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): 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 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>	<p>may wish to estimate approximate budgetary costs for each squid-related task (MSEs, HCRs, alternative options to stock assessments), in consultation with SC.</p>	
16	<p>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</p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-part</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): Low</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM:</p> <p>The IWG noted that the FAC would need to option into the budget an ongoing fund to engage scientists, particularly on</p>	<p>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).</p>	<p><i>To be completed during FAC</i></p>



	<p>should be encouraged to maintain their cooperation through both in-kind and financial contributions.</p>	<p>this recommendation which is related to squid, in view of other competing budget priorities and resourcing. These options would need to be brought forward to the Commission for decision.</p>		
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>	<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>	<p>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>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>To be completed during FAC</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</p>	<p>Agree? (In-full or in-part)? In-full</p> <p>IWG Priority (low, medium, high): Medium</p> <p>IWG Comments to COMM: As per comments to FAC, which are relevant for COMM.</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>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</p>	<p><i>To be completed during FAC</i></p>



<p>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>		<p>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, the Commission play an important role in understand the issues of accessing the technical capacity element, and how the Commission can assist.</p>	
---	--	---	--