



# Strategies to enhance PITIA and National Fishing Industry Associations' viability and impact on fisheries development

Prepared for the Secretariat of the Pacific Community  
Funded by DevFISH II

June 2012



## **Executive Summary**

Effective fishing industry associations are well-placed to play an important role in meeting the fisheries development aspirations of many Pacific island nations (for example, those outlined in the Regional Tuna Management and Development Strategy). Industry associations can act to coordinate unified industry input into management and development initiatives, and from a Government and regional body point of view, can act as a valuable ‘development partner’. A number of industry associations currently exist in the Pacific, however many struggle for operational and financial sustainability and are seeking advice on means to enhance effectiveness.

This report sets out the results of a study entitled “*Assessment and identification of strategies to enhance PITIA and National Fisheries Associations’ long-term viability and impact on sustainable national fisheries development*”. The study was undertaken in two broad parts. The first part consisted of an assessment of case study fishing industry associations in Australia and New Zealand to identify alternative sustainable funding models, as well as lessons learned on organisational effectiveness. The second part consisted of working with four Pacific islands fishing industry associations to identify current constraints to organisational effectiveness, potential sustainable funding options and general means to strengthen effectiveness.

Case studies of six fishing industry associations operating in Australia and New Zealand were undertaken during the first stage. The case studies examined the main features of each association including organisational structures, objectives, staffing, funding levels and arrangements, membership structure and voting rights and policy making structures. The key lessons learned from the case studies and interviews with association executives are presented. Seven different types of funding model, or combinations of funding models, were identified from the case studies. These included: (i) membership fees only, (ii) membership fees supplemented with external funding, (iii) external funding only, (iv) compulsory membership through a statutory requirement, (v) compulsory membership collected through licence fees, (vi) compulsory membership collected through a statutory levy, and (vii) a voluntary levy. The relative strengths and weaknesses of each funding model are discussed.

While the ultimate responsibility for organisational effectiveness and financial sustainability of industry associations rests with industry, practical steps governments can take to encourage effective associations are explored. These range from quite ‘interventionist’ approaches such as mandating compulsory membership to other forms of assistance such as recognition as the peak industry body, provision of licence lists, helping distribute association membership material and staff secondments to industry associations.

In the second part of the study four Pacific fishing industry association case studies were examined, namely the Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITIA), the Fishing Industry Association of Tonga (FIAT), the Fishing Industry Association of Papua New Guinea (FIA) and the Nareau Tuna Association (NTA). Interviews were conducted with association executives and members, as well as other key stakeholders such as government fisheries officials. For each association, the background to the association and country context, current sources of funding, governance and policy making structures, and main successes and challenges to date were examined. Based on this,

recommendations to enhance organisational effectiveness and possible sources of funding were identified.

In the case of PITIA, the main challenges identified were the difficulties associated with its current 'association of associations' model, weaknesses in capacity to pay amongst its membership and the currently diffuse nature of its mandate. Opportunities to strengthen effectiveness included better defining its core role and purpose including a greater focus on strengthening the international competitiveness of Pacific tuna fishing businesses and using its influence to leverage external resources (e.g. the design and delivery of large scale aid programmes, the negotiating position of FFA and others in the WCPFC). The main challenge in Tonga was to resolve the current complexities around industry representation and strengthen the relationship between FIAT and MAFFF. A number of possible strategies are outlined including reinvigoration of a high level government/industry forum to discuss and resolve development issues and the appointment of an independent Executive Officer.

The overarching challenge faced by FIA is to address the perception that "the industry is 'growing up', the FIA needs to grow up with it". Of all the case study associations, FIA has the greatest capacity to generate additional internal funding from membership subscriptions. FIA is in the process of developing a new business model, including the appointment of an independent Executive Officer, overseen by a strategically focused board. This appears to be a move in the right direction. Other opportunities to enhance effectiveness included more strategically using its position on the NFA Board, strengthening its presence outside of Port Moresby and strengthening communication mechanisms.

As a newly created association, the main challenge for the NTA to establish robust organisational structures and get some early runs on the board to demonstrate to fishers and government the benefits and bona fides of the association. Opportunities to enhance effectiveness included the establishment of structured development dialogue between the NTA and Government, development of a clear set of organisational priorities in association with the membership and ensuring membership arrangements are clear.

In addition to this, more general recommendations applicable to all Pacific fishing industry associations were identified. These included strengthening the ability of association executives to 'sell the benefits' of membership, encouraging the use of independent directors to strengthen organisational capacity and governance, encouraging the development of tailored training for association executives and strengthening the use of cost effective communication mechanisms such as websites.

## Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. AUSTRALIA/NEW ZEALAND CASE STUDIES.....</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1 LESSONS LEARNED .....	2
2.2 ALTERNATIVE FUNDING MODELS .....	5
<b>3. REGIONAL CASE STUDIES .....</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1 PACIFIC ISLANDS TUNA INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION (PITIA).....	12
3.2 TONGA – FISHING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF TONGA (FIAT) .....	18
3.3 PNG – PNG FISHING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION (FIA).....	22
3.4 KIRIBATI – NAREAU TUNA BOAT OWNER’S ASSOCIATION (NTBOA) .....	27
<b>4. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>ANNEX 2: AUSTRALIA/NEW ZEALAND FISHING ASSOCIATION CASE STUDIES.....</b>	<b>37</b>
QUEENSLAND SEAFOOD INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION .....	38
NORTHERN PRAWN FISHING INDUSTRY PTY LTD. ....	42
COMMONWEALTH FISHERIES ASSOCIATION .....	44
OCEANWATCH AUSTRALIA .....	46
NEW ZEALAND SEAFOOD INDUSTRY COUNCIL (SEAFIC) .....	49
NEW ZEALAND ROCK LOBSTER INDUSTRY COUNCIL .....	51
<b>ANNEX 3: LIST OF PERSONS CONSULTED.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>ANNEX 4: RELEVANT REGIONAL FUNDING PROGRAMS .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>ANNEX 5: ACTION MATRIX .....</b>	<b>58</b>

## **1. Introduction**

Effective fishing industry associations are well-placed to play an important role in meeting the fisheries development aspirations of many Pacific island nations (for example, those outlined in the Regional Tuna Management and Development Strategy). Industry associations can act to coordinate unified industry input into management and development initiatives, as well as providing advice to Government on economic and management conditions required to encourage sustainable domestic development. From a Government and regional body point of view, industry associations can act as a valuable 'development partner', helping to best focus government development initiatives and reducing the transaction costs associated with industry consultation.

A number of industry associations currently exist in the Pacific, operating at regional, national and local levels. While operational successes have undoubtedly been achieved, many continue to struggle for operational and financial sustainability and are seeking advice on means to enhance effectiveness. Problems associated with financial sustainability are exacerbated by challenging economic circumstances facing the domestic fishing industry in many Pacific Island countries.

This report sets out the results of a study entitled "*Assessment and identification of strategies to enhance PITIA and National Fisheries Associations' long-term viability and impact on sustainable national fisheries development*". The Terms of Reference for the study are included at Annex 1.

The study was undertaken in two broad parts. The first part consisted of an assessment of case study fishing industry associations in Australia and New Zealand to identify alternative sustainable funding models, as well as lessons learned on organisational effectiveness. The second part consisted of working with four Pacific islands fishing industry associations to identify current constraints to organisational effectiveness, potential sustainable funding options and general means to strengthen effectiveness (and thereby have greater impact on domestic development). Site visits were undertaken to Tonga, Papua New Guinea and Kiribati between March and May 2012. The list of persons consulted is at Annex 2.

This report is broadly structured around the two phases of the project. Following this introduction, Section 2 of the report discusses lessons learned from the Australian and New Zealand case studies together with an assessment of alternative sustainable funding options currently in use. Section 3 then provides an overview of the outcomes of the Pacific Islands fishing industry association case studies, together with recommendations to enhance organisational effectiveness as well as an assessment of potential sustainable funding options for each.

Section 4 provides some overarching recommendations applicable to all Pacific fishing industry associations.

## **2. Australia/New Zealand case studies**

In the first phase of this study case studies were undertaken of six fishing industry associations operating in Australia and New Zealand. These included:

- The Queensland Seafood Industry Association (QSIA)
- The Commonwealth Fisheries Association (CFA)

- Oceanwatch Australia (OA)
- The Northern Prawn Fishing Industry Inc. (NPFI)
- The New Zealand Seafood Industry Council (SeaFIC)
- The New Zealand Rock Lobster Industry Council (RLIC)

These associations were selected on the basis that they represented a diversity of organisational structures and operated under a range of funding arrangements. The primary purpose of the case studies was to identify which of the organisational structures and funding models might best apply in the Pacific and to identify any broader lessons learned that might assist the Pacific case study associations.

For each of the associations, information was collected through interviews with senior association executives on a range of topics including organisational structure and funding arrangements, membership and voting arrangements, proportion of the industry covered and mechanisms to deal with 'free riders', governance and policy making structures, organisational successes and constraints and general lessons learned. Summaries of each of the case study associations are provided at Annex 2.

## **2.1 Lessons learned**

A summary of the main observations and lessons learned from the case studies, and general discussions with association executives, is provided below:

- **The most successful associations are integrated into government processes**

Associations that are integrated into government processes are almost always more effective than those sitting 'outside the process' (and often being critical of Government). Integration allows for the views of the association's members to be presented directly and systemically to key government decision makers, and is often helped by designation of the association as a peak body. Integration can occur through a range of mechanisms, for example, by way of seats on the fishing authority Board, membership of key fisheries advisory committees, membership of wider government advisory committees (e.g. on tax, trade, training, labour, maritime safety, marine parks, etc), aid programme advisory committees and the like. While all associations should reserve the right to be critical of government or other relevant bodies, most of the association executives interviewed held the view that associations who chose to 'sit outside the process and throw rocks' (as one executive put it) were ultimately much less effective than those who attempted to contribute positively and professionally to Government policy and development.

- **There's no substitute for good, committed staff**

A common theme coming from interviews with association executives is there's no substitute for professional, committed staff (as well as executives). An association with few resources but with clever, resourceful staff can often function equally as effectively as a larger association with more resources (noting however that an association with both adequate resources and committed staff will function even better!). The main lesson arising from the case studies is that every effort should be made to find staff of the 'right fit' and where good staff are found, every effort should be made to keep them.

The other lesson worth noting in the 'staffing' theme is that an 'independent' office executive can help get over concerns about 'influence' or favouritism from senior association executives. Many industry associations face the perception that the company or fishery from which the Chairperson comes receives favouritism from the association. Perceptions of favouritism, either real or imagined, can undermine the credibility of the association and harm membership subscriptions. Ensuring effective governance structures incorporating an independent executive officer responsible to an elected Board of Directors can help to address any perceptions of favouritism.

- **At least some internal funding is required to demonstrate member commitment and organisational credibility**

The commitment of at least some internally-sourced funds is critical to organisational effectiveness and credibility for at least two very important reasons. Firstly, member commitment to an association and the degree of credibility of the association in speaking on behalf of its members is ultimately measured by industry's willingness to pay. Associations that rely entirely on external funding for their operation struggle to demonstrate industry support, however committed the staff and executive and well intentioned the objectives. Secondly, there will almost inevitably come a time when the association needs to take a 'robust' position against a Government proposal or plan. Internally generated funds are effectively 'unencumbered' and allow the association to resource principled stands against perceived threats. By contrast, externally generated funds are typically for the delivery of specific services, and not for 'lobbying' or other normal operational business. The absence of any internally generated funding in these circumstances may lead to (a) criticism that the association is misusing external funds and/or (b) having the funding pulled.

- **External funding can help build organisational capacity**

Notwithstanding the above, funds from external sources can be a very valuable way of resourcing the delivery of member objectives and building organisational capacity. Most of the associations surveyed sought external funding to supplement their core (internal) funding, and many relied on external funding for the majority of their income. Oceanwatch Australia, for example, has a budget of AUD\$1.8m, over 90% of which comes from external grant funding. Grant funding is usually tied to specific projects, and hence not available for the ordinary business of the association, but can nevertheless help deliver on key member priorities (e.g. production of strategic plans, training, environmental protection) as well as boost association 'visibility' (and indirectly attract new members).

- **Stability of funding is important**

In addition to the overall level of funding available, stability/predictability of funding is important for planning purposes. Perhaps most importantly, stability of funding (particularly core funding) allows associations to attract and retain good staff, and develop future operating plans with confidence. It also allows association executives to get out of the cycle of spending the majority of their time sourcing new funding, rather than delivering on member priorities.

- **Over-reliance on external funding is fraught**

Associations that rely for the majority or all of their funding on external sources inevitably 'build their house on quicksand'. As discussed above, external funding can be a valuable source of revenue to help deliver on members' objectives, however over-reliance on external funding (particularly single source funding) to do the normal business of the association is a risky proposition. External funding can be both pulled or delayed, which can have significant implications for association staff (i.e. they might not get paid) and ongoing programmes. Where possible, internal sources of revenue (however modest) should be developed, or at the least external sources of funding diversified to minimise risk.

- **Effective policy making structures are critical to organisational effectiveness and credibility**

Being able to reliably demonstrate how organisational policies were developed, and ensuring that all interested members have the genuine opportunity to contribute to organisational policies that affect them, is central to the effectiveness of industry associations. Effective policy making structures are critical to attracting and retaining members (and hence are a financial as well as policy making asset - few things make members exit an association faster than when they feel their voice is not being heard), as well as demonstrating to Governments and others (e.g. donors) that the organisation's policies have 'weight'.

- **Pragmatism is required in setting member fee schedules and voting rights**

Most fishing associations will almost inevitably cover a broad spectrum of members (e.g. small/large catching sector operators, small/large processors, marketers), with a variety of interests and differing capacities to pay membership fees. In some cases there will be an objective basis for charging different membership fees and setting voting rights – for example, the NPFI sets fees and voting rights based on the number of quota units held in the Northern Prawn Fishery – but in many (if not most) cases, it is difficult to come up with a membership fee/voting rights arrangement that is perfectly equitable to all. With that in mind, there is a need for association members to show a degree of pragmatism about membership fees/voting schedules for the mutual benefit of all. The CFA, for example, has a 'one member, one vote' policy despite the fact that their association members may represent many dozens of people, and single members only represent themselves. This situation has worked because all players recognise what benefits one member of the association usually benefits all. This is not to say that there shouldn't be an underlying element of equity in the membership fee schedule and associated voting rights, but pragmatism is required.

- **There is no silver bullet for 'free riders'**

'Free riders' are those potential industry association members who benefit from the association's activities, but who don't pay membership fees. The problems of free riders are particularly acute where the association is focused on achieving industry-wide objectives (e.g. construction of a favourable fisheries management plan, tax/duty incentives for domestic industry, etc), rather than member specific issues, and is one faced by trade associations worldwide. Undoubtedly the most effective way to deal with free riders to implement compulsory membership, however many (if not most) governments are wary of doing so. In the absence of compulsory membership, associations face a resourcing question about whether to spend time chasing free riders, or whether simply to acknowledge there will always be an element of free riding and to 'get on with business'. Each of the voluntary associations we spoke with chose the latter option. The view was that an inordinate

amount of time can be spent chasing free riders, or attempting to limit the benefits of the association to members only, however ultimately both of these were likely to meet with little success. Where Governments are not prepared to support compulsory membership, the best approach appears to be to simply get on with the business of delivering results for members and actively sell the benefits to potential members, recognising that there will always be a small percentage who will never join.

Notwithstanding this, it is worth noting that there are some ways that associations retain the benefits of membership to members only. Perhaps the most common way is through some form of member benefits card (or arrangement), where the association negotiates bulk discounts on behalf of members (a prominent example is the Union Shopper<sup>1</sup> which negotiates bulk purchasing arrangements for members of Australian trade unions). These arrangements obviously rely on the power of bulk purchasing (the more members the better) and well-functioning, competitive markets. It's important to note however that they can require considerable resources to establish and maintain and require a careful assessment of costs and benefits before proceeding.

- **Most associations struggle for funds**

The struggle to generate funding to achieve member objectives is not unique to the Pacific. All of the associations surveyed (with the exception perhaps of those with compulsory levy/membership arrangements) identify funding as a significant constraint, with senior executives in many associations spending considerable time chasing organisational funding rather than dedicated to members' operational/policy priorities.

## **2.2 Alternative funding models**

From the case study associations and a broader review trade association funding models, six separate funding models, or combinations of funding models, were identified. These were:

- **Membership subscriptions only.**

Under this model, the association is fully funded from voluntary subscriptions paid by members. Very few associations – including none of the case study associations – adopt this model, largely because of capacity to pay issues, and the need to supplement member funds with additional income.

- **Membership subscriptions + external funding.**

Under this model, associations generate a 'core' level of funding from membership subscriptions, but supplement their income with funding from external sources. This general model was widely used amongst case study associations, including QSIA, CFA, NPFI and Oceanwatch. Sources of external funding can be highlight varied. Many associations seek funding from either competitive government funding programmes (e.g. QSIA has won funding to facilitate climate change adaptability amongst the Queensland fishing industry from the Australian Government; many Australian industry associations receive research and development funding from the Commonwealth Fisheries Research and Development Corporation), or seek to deliver services on a

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.unionshopper.com.au/page/About>

fee-for-service basis (e.g. the CFA receives fees from both AFMA and the Commonwealth Department of Sustainable Population, Environment, and Water to undertake consultation on fisheries management and marine parks respectively).

- **External funds only**

Under this model the association is funded from contributions by external parties only. Few of the case study associations interviewed used this model. Sources of external funding might include funding from donors, research and development agencies. Provision of external funds often comes with a condition that the association will become internally self sustaining within an agreed time limit.

- **Compulsory membership**

A number of forms of compulsory membership exist. All rely on very strong support from both Government and industry, and many require an ongoing demonstration of support from industry by way of a periodic vote of members. A pre-determined threshold level of support is usually required (e.g. 75% of members; 66% of members, etc).

- **Statutory membership**

Under this model, fishers (and potentially members of other sectors) are compulsorily required to become a member of the association by law (usually by virtue of holding a certain licence or permit). The model differs from the 'levy' model below by (usually) being a flat fee for membership. This model was previously used to support the QSIA before the transition to voluntary membership in 2003. Under the QSIA's arrangement, all persons holding a Queensland Master Fisherman's Licence were required to become a member of the association and pay membership fees. (It's worth noting in passing that there two main types of licence: Commercial Fishing Boat Licences and Master Fishermen's Licenses. Holders of Master Fishermen's licences were required to become members of the association; holders of Commercial Fishing Boat Licences weren't. Master fishers were typically either owner/operators or skippers. Holders of Commercial Fishing Boat licences could be wealthy investors in the fishing industry, and substantially benefit from the QSIA's services, but may not hold a Master Fisher's Licence and therefore were not required to pay membership fees. This inequity was a continual source of frustration for many master fishers, many of whom were relatively small scale operators. The lesson being that it is critical that any compulsory membership arrangements are carefully thought through to ensure equity amongst potential members.)

- **Licence fee**

Another model used is to require all licence holders to pay a small fee as part of the licence renewal process which is collected and pass on to the industry association. Typically, a prescribed fee is added to the normal cost of license renewal and passed on by the management agency to the industry association. The addition of the fee to licence renewals requires a head of power under relevant legislation. Different membership fees can be prescribed based on different classes of license, size of vessel, etc.

- **Levy**

Under this model a production based levy is applied to nominated products and used to fund the business of the association. Levies can be collected by the Association itself, or by Government at a convenient point (e.g. on exports) and passed on to industry. Both the New Zealand Seafood Industry Council (SeaFIC) and its 2<sup>nd</sup> tier member bodies (e.g. RLIC) are funded by commodity levies under the New Zealand Commodity Levies Act. The Act requires SeaFIC to renew the general levy order every 5 years by achieving majority support (by both number of levy payers and by levy value) for the continuation of the levy. Within the 5 year order, SeaFIC is obliged to consult on both the annual business plan and the matching annual levy. Approval of the plan and the levy in any year is the responsibility of the SeaFIC Board. Second tier or stock specific levies (collected on behalf of shareholders by SeaFIC) must be able to demonstrate that 2/3 of levy payers participated in processes to approve the levy and 2/3 of those participants supported the levy (i.e. the approval threshold is  $2/3 \times 2/3$ ).

Statutory levies are also often applied to fund collective marketing and other initiatives such as generic industry promotion. For example, the Australian Government has the facility to collect levies for marketing and industry promotion under the *Primary Industries (Excise) Levies Act 1999*. This facility is used to fund industry marketing bodies such as the Australian Meat and Livestock Association. The Australian seafood industry is currently debating whether to make use of the levy facility. Importantly, these funds cannot be used for lobbying and other political purposes and require careful accounting.

Marketing/trade promotion levies are often collected at the point of export. If the relevant legislation is geared around collection upon export, this approach is only really suitable for industry sectors for which significant majority is exported (e.g. southern rock lobster in Australia). If there is a mix of export and domestic sales, but only exporters are funding association, equity concerns will inevitably arise.

- **Voluntary levy**

Under this model, funds are collected on a voluntary basis usually through an exporter or central marketing facility. Funds are usually collected as a standard price per kilo or percentage of the value of product sold. This model typically works best where a majority of fish are funnelled through a small number of main export or marketing facilities. One of the case study associations - Oceanwatch – collects funds in this way through a 15c levy on each bin of fish sold through the Sydney Fish Market (SFM – through which a significant proportion of the fish in NSW are sold). The 15c is comprised of 5c from the fisher, 5c from SFM and 5c from the buyer. Funds are collected by SFM and supplied to Oceanwatch on a quarterly basis. This model relies on very strong accountability and trust between the fisher and the entity collecting revenues.

The model is often used to fund the ‘lobbying’ activities of fishing cooperatives, where they have this function.

In addition to the above, there were other combinations used based on the unique circumstances of the association – e.g. Oceanwatch Australia sources a ‘base’ level of funding through a voluntary levy collected on each bin of fish sold through the Sydney Fish Market (albeit only a small fraction of their overall budget), and seeks external funding (largely from competitive government funded environmental programmes) to fund the bulk of its work.

The main pros and cons of the above models are outlined in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Summary of the main advantages and disadvantages of alternative funding models.

Funding model	Example Association	Pros	Cons
<b>Voluntary membership fees only</b>	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides source of 'unencumbered' funds</li> <li>Voluntary funding promotes self-sufficiency and demonstrates industry commitment to the association (enhances organisational credibility)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many association members have limited capacity to pay</li> <li>Funds available are often inadequate to achieve objectives of association</li> </ul>
<b>Voluntary fees + external sources</b>	QSIA, NPFI, CFA, FIAT, PNG FIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Voluntary funds demonstrate industry commitment and allow some 'unencumbered' funds</li> <li>External funds allow for achievement of member objectives over and above that able to be funded internally</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Association executives can spend substantial time seeking funding rather than working on member issues</li> </ul>
<b>External sources only</b>	PITIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Useful in situations where association members have extremely limited capacity to pay and in allowing organisations to transition to some level of internal funding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No unencumbered funds</li> <li>Funding availability can be variable and unpredictable</li> <li>Absence of internal funding undermines credibility of association</li> </ul>
<b>Compulsory membership</b>			
<b>Statutory membership</b>	QSIA pre-2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Able to secure solid funding base</li> <li>Deals effectively with free riders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highly reliant on Government goodwill</li> <li>Can be politically challenging for Governments and associations</li> <li>Can be perception that association is constrained from confronting Governments because of reliance on Government goodwill for funding</li> </ul>
<b>Licence fees</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As above</li> <li>Streamlines fee collection by using Government processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As above</li> </ul>
<b>Levy</b>	SeaFIC, RLIC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As above</li> </ul>
<b>Voluntary levy</b>	Oceanwatch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates industry commitment to association and provides source of unencumbered funds</li> <li>Most suited to circumstances where majority of product is funnelled through a small number of collection points (e.g. exported through a single/few facilities)</li> <li>Provides an equitable basis for fee contributions – small fishers pay less, larger operators pay more</li> <li>Can be a way of avoiding paying large membership fees in a lump sum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires strong governance/accounting and degree of trust between members and collector of levies</li> </ul>

### Other sources of funds/resources

In addition to those above, other sources of funding are sometimes accessed by industry associations. These include:

- **Sponsorships/advertising** – Sponsorships are practical/possible where the association is seen to have something of value to potential advertisers – e.g. they have a large membership base which is otherwise difficult to ‘get to’. In particular, sponsorships and advertising can be a useful way to financially support dissemination of information amongst members and potential members. For example, the QSIA publishes a monthly magazine called *The Queensland Fisherman*. The magazine is the primary vehicle by which the association communicates with its members and includes information on current association activities, policy debates, industry submissions and current issues of relevance to the industry (e.g. management changes, marine parks issues, maritime safety issues, etc). The magazine is funded entirely by advertising and has been self-sustaining for over 20 years. A full time editor is contracted to publish the magazine, in return for receiving the advertising revenue. QSIA maintains editorial control over the content. The magazine is also both a valuable lobbying tool for the association/industry (it is automatically sent to relevant Ministers, members of parliament and senior government officials and provides an easily digestible summary of key industry issues and priorities), and a valuable ‘recruitment’ tool to let new members know what the association is doing on the key industry issues.
- **“Fighting funds”** – These are funds sought (usually from members, but also potentially from other businesses affected) from members over and above normal membership fees to resource specific initiatives. They are often termed ‘fighting funds’ because money is collected to oppose particular government regulations/proposal that would harm the industry (e.g. marine parks, harmful legislation, etc), however the principle of collecting additional money from industry for a specific purpose could be applied to any range of initiatives.
- **Staff secondments** - Importantly, resourcing of industry associations need not come in the form of direct cash payments. For example, Fisheries Queensland has recently agreed to second one of their staff to the QSIA to help it develop a Line Fishery Development Plan in association with the industry. This approach gets around difficulties some Government departments have in directly providing funds to industry associations, while at the same time providing industry with resources to pursue member objectives. The approach can work well (a) where the government has some capacity to loan staff and (b) where Government and industry have common objectives (e.g. industry development). In the latter case the Government agency can legitimately argue that tax payer funds have contributed to broader Government/national objectives, as opposed to funds to support the general operation of the association, the benefits of which will largely accrue to private individuals/companies. Importantly, staff secondments can also have the broader benefit of promoting a better awareness/collaboration between industry and government on common issues.
- **Influencing external funding programmes** - In addition to securing funds that are directly available to the association, member priorities can often be delivered equally as effectively (sometimes more effectively) by influencing funding delivery and priorities of external funding programmes. This has particular relevance in the Pacific given limited capacity to pay amongst many associations and the significant amount of external aid funding available

for fisheries development and related work. Effectively influencing programme design and delivery requires both recognition of a certain ‘standing’ of the association by the programme (i.e. the association is credible and can speak with authority on industry needs and priorities) and an ongoing, structured dialogue between the industry association and programme coordinators (e.g. through a programme steering committee or something similar). In the Pacific, opportunities are available to influence programme delivery at both the regional (e.g. by PITIA influencing the rollout of the DevFish II and ACP Fish II programmes, and wider aid programmes of significant donors such as AusAID and NZAID) and national (e.g. by national associations influencing the national level programmes of these funders) levels.

Annex 4 outlines a (non-exhaustive) range of relevant funding programmes operating in the Pacific that could either be possible sources of external grant funding for Pacific Fishing Industry Associations, or whose programmes may be influenced to directly support member priorities.

**Box 1: What can Governments do to help?**

The ultimate responsibility for organisational effectiveness and financial sustainability of industry associations rests with industry. Nevertheless, effective industry associations can be a valuable ally to Governments in the Pacific as a ‘partner’ in development, as well as in assisting to develop good public policy and the effective achievement of common government/industry aims. With that in mind, there are a range of practical steps government can take to encourage the development of effective associations. These range from quite ‘interventionist’ approaches such as mandating compulsory membership to more subtle assistance such as helping distribute association membership material and information. A number of possible forms of Government assistance are outlined below:

- **Compulsory membership**

Mandating compulsory membership is perhaps the ultimate assistance Governments can give to industry associations. Compulsory membership can provide a secure funding base, as well as ensuring broad-based membership and policy credibility to association positions. Nevertheless, the sustainability of compulsory membership relies very heavily on strong Government and industry support, which is not always available (Governments often find themselves under pressure from vocal industry members who don’t want to be forced to join an association).

- **Creation of domestic development funds**

In the context of the Pacific, one possible form of funding available to governments is to apply a levy or fee on foreign licences and/or VDS days to assist in domestic development and consultation. These funds could be transferred to a suitable national organisation representing local vessel and shore facility operators. All Governments in the Pacific ostensibly support local development and employment and this would be a way of ensuring that those sectors were in a position to inform the Government of contemporary development problems or relationship issues with non-local fleets. A generous definition of ‘local’ development could be employed (including companies who landed fish in the jurisdiction as prospective members of the local association for membership purposes). However, local status would not provide exemption from the vessel or day levy. Fee rates could be set at levels commensurate with the intended purpose of the fund – for example, if the fund supported consultation with the national association only, only a modest fee would be required. If the development fund was also be used for capital improvements and the like in the domestic sector, larger fees would be required although would need to be balanced to ensure it didn’t act as a disincentive for foreign access. This funding model would work better for national associations than for the regional PITIA model.

- **Recognition as a peak body**

Short of mandating compulsory membership or providing funds directly, this is arguably one of the

most valuable step a government can confer on an industry association. Recognition as a peak body provides a clear message to potential association members that ‘this is the association to join’, and confers an added level of credibility in dealings with both Government and the media. The benefits are not purely to the association however, with Government benefitting by having a single (hopefully unified) peak association to deal with. This can help in streamlining consultation processes, for example, and potentially reduce transaction costs. Importantly, recognition as the peak body brings with it very important obligations on the association to ensure professionalism and credible policy making. Recognition as a peak body can also better position associations for external funding opportunities.

- **Legislating consultation requirements**

A number of countries internationally have fisheries legislation that requires consultation with industry where their interests are affected. In some cases Governments may choose to name the body with whom consultation is required, particularly where a recognised peak association exists. Naming the association in legislation sends a clear message to potential members that membership of the association is valuable and can act as a unifying force (even if consultation is also held with other groups as well).

- **Provision of licence lists**

A common problem faced by industry associations looking to market themselves amongst potential members is that they don’t know who the potential members are. In most fishing industry cases, potential members will be the holders of various classes of government-issued licence (e.g. catching sector licence, processor licence, export licence, aquaculture licence, etc). Provision of current license lists to the industry association (or publishing on a publicly available website) can be a low-cost way for Governments to assist industry association promote themselves to new members, however the ability to do so would clearly be subject to any relevant privacy laws.

- **Providing association material/application packs with licence renewals**

In the event license lists were unable to be provided, an alternative is for government to provide information about the industry association and application packs with all licence renewals. This gets around any privacy concerns and still promotes the benefits of association membership to potential members.

- **Using industry associations to deliver services**

In some cases it may be more cost effective or feasible for industry associations to deliver services currently being delivered by government on a fee-for-service basis. For example, the Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA) contracts the CFA to undertake industry liaison about management changes in Australian Commonwealth fisheries, and separately the NPM to coordinate observer services and other initiatives in the NPM under a co-management trial. In New Zealand, FishServe (a subsidiary of SeaFIC) provides quota registry services, which were previously provided by Government. ‘Outsourcing’ of services to industry can yield a valuable income stream for industry associations as well as lend additional credibility to some processes for Government (e.g. industry members may be more receptive to association staff presenting the outcomes of industry consultations than Government staff).

- **Staff secondments** (see above)

### **3. Regional Case Studies**

#### **3.1 Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITIA)**

##### **Background to association and regional situation**

PITIA was established in 2005 to provide a unified representative voice at the regional level for the Pacific Islands-based domestic tuna fishing industry. The association's Articles of Incorporation lists 21 separate 'purposes and powers' for which the association has been established including, amongst others, to encourage the promotion of the economically and biologically sustainable use of tuna by domestic tuna fishing and associated industries, to represent the interests and views of Association members (and the commercial tuna industry generally) in all matters of government policy, and to provide a responsible and representative body through which governments and other organisations may obtain the views and participation of the Pacific islands tuna industry.

PITIA's membership includes national associations from Pacific Island nations with the most developed domestic industries (e.g. PNG, Fiji, Samoa, Cook Is, FSM), although it is not clear what percentage of overall domestic industry production is covered by member associations (e.g. PNG's FIA covers only 40% of the domestic commercial activity in the country). The domestic tuna fishing sector in the Pacific islands has faced challenging economic circumstances in recent years including increasing fuel prices, declining catch rates of some species and increasing effort by efficient foreign vessels.

The association currently has one paid staff member – an Executive Officer based in Nuku'alofa, Tonga. Secretariat services for PITIA are provided by FIAT under a fee-for-service arrangement.

##### **Current sources of funding**

PITIA has a current budget of approximately \$100,000, funded entirely externally through the EU-funded DevFish II programme. Funding has been provided on the basis that PITIA will assist in the implementation of the industry development components of the program. The majority of the budget is spent on travel. Funding has been committed for the four-year life of the DevFish II program, with approximately 2.5 years left to run.

Membership fee rates have been set for member associations (US\$5,000 for large; US\$2,500 for medium; \$1,000 for small), although no call for membership fees has been made since the establishment of the association in 2005. Prior to the DevFish II funding, some funding was accessed through the GEF-funded Oceanic Fisheries Management Program (OFMP) to support PITIA executives' travel to meetings.

As a peak association of associations, PITIA has provision for one member association from each of the 15 Pacific Island parties to the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA). Currently the association has six confirmed members, with 5 other countries having a national association who are not yet members. Three countries - Nauru, Vanuatu and Palau – have no active national association (although a Palau association was formed in 2009). In some cases (e.g. Fiji, Samoa, Tonga) two national associations exist and provision has been made to allow for input from both (albeit with only one effective vote).

## **Governance and Policy Making Structures**

PITIA is registered as a not-for-profit, incorporated association in the Federated States of Micronesia. The association is overseen by a five person Board comprising the Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary/Treasurer and two others. The Articles of Incorporation provide for the Board to be elected annually at the AGM, although prior to 2010 AGMs were not held every year. Any member can be elected to the Board, but in practice effort has been made to ensure each of the main sectors and regions are represented (e.g. purse seine, longline, processing, north, south).

The Board serves as the primary source of policy advice. Board meetings are held quarterly via teleconference. Priorities are to a certain extent driven by external funding and forums (e.g. WCPFC), although a meeting is planned for later in 2012 to consult members and set association priorities.

No formal policy making structures have yet been established for the main sectors (e.g. purse seine, longline, pole and line, processing).

## **Key successes and challenges**

The main early success of PITIA has been to raise the profile of domestic industry management and development needs in regional forums. Association staff and executives regularly attend WCPFC and key FFA meetings and provide statements as observers on key industry concerns. Association staff are also increasingly beginning to influence the delivery of large external aid programmes (e.g. DevFish II) to meet member needs.

Apart from the normal 'tyranny of distance' type challenges faced by most Pacific organisations, the main challenges faced by PITIA include:

- 'Association of associations' model

The 'association of associations' model has historically been a difficult one to make work. Member associations are often themselves 'strapped for cash' and find it hard to pass on limited funds for peak association membership fees. Members of national associations can also see the peak association as 'one step removed' from their daily concerns, reinforcing pressure to keep limited funds internal. In addition, in the absence of very clear demarcation in roles and responsibilities, member associations can also see the peak association as a competitor on some issues, leading to tensions. The difficulties of the 'association of associations' model are not new and led to the failure (around 2005) of the Australian Seafood Industry Council, which operated on a similar structure to PITIA.

- Weak capacity to pay amongst member associations

PITIA's member associations have a weak capacity to pay and there are likely to be ongoing challenges in deriving a large proportion of necessary funding internally. The budgets of the five PITIA members (including the three national case study associations) made available to this study totalled approximately US\$140,000, with less than US\$26,000 contributed by members. Approximately \$24,000 of this came from PNG FIA members, with the remaining four association's

members contributing less than \$1,500 in total. Notwithstanding these challenges, some member funding is required to demonstrate commitment to the association.

- Finding a niche that ‘adds value’

Unlike national associations who have a clear role in contributing to national level legislation, policy and management, PITIA’s ‘mandate’ as a regional body is perhaps less clearly defined. It is critical the PITIA focuses on areas of work that add value to the work of national member associations, rather than duplicate it. From this review, it seems clear PITIA can play a valuable coordinating role in influencing the direction of FFA and PNA negotiating positions at the WCPFC, influencing the roll-out of large scale aid programmes to meet member needs, as well as leading discussion on cross-national policy and management issues that affect members – e.g. development of regional and sub-regional management regimes (e.g. PITIA’s recent paper on the economics of the southern longline fishery); coordinating regional industry policy positions in response to proposal to establish shark sanctuaries in many Pacific EEZs.

- Interacting with the locally based foreign fleet

An important issue for discussion amongst the PITIA membership is whether, and how, it interacts with the locally-based foreign (LBF) tuna fleet. There is little interaction at present, and any relationship that does exist at present is largely defined by its member national associations (e.g. are LBF operators members of the national association?) and the views of the national governments (e.g. do they encourage LBF’s to be members of the local association?). A number of interviewees suggested that some level of interaction with the LBF fleet was required, although no concrete proposals were put forward. Ultimately, existing PITIA members should examine whether, on balance, a stronger relationship with LBF operators will better position them to achieve their own development objectives, and if so, what form the interaction should take.

### **Ways forward to enhance effectiveness**

- **A commercial focus** – Although the 20 or so separate purposes listed in the PITIA Articles of Incorporation are all undoubtedly worthy, the pragmatic reality is that it’s not possible for PITIA to be ‘all things to all people’ with its current budget. In this context, it is important the association’s core goals and objectives are clear to guide day-to-day activity. While arguably it goes without saying, our view is that PITIA’s main focus should be unashamedly commercial, and more specifically to encourage and promote the international competitiveness of Pacific fishing sector businesses. As one interviewee noted “there are already plenty of people out there looking after the fish”, and potential members need to be confident that the association will vigorously promote their (collective) commercial interests. To this end, PITIA might wish to think better define its ‘core objectives’ in its governance documents and strategic plans.

This may also have implications for issues such as membership and staffing. For example, an argument was made that PITIA’s scope is currently ‘too diffuse’, attempting to represent everyone from artisanal fishers up to larger commercial operators. To some extent, this is a product of the current membership structure, where PITIA’s members are the national associations, the members of which in turn range from very small to large and across a range

of different fisheries (including non-tuna fisheries). The issues involved with artisanal and commercial sectors aren't always well aligned and it is not clear that attempting to resolve these issues is the best use of PITIA's limited resources, or the best contribution PITIA can make to regional development. These issues should be kept in mind when defining PITIA's core goals and objectives.

Likewise, a clearer definition of PITIA's core goals and objectives may influence any future consideration of membership arrangements. For example, an alternative structure to the current 'association of associations' model would be to have direct membership of PITIA from domestic tuna fishing businesses in the Pacific. Arguably, this would help promote a more clearly defined commercial focus, better define PITIA's core constituents and allow for more direct revenue collection, while at the same time avoiding some of the pitfalls of the association of associations model. Businesses with interests in both national and regional affairs would have the option of joining both PITIA and the national association (perhaps with some discount worked out for joining both). Nevertheless, direct membership of PITIA would be a significant change which may have implications for the sustainability of national associations, and should be canvassed with existing members. It would be important under any direct membership model that a sufficient proportion of domestic tuna fishing businesses in the Pacific took up membership to ensure PITIA continued to be seen as representative.

In addition, better defining PITIA's core objectives and functions will better position the organisation to assess staffing and other resourcing needs. While more objectives can ultimately be pursued with more staff (see for example the range of staff numbers in the Australia/NZ case study associations), defining the 'core' set of objectives and functions for the association will allow some reasonable estimate to be made of staff time/resources required. Pragmatism from the membership is required in defining 'core' objectives in the early stages where staff time and resources are very limited. If a key function of at least one staff member (e.g. the executive officer) is securing external funding, at least one other operational staff position, with administrative support, will be required to undertake the operational business of the association (e.g. coordinating/developing policy positions, meeting attendance/advocacy, etc).

- **Leveraging resources through strategic intervention** – In the context of limited organisational resources, priority needs to be given to activities with the best potential return on investment for members. While operational priority setting is a matter for PITIA members, a key strategy for delivery should be to leverage the larger resources of external bodies to best meet members' interests. This could include, for example, using limited PITIA resources to influence the FFA's WCPFC negotiating position at the WCPFC to match member priorities (FFA can then use their significantly larger resource and 'clout' to achieve common PITIA/FFA aims), or influencing the rollout of large externally-funded aid programs to meet member interests (see below). Attendance at key preparatory meetings and the preparation of targeted policy papers<sup>2</sup> and media releases (where appropriate) are helpful in this regard.

---

<sup>2</sup> The recent PITIA paper on economic aspects of the southern longline fishery is a good example

- **Influencing aid programmes** – This issue is essentially a sub-set of the previous one, but is important enough to be highlighted in its own right. The Pacific fisheries sector is currently the focus of significant aid funding, with key programmes listed in Annex 4. Funding available totals over US\$12m, with more directly related funding proposed (e.g. NZ MFAT has proposed a NZD\$7.4m program of vocational training support for the Pacific fisheries sector). A not uncommon complaint in the rollout of large aid programmes is that they are insufficiently targeted towards the day-to-day needs and realities of industry. In this context, PITIA can play a critical role in acting as a link between programme managers and the industry ‘coalface’ to help shape the design and delivery of aid programs to best meet member needs (and thereby national development objectives). In practical terms, it means PITIA can ensure very significant resources are directed at member priorities without having to raise the funds directly. Even if PITIA focused on little else apart from influence aid programs, it has the capacity to generate substantial return on investment for members for relatively modest contribution.
- **Ensuring roles and relationships between PITIA and member associations are clear** – One relatively common weakness in the ‘association of associations’ model is that the roles and responsibilities of the peak and member associations are not clear. This can mean funds meant to be used at the peak level are used on national level issues (and vice versa), confused and contradictory policy positions can be put forward between the peak association and its members, and overlapping/unclear responsibilities can lead to tensions. While there is obviously a need for pragmatism in the relationship and work programs of PITIA and its members (many of whom have few if any resources and require assistance), it is important there is clarity around which associations take the lead on which issues.
- **Fishery specific policy making structures (longer term)**– PITIA’s members have a diverse range of interests ranging from artisanal to industrial, and across each of the main fishery sectors – purse seine, longline, pole and line, artisanal and post-harvest. In the short term, with little funding, it is pragmatic to make policy across all sectors within the one Board/AGM structure. However, if membership and funding grow, consideration should be given to establishing fishery specific policy making structures to ensure organisational policy is made by those who have most at stake (i.e. longline policy is made by longline operators, etc). As a general rule, any structures should be based on the defined ‘fisheries’ or fisheries management units. Policy making committees could be established for the four main sectors – purse seine, longline and pole and line (assuming activity in this sector) and post-harvest – and, depending on the nature of how fishery management structures develop, some sectors could be further defined – e.g. a southern longline committee and a tropical longline committee. Organisational policies on each of the main fisheries would be led by the relevant committee, while PITIA ‘head office’ could focus on cross-sectoral issues (e.g. training, regional fisheries governance, influencing aid funding), as resolving disputes where they arise between committees.

### **Possible future sources of funding**

Possible future sources of funding for PITIA are discussed below:

Table 2: Assessment of PITIA broad funding options against models identified through case studies

Funding model	Applicability
<b>Membership fees</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Member associations have limited capacity to pay, although some membership fees are important to demonstrate commitment and organisational credibility</li> <li>Hard to see membership fees alone supporting a sustainable association in short-medium term</li> </ul>
<b>Membership fees + external funds</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members may be able to make modest contributions, although difficult to see membership contributions alone delivering financial sustainability in short-medium term</li> <li>External funding improves ability of association to deliver on member priorities (albeit variable)</li> </ul>
<b>External funds only</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of external funds variable and subject to 'strings attached'.</li> <li>Absence of internal funding undermines credibility of association</li> </ul>
<b>Compulsory membership – statutory membership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No formal mechanism to require compulsory membership of a regional association</li> </ul>
<b>Compulsory membership – Licence fees</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No regional licence to attach fees</li> </ul>
<b>Compulsory membership – compulsory levy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mechanism to impose regional compulsory levy</li> </ul>
<b>Voluntary levy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difficult to apply in regional 'association of associations' model</li> </ul>

- Regional organisation funding

The uncomfortable reality is that there is a significant gap between the potential benefits associated with having an effective regional fisheries sector representative organisation in the Pacific, and the capacity of PITIA's members to pay for those services. Amongst the national associations surveyed, even the relatively modest existing PITIA membership fees exceeded the total annual budget of some associations. Given the economic circumstances surrounding the fishing industry in many PICs, these capacity to pay constraints are unlikely to disappear soon. While the responsibility for funding private sector representative organisations ultimately rests with the private sector, where the existence of an effective organisation would better enable regional organisations to achieve common objectives (e.g. industry development) or streamline some functions (e.g. industry consultation/communication), a case can be made for the provision of funding support for the private sector body. Precedents for governments providing support to private sector bodies which would otherwise not exist, or would operate less effectively without support, are not uncommon (e.g. the QSIA receives a \$125,000 grant from the Queensland Government; the NPFI and CFA both receive funding from AFMA to assist with some services). If the region as a whole is interested in continuing and encouraging the existence of an effective fisheries sector peak body, then it may be the case the regional organisations need to commit an ongoing level of funding to it in at least the medium term. Any arrangement could be structured on a fee-for-service basis, with specific, measurable deliverables to assess performance. The arrangement may also be contingent on PITIA generating benchmark amounts of internal revenue to demonstrate private sector commitment.

- Project based funds

As the regional representative body for the fisheries sector, PITIA is well-positioned to assist in the delivery of regionally-focused aid and related projects. Funds could be sought for generic assistance in the implementation of aid programmes – similar to the current DevFish II funding arrangement – or for specific projects based on member priorities – e.g. coordinating training or safety projects. External funding of this nature forms a significant component of the budget of many of the

Australian/New Zealand case study associations examined. Opportunities may also exist for PITIA to use its unique position to contribute to consulting and other projects - e.g. where a high degree of industry consultation is required, PITIA could be contracted to provide a consultation service.

- Membership fees

As highlighted above, some level of internal funding is essential to demonstrate member commitment and to establish organisational credibility. The situation to date where members have yet to contribute to PITIA's operation is less than ideal, although it's important to note PITIA have moved recently to address this by making a 10% call on membership fees.

- Corporate membership

One possible option available to PITIA is to provide for corporate membership under its Articles of Incorporation. Allowing corporate membership would provide an avenue for larger, international businesses with investments in Pacific domestic fisheries to contribute directly to association, many of whom may have greater capacity to pay than current members. Having both 'corporate' and 'association' members is not unique – the Commonwealth Fisheries Association uses the same structure – and adding corporate members could add both resources and 'clout' to the association. Nevertheless, it would likely significantly alter the 'flavour' (and perhaps priorities) of the current association, and any proposal to move in this direction should be canvassed widely amongst the existing membership. Considerable pragmatism would also be required in agreeing equitable voting structures between corporate and association members.

- Staff secondments

Where direct regional agency funding support is deemed not to be desirable, staff secondments from regional agencies to PITIA may be a way of providing practical support to progress issues of common interest (e.g. a development plan for a particular sector; a comparative review of industry arrangements). This may be particularly relevant for divisions of regional associations focused heavily on industry development (e.g. FFA's development section). Under this model, regional agencies would continue to fund staff salaries.

## **3.2 Tonga – Fishing Industry Association of Tonga (FIAT)**

### **Background to association and country situation**

FIAT was incorporated in 2008, taking over from the previous Tonga Export Fisheries Association (TEFA). The association's main objectives are outlined in its strategic plan and include to:

- Advocating for better public policy that serves its members.
- Ensuring member's costs of production are as low as possible.
- Improving member's access to capital.

The association is multi-sectoral with provision for members across each of Tonga's main commercial fisheries. Currently the association has 2 members in the tuna fishery, 12 members in the snapper fishery, 2 in the beche-de-mer fishery and two sportfishing clubs. The association focuses on representing fishers in the formal (licensed) sector and has yet to establish membership

criteria for the artisanal (informal) sector. The association's members represent approximately 90% of the current commercial fisheries sector activity in Tonga. FIAT has no paid staff at the moment, with senior association executives doing much of the business of the association around their 'day jobs'.

The fisheries representative situation in Tonga is in a dynamic state at the moment. A second association – the Tongan National Fishers' Association (TNFA) – has operated for some time and recently there has been a proposal for a third – the Fisheries Council of Tonga (FCT). TNFA was established with support from MAFFF and is comprised largely of smaller (informal) fishers. Some industry participants are members of both associations. The proposal to establish the FCT is ostensibly to unify the sector in order to 'get things going again' and is supported by MAFFF.

Tonga's fisheries are going through a difficult period, with fishing effort at historically low levels. The number of domestic tuna boats operating is now down to 1-2, and some other fisheries are closed for stock rebuilding (e.g. beche-de-mer).

### **Current sources of funding**

FIAT currently receives funding through a number of sources. These include:

- Core funding of 10,000 pa'anga (US\$5,800) provided by the Tonga Chamber of Commerce;
- Membership fees (2,000 pa'anga – US\$1,160)
- US\$12,000 from PITIA in return for providing a Secretariat service to the association
- A 7.5% service fee (equivalent to about 2-2.5,000 pa'anga – US\$1,160-1,450) for the administration of a safety project
- US\$625/quarter from FFA for the provision of tuna data and economic indicators.

The total current budget is approximately US\$22,910.

### **Governance and Policy Making Structures**

FIAT is overseen by a Board of eight members, and provision also exists for an Executive Working Committee of 4 Board members plus the Executive Officer. In practice, neither the Board nor the Executive Committee have worked actively in recent times due to the state of the industry. Much of the work of the association has been carried out by the Secretary and 'Etimoni (Eddie) Palu.

The Association has a Strategic Plan 2011-2013, developed in consultation with members. The Plan notes the key challenge for the association is to "work with the Tongan Government and its agents to improve fisheries governance and policy-making and implementation". The association is set up around eight sector groups (tuna, snapper, beche-de-mer, aquarium, sportfishing, etc), and is capable of making sectorally-specific policies, though has not used this approach in recent years due to general inactivity.

### **Key successes and challenges**

The main organisational successes listed by the association have been the removal of duty on fishing inputs including fuel, lobbying to date for the exemption of the industry from Consumption Tax and the implementation of the safety at sea project which has resulted in full compliance with domestic requirements, based on SOLAS.

The main current challenges are the difficult relationship with Government, the lack of full time staff to progress industry priority issues, the lack of association funding and the depressed state of the domestic industry, which serves to reinforce the first three.

### **Ways forward to enhance effectiveness**

The main need in Tonga is to resolve the current complexities in the industry representative arrangements and strengthen the working relationship between FIAT and MAFFF (either through the new FCT or independently). Interviewees on both sides of the fence indicated the other side did not have a good appreciation of their working environment and priorities, and there appeared to be low levels of trust and cooperation. FIAT representatives talked of the 'big disconnect' between the commercial sector and MAFFF, while some MAFFF representatives questioned whether FIAT had been an effective representative voice on behalf of all members. These difficulties appear to be longstanding, having been discussed as far back as the 2007 Tonga Commercial Fisheries Conference.<sup>3</sup>

At the time of writing a new Fisheries Council of Tonga is being proposed, supported by MAFFF, and it is not immediately clear what, if any, the relationship between the FCT and FIAT will be. Proponents of the FCT saw the Council as a unifying voice for the industry in Tonga, which would include both FIAT and TNFA as members. The proposal is that the Council would be overseen by an Executive Board, upon which representatives of both FIAT and TNFA would sit, and funded through a proportion of licence fees and levies paid by fishers to government. However, despite that there was considerable opposition to the concept of a third association amongst all FIAT members interviewed (which together represented a considerable proportion of the remaining commercial activity in the country) and seemingly little prospect of active involvement. It is not clear at this stage how the situation will develop.

While these issues are undoubtedly challenging, the question arising now is what practical steps can be taken to improve the relationship such that Government and industry are working effectively together as development partners. Possible approaches are listed below:

- **Appointment of an 'independent' FIAT executive officer** – Most industry members interviewed believed that the appointment of a new Executive officer for FIAT would assist in rectifying the relationship with Government. One practical impact of the absence of an Executive Officer in the past year has been that the main players in the larger fishing businesses have necessarily taken on more of the day-to-day functions which has reinforced a perception (whether real or not) that the association speaks only on behalf of the few larger players. The appointment of an 'independent' executive officer is seen as a way of bringing a 'fresh face' to table and acting as a way to restart the relationship with government;
- **Recognition of FIAT as the peak body for the formal fisheries sector** – Irrespective of how the FCT proposal develops, there would be value in acknowledging FIAT's role as the peak body, at least for the formal (licenced) fisheries sector. FIAT is already recognised as the peak fisheries sector association for the purposes of the Tonga Chamber of Commerce, and is invited to represent the sector on other government sector bodies. Recognition as the

---

<sup>3</sup> Anon (2007). Tonga Commercial Fisheries Conference. Lopaukamea II, 'Atele, Tongatapu. 7<sup>th</sup> – 9<sup>th</sup> Feb, 2007

peak body would make it clear to all licenced operators that FIAT is the main body with which government communicates on formal sector fisheries issues and may assist in unifying the formal sector around a single association (even if MAFFF wishes to consult the broader sector through the new council).

- **Reinvigoration of a high level forum to discuss commercial/development issues** – While interviews in Tonga highlighted a range of differing viewpoints on the best industry representative structures and the like, the one common theme was a desire to ‘get Tongan fisheries going again’. A Fisheries Management Advisory Committee (FMAC) previously existed to discuss high level fisheries issues, however it reportedly met inconsistently, members often didn’t turn up and was generally ineffective. A reinvigorated, development oriented committee involving not only MAFF and FIAT, but also related ‘enabling’ agencies such as the Tongan Development Bank, the Ports Authority Tonga, the Ministry of Labour, Commerce and Industry, would be a valuable standing forum to set and coordinate priorities for industry development, as well as troubleshoot any impediments to industry development as they arise. It is important in the context of previous agreements which have not been progressed (even those reportedly agreed at Cabinet level), that any matters agreed by the forum receive adequate resourcing and are progressed.

### Possible future sources of funding

Possible future sources of funding for FIAT are discussed below:

**Table 3: Assessment of FIAT broad funding options against models identified through case studies**

Funding model	Applicability
Membership fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the current state of the industry in Tonga, there appear to be weak capacity to fund an effective association fully from member funds</li> </ul>
Membership fees + external funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FIAT currently operates under this model. Some capacity appears to exist to continue collecting modest membership fees. FIAT has a track record of successfully delivering externally funded projects.</li> </ul>
External funds only	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full external funding may undermine the credibility of the association.</li> </ul>
Compulsory membership – statutory membership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the difficulties in the relationship with MAFFF, it seems unlikely Government will support compulsory membership in the short-medium term</li> </ul>
Compulsory membership – Licence fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As above</li> </ul>
Compulsory membership – compulsory levy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As above</li> </ul>
Voluntary levy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited number of current exporters potentially makes collection/administration of a levy feasible</li> </ul>

Possible opportunities for future FIAT funding appear to be:

- Use of licence fee revenue (domestic and/or foreign)

One proposal to fund the new FCT is to redistribute some of the funds paid by domestic operators in licence fees back into the FCT. If Government is amenable to redirecting licence fee revenue to fund the work of industry associations, FIAT may wish to apply to access some of these funds. Funding could be used for specific initiatives – e.g. the development of a strategy to strengthen access to credit – or for the general operation of the association, depending on any conditions applied by MAFFF. Any funds received should have clear deliverables attached to ensure accountability. Notwithstanding that, the practicality of FIAT being able to access funds is likely to be intertwined with the ability achieve a mutually agreed model for industry representation above. If MAFFF

continue to hold the view that FIAT has been ineffective, they may not see providing funds as a good investment.

Another option would be to set aside some of the funding received from foreign access licence fees to fund the work of the association. After a long period of prohibiting access by foreign vessels, Tonga has recently re-opened its EEZ to foreign access. Although only relatively modest revenues are currently collected (\$20,000/licence), this has the potential to grow substantially under the right circumstances.

- US Treaty Project Development Funds

The US Treaty PDF is a possible source of funding support to FIAT, although would need the support of MAFFF. The PDF was recommended as a possible source of funds at the Tonga Commercial Fisheries Conference 2007<sup>4</sup>. Interviewees recalled that the possible use of PDF funds was discussed between MAFFF and (then) TEFA at the time, but TEFA were advised that there were insufficient funds to provide any to industry. A subsequent proposal requesting access to PDF funds was reportedly never acted on.

- Voluntary export levy

The current contracted state of the Tonga industry has meant that much of the fisheries export is being channelled through a handful of main operators (e.g. snapper through KoolFresh). This situation (albeit perhaps not desirable in the long term) makes it feasible to apply a voluntary levy on export, assuming current exporters have the capacity to collect and account for levies (which they are likely to) and support exists from local fishers (which is unknown). One of the benefits of a levy over a standard membership fee is that it doesn't need to be paid in one lump sum, and is production-based such that overall payments should be equitable according to each operator's level of exports. If a levy based approach is adopted, one issue to consider is how to capture membership revenue from product sold on the domestic market (if necessary).

- Staff secondments

Staff secondments from MAFFF to FIAT may be a practical way of strengthening the capacity of FIAT to contribute to the Government's development agenda, as well as generating greater goodwill and understanding between the organisations. It is worth noting though that this option, like each of those above (with the exception of voluntary levies) will require support from MAFFF. This, in turn, will likely first require resolution of the relationship issues discussed above.

### **3.3 PNG – PNG Fishing Industry Association (FIA)**

#### **Background to association and country situation**

The PNG Fishing Industry Association (FIA) was established in 1991 to represent the interests of the domestically-based fishing industry. The objectives of the association are to:

- To provide a united voice for the fishing sector in PNG;
- To facilitate and encourage the promotion of the fishing sector in PNG and elsewhere;

---

<sup>4</sup> Anon (2007). Op cit.

- To undertake, coordinate and promote liaison and negotiations with the NFA, the Fisheries Minister and other interested bodies.

The fishing industry in PNG is undergoing rapid change, particularly the onshore processing sector which is expected to see significant investment in the coming decade.<sup>5</sup> The number of tuna canneries is expected to increase from 3 to at least 8, with actual production increasing from 87,500 mt to 182,500 mt by 2016, and employment increasing from 22,869 to over 53,300.<sup>6</sup> These developments are supported by PNG Government financial incentives and benefits associated with global sourcing arrangements under the Interim Economic Partnership Agreement (IEPA).

Fisheries other than tuna purse seine (e.g. tuna longline, prawn, barramundi, reef fish) are subject to domestication arrangements and have been constrained by challenging economic circumstances.

FIA currently has 36 financial members, around 60% of which are larger companies. The remaining members include smaller operators, fishing cooperatives and support businesses. All meetings are held in Port Moresby, with members expected to fund their own travel costs.

The association has one full-time staff member (an Executive Officer), based in Port Moresby. FIA estimate about 40% of the industry are current members of the association.

### **Current sources of funding**

FIA currently receive approx. PGK30,000-50,000 (\$US14,000-\$24,000) in subscriptions from members as well as additional PGK195,000 (US\$93,000) grant from NFA. Membership fees are set at between PGK500-3,000 (US\$240 - \$1,445) depending on the size of the member's operation and number of vessels (PGK3,000 is for a company with over 80 staff or 8 licenced vessels). The NFA grant is a temporary measure for 2012 and follows a PGK150,000 grant in 2010.

### **Governance and Policy Making Structures**

The association is overseen by an Executive Management Committee (EMC) comprising the Chair, Deputy Chair, Treasurer, Secretary and each of the sector Chairs (Prawn, Tuna, Processing, International Relations, Support Industry, Fishing Cooperatives and Training). Positions are elected annually at the AGM.

Policy priorities are generally set by the EMC, with input from (or initiated by) the Executive Officer. Where a significant issue arises, a full member meeting can be called. The association is planning to hold a member consultative meeting later in 2012 to set operational priorities. If successful, the meeting may become an annual event.

### **Key successes and challenges**

The FIA can lay claim to a number of tangible successes during the course of its history. These include playing a key role in the establishment of the NFA (including successfully arguing for seats on the Board), successfully lobbying for reforms to tax arrangements for fishing gear (duties were

---

<sup>5</sup> Hamilton, A., Lewis, A. & Campling, L. (2011). Report on the Implementation of the derogation to the standard rules of origin granted to the Pacific ACP States in the framework of the Interim Economic Partnership Agreement . FWC COM 2011 RFS 2011/266449 . 207pp.

<sup>6</sup> Hamilton et al (2011). Ibid.

previously 5-30%; many are now 0%), effectively integrating into the working processes of government (FIA sits on a range of key decision making/advisory committees) and advancing the interests of domestic operators through domestication policies.

Notwithstanding that, the overarching challenge now faced by FIA is to address the perception that “the industry is ‘growing up’, the FIA needs to grow up with it”. Several interviewees expressed the view that the industry needed to chart a course to expand its membership base and funding arrangements such that it’s scale and influence are commensurate with the growing contribution of the fisheries sector to the PNG economy. This will require new ways of operating, including modernising the governance structure, strengthening the funding arrangements and membership base, expanding staffing and taking a more prominent position in policy and public debates.

Other challenges facing the association include:

- A perception that larger companies control the FIA agenda (this is a common challenge faced by trade associations worldwide);
- The decentralised nature of the fisheries sector in PNG, and the costs and practical challenges associated with serving a distributed membership;
- The very large spread of economic circumstances amongst the membership – from vertically integrated international companies to smaller artisanal cooperatives;
- Management of perception issues around the influence of foreign vs domestically controlled businesses in the association;
- Demonstration of benefits to large potential new members of the association – i.e. large companies often have sufficient ‘corporate clout’ to influence government policy in their own right; to attract these companies as members, FIA needs to be able to demonstrate being able to add value over and above that able to be generated by larger companies on their own.

### **Ways forward to enhance effectiveness**

The FIA appears to be on the right track in moving to sure up the fundamental structures of the association. The aim is to strengthen credibility (both with industry and government) and in turn attract members. At the same time, strengthening credibility will (particularly financial and organisational credibility) improve the prospects of securing external funding.

The general intent of the new strategic direction is outlined in a new draft business plan currently under development. The draft plan lays out an organisational vision and mission, as well as strategic priorities and performance indicators. These provide a positive framework to guide the association, however there is little detail as yet on the changes and improvements planned for the association’s structure/governance. During interviews it was clear that a key part of the reforms proposed was the appointment of an independent Chief Executive Officer (with a higher degree of delegated authority than exists at present), overseen by a strategically focused Board. The intent was to free up the time of elected association officials, allow the CEO the flexibility to achieve objectives determined by the Board, remove any perception of influence from elected officials’ companies and generally strengthen the professionalism of the association. These all appear to be positive motives and we suggest proposed changes to the association’s governance and executive arrangements be more clearly spelled out in the final business plan. All other things being equal, a move towards a

stronger, more businesslike association will help to generate memberships and will help to bridge the gap in the current plan between the associations' priorities and how they are going to be achieved. To that extent, we also suggest proposals for funding of the new association structure are more clearly spelled out. These should be developed in association with members (and potential members) taking account of the options presented in this report.

Other opportunities to enhance effectiveness include:

- **Capitalise on the opportunity afforded by NFA Board membership** - The FIA has a unique opportunity to contribute to and shape PNG's fisheries management and development agenda through its position on the NFA Board. Some interviewees indicated that whilst the FIA nominated Board members contributed actively to Board discussions, they were largely responding to the agenda, rather than setting the agenda. FIA through its new structure should look at means of more actively influencing the development agenda at Board level. This could include for example, submission of agenda items and policy papers on key issues affecting the industry (developed through an inclusive industry process), and proposals for directing NFA resources on key issues. Being able to demonstrate 'wins' at Board level will reinforce the benefits of membership to potential association members. Another key focus at Board level should be on influencing the PNG national position in international negotiations, given the significant role PNG plays in the PNA, FFA and WCPFC.
- **Need to increase exposure outside POM** – a consistent theme identified during interviews was the need to strengthen FIA's exposure to potential members outside of Port Moresby. PNG's fisheries sector is highly decentralised – particular the artisanal/co-operative sector – and a stronger presence is required to both demonstrate the benefits of membership and respond to regional member concerns. Consideration should be given to increasing the travel budget to allow the CEO to increase regional travel (concentrating initially on areas that might generate best returns), or looking at alternative mechanisms such as placing staff in strategic locations (e.g. the Madang PMIZ). Cost effective mechanisms to strengthen communication – e.g. websites, magazines, newsletter, email updates – should also be investigated.
- **Promoting good governance** – Given the scale of current and future investment at stake in the PNG fisheries sector, FIA has a critical role to play in promoting good governance. During the course of this project significant changes have been made to the structure and operation of the NFA (changing the make-up of the Board, including reducing NFA's positions from 2 to 1; changing Board appointment procedures; changing licence approval procedures), which appeared to be undertaken without the knowledge of most affected stakeholders. These changes, and in particular the process leading up to them, have the potential to undermine accountability and increase the level of sovereign risk associated with investments. In this environment, FIA has an important role to play as a credible, independent voice calling for good governance and highlighting on behalf of members how weak governance can harm investment attractiveness (amongst other things).
- **Need to strengthen communication mechanisms** – In an environment where FIA is representing multi-million dollar businesses, attempting to widen its effective presence beyond Port Moresby and attract new members, it is critical the association is (and, equally importantly, gives the appearance of being) 'open for business'. Current communication

arrangements for the FIA office appear less than adequate, with email communications intermittent at best.

### Possible future sources of funding

The following appear to be the credible sources of future funding for FIA:

Table 4: Assessment of FIA broad funding options against models identified through case studies

Funding model	Applicability
<b>Membership fees</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant expansion of fisheries sector in PNG should bring potential to expand membership base</li> <li>Potential also exists to increase membership fees from relatively modest levels for larger businesses</li> </ul>
<b>Membership fees + external funds</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potentially to supplement internal funds with external funding for projects to support expansion of sector; assisting to coordinate delivery of services to artisanal sector</li> </ul>
<b>External funds only</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unlikely to be credible given significant capacity to pay amongst PNG-based companies.</li> </ul>
<b>Compulsory membership – statutory membership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NFA have indicated government is unlikely to be receptive to compulsory membership</li> </ul>
<b>Compulsory membership – Licence fees</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NFA have indicated government is unlikely to be receptive to compulsory membership</li> </ul>
<b>Compulsory membership – compulsory levy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NFA have indicated government is unlikely to be receptive to compulsory membership</li> </ul>
<b>Voluntary levy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multiple exporters likely to make administration and collection complex</li> </ul>

Of all the case study associations, the FIA has perhaps the greatest potential to generate additional internal funding from membership subscriptions. Opportunities appear to exist both to increase the level of funding generated from individual members (for example, the current membership fee for a business with over 80 staff is US\$1445; equivalent corporate members of the Commonwealth Fisheries Association in Australia are paying \$20,000), as well as expanding the membership base to incorporate existing non-members (FIA estimate current coverage of the industry is around 40%) as well as new industry players (e.g. new canneries). Our view is that strengthening internal funding through attracting new members and sustainable increases in fees (particularly for larger members) should be the first funding priority for FIA. This needs to be tied to improvements in the association's effectiveness proposed in the business plan.

NFA have indicated the Government is unlikely to be receptive to compulsory membership, however they recognise the benefits of a strong industry association and would be prepared to assist in other ways. For example, they have indicated a willingness to provide FIA information and application forms with license renewal forms, as well as supplying a list of current licences to the association. These are valuable resources for any association and FIA should think about how they can be best used to target new members/raise revenues (e.g. through the development of association information material, calls/visits to potential new members, distribution of newsletters, etc).

In addition to internal funding, potential also appears to exist for FIA to secure external funding targeted at specific initiatives. For example, it was suggested during interviews that FIA would be eligible to apply for funding to help coordinate NFA-funded activities amongst local coops. Planned

improvements to the organisation's governance will improve its attractiveness as a supplier of outsourced services.

### **3.4 Kiribati – Nareau Tuna Boat Owner's Association (NTBOA)**

#### **Background to association and country situation**

The NTA was formally incorporated as a not-for-profit society in November, 2011. The incorporation followed over a year of preparatory discussions, as well as consultation with PITIA and regional organisations. The establishment of NTA has effectively drawn together three local fishing industry associations – the Katonu Tuna Boat Owner's Assoc. (KTA - based in Bairiki), the Causeway Tuna Association (CTA - based in Bikenibeu) and the Bonnano Tuna Association (BTA - based in Betio) – which had previously operated informally (i.e. none were registered as an incorporated society).

The members of the NTA are small scale fishers, almost all of which have vessels less than 7m in length. Catches are almost exclusively sold into the local Tarawa market, for a maximum price of about AUD\$1.40/lb. Catches are focused on smaller skipjack and yellowfin, with larger yellowfin and bigeye difficult to sell locally. There are also around 10 larger vessels flagged to Kiribati (longliners, purse seiners, carriers), although these are not currently members of the NTA member associations.

A number of recent developments influenced the establishment of the NTA. Firstly, local fishers were keen to establish a stronger and more united voice to government on local issues (e.g. increasing sale of undersized/reject fish from foreign vessels transshipping in Tarawa and impacts on local markets). Second, the Kiribati Government together with joint venture partners Golden Ocean (based in Fiji), and Shanghai Fishing Co, plan to establish a processing/exporting facility (the Kiribati Fishing Co.) on Tarawa. Although originally planned as a local base to process products from the fleets of the joint venture partners, local fishermen are also interested in supplying to the facility as a way of improving returns and wanted a local association to coordinate their interactions with the new company. More recently, Yuh Yow Fisheries Corporation Ltd were interested in having their longline vessels (operated through locally registered company Marin Marawa Fisheries - MMF) accredited by the Organisation for the Promotion of Responsible Tuna Fisheries (OPRT) to export super frozen tuna into Japan. In order to receive accreditation, a national association was required to support the application. Yuh Yow supported the development of the NTA by allowing in kind use of its MMF facilities and staff in Tarawa.

Under NTA's Rules, its members are the members of the three local associations, provided they are 'recognised as regular tuna fishers and a boat-owner of an active tuna fishing boat'.<sup>7</sup> 'Foreign investor tuna boat owners of flagged vessels' are also eligible to apply for membership, with MMF a member under this provision. The association has no paid staff, but MMF has supported the association through in kind use of staff time and facilities.

#### **Current sources of funding**

NTA currently doesn't receive any direct funding and the Board has yet to set membership fee arrangements. There may be an implicit expectation that some of the funding provided by fishers to their local associations is passed to the NTA, though it is not happening yet. Members of the KTA

---

<sup>7</sup> NTA (2010). Rules of 'Nareau Tuna Boat Owners Association' 2010. 8pp.

pay an initial \$50 fee to join the association, although it doesn't appear that CTA or BTA members pay membership fees (many are fishers, as opposed to boat owners).

Yuh Yow may support the Chair of NTA attending the AGM of OPRT.

Up to half the potential boat owner members are not members of one of the local associations.

### **Governance and Policy Making Structures**

The NTA's Articles of Incorporation have been modelled off PITIA's, listing similar objectives and purposes. The powers of the association are vested in the Board, which comprises at a minimum a Chairman, Vice Chairman and Secretary/Treasurer. Policy priority setting is still in its early days, but is largely done through the local associations. Where common issues arise, the NTA brings the representatives from each association to a meeting.

The main operational priorities/opportunities appear to be:

- Gearing up to supply the Kiribati Fishing Co. (including associated training/equipment needs);
- Installation of more FADs
- Establishing bulk fuel arrangements for members to reduce cost
- Improving safety at sea (there were 51 incidents of 'castaways' in 2011, almost all of which were fishermen; 13 people are still missing)
- Construction/dredging of a small boat channel in the Causeway region, near the airport.

### **Key successes and challenges**

The NTA is still finding its feet as an association, but nevertheless already has some 'runs on the board'. In particular, the association has provided local boat owners with an effective voice in discussions with the KFC and has reportedly managed to widen the focus of the KFC from one purely focused on processing fish from (foreign) LL operations to one that will readily accept fish taken by local fishers that meet appropriate quality standards. NTA is also negotiating with the KFC about providing equipment and supplies (fishing gear, ice, etc) at competitive prices and also providing practical training in seafood quality.

As a young association, the main challenge is to establish robust organisational structures and get some early runs on the board to demonstrate to fishers and government the benefits and bona fides of the association. Ways and means of approaching these issues are discussed below. One challenge that needs to be negotiated is the balance between the benefits of receiving assistance from MMF in the start-up phase of the association, with the perception that the association is overly influenced by a foreign controlled company rather than existing to serve local fishers. Establishment of an independent funding stream and dedicated staff will help mitigate this perception.

### **Ways forward to enhance effectiveness**

A number of mechanisms to promote organisational effectiveness and enhance the contribution of local fishers to national development priorities were identified:

- **Need for a structured development dialogue** – currently there is little ongoing interaction between local fishers and key government agencies such as MFMRD. A more structured forum – for example monthly/bimonthly meetings between NTA and MFMRD (and perhaps other key groups such as the FTC and KFC) – would provide the opportunity for local fishers to discuss current issues in the industry and raise priority development constraints and opportunities with senior Government officials, and for Government officials to outline current activities, policies and opportunities directly with local fishers. A ‘coal-face’ understanding of the needs of local fishers will help better shape Government policy and programmes, and might also help influence Government discussions with development partners (e.g. by being able to build local fishers priorities into external aid programmes, etc). Importantly, the forum should be attended by senior representatives of both groups, capable of ‘getting things done’. Previous experience in the region has also shown that high levels of consultation with local fishers are required to avoid misconceptions about major fisheries developments, particularly where Government is a commercial partner.<sup>8</sup> Both NTA and MFMRD were receptive to the establishment of a structured forum in initial discussions.
- **Ensuring clarity around roles and relationships of the NTA and local associations** – Clarity is needed around the roles and function of the NTA versus local associations. This is particularly the case given the small space in which all associations operate. Clarity is needed to avoid duplication of work effort and to avoid potential tensions around who’s responsible for what. For example, local fishers currently pay membership fees to the KTA. What do they expect for these, as opposed to any money provided to the NTA? This requires discussion between the NTA and associations and may influence funding arrangements.
- **NTA membership arrangements** – Under both the NTA Articles of Incorporation and Rules, there is room for ambiguity about who is a member of the NTA. The Articles of Incorporation list the regular members as ‘commercial tuna boat owners’, while the Rules note that NTA’s members are the members of ‘the tuna boat associations from each established and regular tuna fishing sector in Tarawa’. While it is understood that the members of NTA are the members of the three local associations, it is important to formalise this, as well as ensuring clarity around which boat owners are recognised members of the local associations (e.g. through a register of members) for voting and policy making purposes and the like.
- **Setting out operational priorities** – in the early stages of the association it is important the NTA sets out its operational priorities. Why does it exist? What is it trying to achieve on behalf of fishers? A clear set of operational priorities together with an outline of how the association plans to achieve them is useful both as a ‘recruiting’ tool for potential members (‘here’s what the association is trying to achieve on your behalf’), as well as a clear outline of industry priorities for government (who may be able to help with resources to assist). Operational priorities should be developed in close consultation with boat owners.
- **Establish funding mechanism to allow for dedicated staff and operations** – Although the in kind use of MMF office and staff resources has been helpful in the development stages of the NTA, dedicated staff will likely be required to pursue the association’s objectives in the

---

<sup>8</sup> For example, local industry expressed concerns about a lack of transparency in the establishment and arrangements underpinning the Niue Fish Processors development in Niue.

longer term. Based on current costs, it appears that an association with a full time staff member could be run for around AUD\$30,000, broken down as follows:

Funding Component	Cost (AUD)
Executive Officer	\$10,000
Office and supplies	\$12,000
Travel	\$6,000
PITIA membership	\$1,000
Communications	\$1,000
Miscellaneous	\$2,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$32,000</b>

Mechanisms to support funding are discussed below.

### Possible future sources of funding

Possible sources of future funding for the NTA are discussed below:

Table 5: Assessment of NTA broad funding options against models identified through case studies

Funding model	Applicability
Membership fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most interviewees were not hopeful about the prospect of adequate membership fees being generated; some thought there was capacity to pay modest amounts (~\$20-50 annually)</li> </ul>
Membership fees + external funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MFMR indicated a willingness to consider applications under the UST PDF or EU FPA; some NTA member associations pay membership fees presently though the extent to which they would be willing to pass on funds is not clear</li> </ul>
External funds only	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MFMR indicated a willingness to consider applications under the UST PDF or EU FPA, however member funds may also be required to demonstrate industry commitment.</li> </ul>
Compulsory membership – statutory membership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial discussions with MFMR did not indicate support for a compulsory membership arrangement. The absence of licencing for vessels under 7m makes compulsory membership difficult.</li> </ul>
Compulsory membership – Licence fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most members of the NTA are not formally licensed</li> </ul>
Compulsory membership – compulsory levy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As above</li> </ul>
Voluntary levy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The establishment of the new joint venture Kiribati Fishing Co. provides the opportunity to establish an equitable levy if a substantial proportion of NTA members' product is supplied to the facility.</li> </ul>

A number of potential sources of funding and resources were identified during consultations and are worth exploration. These include:

- Establishment of a voluntary levy through the Kiribati Fishing Co.** – Local fishermen appear very keen to supply fish to the KFC, particularly larger YFT and BET that are difficult to sell on the local market. One method of collecting funds for the association would be to deduct a small fee from the price received by the fishermen and have this passed to the NTA (this method is used by Oceanwatch in NSW). Levies are a potentially equitable way of collecting funds, with larger fishermen who potentially benefit more from the association contributing a larger amount. Nevertheless, the fee could be capped if there was concern that larger operators were contributing disproportionately. A small levy deducted from fishermen's fees gets around the need to pay relatively large membership fees in a single payment upfront. Discussion would be required by the KFC on the administration of the scheme.

- **Membership fees** – Having either boat owners, or member associations, pay membership fees through normal subscriptions is a potential mechanism to generate internal funds, however might be difficult as a model to generate substantial funding. Only members of the KTA currently pay membership fees, and it is likely to be argued that these funds are needed by the local association (i.e. the NTA runs into the same ‘association of associations’ challenges faced by PITIA). Assuming around 80 potential boat owner members, a AUD\$50 annual fee would generate AUD\$4,000. Initial reaction from fishermen interviewed to paying membership fees was not promising.
- **Seeking Associate Members** – the NTA Articles of Incorporation provide for associate membership (non-voting) for non-boat owners with an interest in the industry – e.g. support businesses, MFMRD, outboard suppliers, boat builders etc. Some revenue could be generated by setting a fee for associate membership and encouraging participation in the NTA.
- **Seconding MFMRD staff for short term assistance** – MFMRD staff indicated that while they didn’t have any ‘spare’ staff, they would be happy to consider requests to help the association with short term assistance on initiatives that met both government and industry needs. MFMRD also noted they had a planning division that could assist in the preparation of grant proposals.
- **Application to MFMRD for funding under external programs** – MFMRD indicated they would be prepared to consider applications by NTA for funding under externally funded programs such as the UST PDF and EU FPA. Any applications would need to meet the objectives of the funding program.
- **Development fee on foreign licences** - Kiribati currently licences over 250 foreign LL vessels and around 190 purse seiners. One option would be to apply a small fee on licences to fund promote domestic development initiatives and fund the association. A similar principle underpins the PDF under the UST. Assuming around 350 licenced vessels, a fee of AUD\$100 would be sufficient to cover the annual operating costs of NTA. This option would require strong support from Government.

## 4. General Recommendations

### Selling the benefits of membership

As a general rule, there is scope to improve Pacific fishing industry associations’ capacity at selling their successes and the benefits of membership. A number of the association executives interviewed struggled to nominate the major successes of the association, and it is noteworthy that many of the Heads of Fisheries interviewed indicated the national fishing industry association was not a major influence on agency thinking (one asked in earnest “do they still exist?”). In an environment of voluntary membership, bringing in new members to the association undoubtedly requires an element of ‘salesmanship’ and it is critical executives be able to confidently answer the question “why should I become a member?”. Selling the benefits is a mix of highlighting past successes (i.e. we have the runs on the board) and laying out a plan of future direction (i.e. here’s what we are going to do for you in the next membership year). This can be helped by the preparation of concise summaries of past achievements (which can be supplied to potential

members), as well as credible, professional future planning documents which have broad industry support and input (e.g. annual operational plan, 5yr strategic plan).

### **Independent directors**

Consideration should be given to including independent directors on association boards, where they can add complementary skills and expertise. This approach is often used by commercial companies to add skills that are unavailable in the management team or general membership/shareholding. In the context of Pacific fishing associations, relevant skills might be accounting, association governance, strategic planning, fund raising, influencing government processes, policy or scientific. In particular, adding directors with proven commercial/accounting skills may assist both the internal financial sustainability of the association, as well as making it a more attractive grant recipient for external donors. Depending on the time commitments and technical inputs required, independent directors may require a modest fee.

### **Tailor operational plans around initiatives that can be externally funded**

In structuring annual operational plans or priorities, consideration should be given to tailoring outputs around discrete initiatives that might be attractive to external funders. In many cases, this won't mean changing existing policies and priorities, but simply reshaping them in a way that is a fundable project.

### **Good governance is critical to attracting external funding**

Many associations are likely to rely to a significant extent on external funding sources to deliver on member priorities for at least the foreseeable future. In order to provide potential external donors confidence in the association's ability to manage and account for grant monies, good governance is critical. In this context good governance includes, but is not limited to, transparent financial systems and financial reporting, clear executive accountabilities and the ability to report effectively on project outputs. Good governance is obviously also central in attracting and maintaining industry members.

### **Training for Association Executives/Directors**

Effective running of a fishing industry association requires a range of disparate skills that are not easily transferable in full from other professions. Many association executives and directors either come from non-fishing backgrounds, or are drawn directly from the catching sector itself. The pool of experienced fishing association executives available to run Pacific fishing associations is limited, and many would be outside of available price range for many associations. With that in mind, there is a strong case for the development and funding of a specific course dedicated to development of fishing industry association leaders in the Pacific. Course material should cover the full range of skills required to run an effective association and include: fisheries policy development, strategic and operational planning, association governance, financial management, influencing government and multi-lateral processes, grant preparation and media training. Similar courses are run in Australia at both the higher and junior executive level arguably with effective results. Executives would also likely benefit from ongoing mentoring by experienced industry association representatives, where available.

## **Websites**

Websites are efficient and cost effective means for fishing industry associations to establish an international presence (particularly in the case of PITIA), communicate with members (where they have access to internet) and promote important policy issues and national investment opportunities to both Government and stakeholders. In the digital age, websites can often also be the first port of call for prospective commercial partners looking for opportunities supply or investment opportunities (and can also provide a tangible benefit to members by advertising their business internationally through dedicated member webpages, links to members websites etc). At present, few national associations have effective websites which summarise who the association is, what it hopes to achieve, who its members are, what its policies and key concerns are, and the like. Websites can be developed relatively cost effectively – in the order of < US\$1500 – for a simple ‘self-maintainable’ site, with small ongoing costs for hosting and domain registration. With that in mind, there is a strong case to strengthen fishing associations’ web presence. Hosting could be done through a single regional site – for example, one hosted by PITIA, with individual member pages – or by national associations where they had sufficient funding and critical mass (e.g. PNG FIA) to warrant one. Useful examples of fishing industry association websites include: <http://www.qsia.com.au/>; <http://www.wafic.com.au/>; <http://www.aboutseafood.com/about/about-nfi>; <http://comfish.com.au/>.

## Annex 1: Terms of Reference



ANNEX II

### TERMS OF REFERENCE

*"Request for Proposal (RFP)" – SPC/FAME/RFP 11/09*

#### *Consultancy study on financial and organisational sustainability options for the Pacific Island Tuna Industry Association (PITIA) and National Fishing Industry Associations*

**Project Title: Assessment and identification of strategies to enhance PITIA and National Fisheries Associations long-term viability and impact on sustainable national fisheries development**

#### **Background**

The EU funded DevFish2 project is jointly implemented between Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) and Secretariat of Pacific Community (SPC) and is focused to reduce constraints to domestic tuna industry development. The direct targeted beneficiaries of the DevFish2 project are the Pacific ACP countries comprising Cook Islands, Fiji, FSM, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, Palau, PNG, RMI, Solomon Islands, Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. The project also includes Timor Leste.

DevFish2 project is undertaking a study to assess and identify strategies which would enhance fisheries Associations long-term viability in terms of financial and administrative sustainability so they have impact on national fisheries management and development. The assessment will case study established and active national fisheries associations within selected member countries and the Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITIA).

National fisheries associations, comprising private sector fishing operators and artisanal level fishermen entities, have the potential to play an important role in the sustainable commercial development of the region's fisheries resources. P-ACP countries and Timor Leste are increasingly looking to involve the private sector as a key stakeholder in consultative processes to create competitive domestic business environments. Ensuring that private sector interests have strong, unified representative associations at this level, improves the likelihood that their concerns will be addressed in the form of supportive government policies and activities. Associations also provide fishing operations and fishermen with an improved platform from which to access external resources to address common problems such as training and financing.

Ensuring that the associations have active and effective capacity to service its objectives determines if these categories of stakeholders are properly organized and functional. Although, the importance of national fishing industry associations in representing the views and interests of their members is recognized in many countries in the region, most rely on the voluntary services of their members and standard membership dues to operate the associations.

In the first phase (DevFish1) project initiated trial activity by providing funding support for association officer positions for a start-up period. The objective was that supporting associations in this manner would assist in building association capacity to service its functions and programs on a full time basis. This included identifying and securing alternate funding strategies for associations' operational and development purposes. There were mixed outcomes from these trial cases.

4

SPC Headquarters: Noumea, New Caledonia. Regional offices: Suva, Fiji Islands, and Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia.  
Country office: Honiara, Solomon Islands.

For contact details – Website: [www.spc.int](http://www.spc.int) Email: [spc@spc.int](mailto:spc@spc.int)



In a recent consultative meeting with DevFish 2 project personnel, representatives of National Fishing Industry Associations and the Pacific Island Tuna Industry Association (PITIA) identified a priority concern as being to address the challenges of sustainability within both PITIA and in national associations. In support of this the DevFish2 project is commissioning a consultancy study to address these questions for both PITIA and National Associations.

### **Objective**

The consultancy study will review funding and organisational arrangements adopted by Fishers Representative Associations in a range of developed and developing countries and situations. It will then undertake an assessment of the options and possible constraints of applying the reviewed funding and organisational models to PITIA and to selected National Associations as case studies. In doing so, the study will provide guiding recommendations as to what strategies may be appropriate and suited for application in the operational context of PITIA and the National Associations.

### **Field Work and Research**

The study will undertake a comprehensive assessment of practicable and accessible funding options and strategies in place in established Associations in both developed and developing country situations. This will require selected country visits, literature and desktop study and correspondence with stakeholders.

It is envisaged that the study will require consultation with identified association(s) contacts in Australia and New Zealand and country visits to three Pacific Island Countries (Papua New Guinea, Kiribati and Tonga) where the operational status of each association will be reviewed and the potential application of funding and operational models considered. In each country, the study will confer with the respective association executives, association members, Fisheries department and other relevant stakeholders (potentially including Government and donors) that are or could be part of the Association support network.

### **Tasks**

- a) Following initial desktop research and planning which will ideally include consideration of Association models from outside the region and a review of relevant literature, the Consultant will undertake email and telephone interviews with selected Association representatives in Australia and New Zealand in order to comprehensively document funding and operational models and organizational status in terms of purpose, function, roles, key relationships, work plans, economic viability and operational constraints. These should include consultation with key Association stakeholders.
- b) The Consultant will then be expected to analyze the operational and funding models of the Associations under consideration in the context of their potential application to PITIA and to Pacific Island National Fisheries Associations. It is proposed that this analysis will provide a range of possible funding and sustainability options which might then be considered for application in the Pacific Island context.
- c) The Consultant will commence the in-country visits with consultation with the PITIA Secretariat and Directorate in Tonga (and by correspondence). Consultation will include a summary of study findings to date and then focus on the current PITIA operational model, work program and



function. Consideration will then be given to the potential application of sustainable operational models and consideration of constraints to their application and how these might be overcome. Consultations with PITIA will also include discussion of the current role of PITIA in supporting and liaising with National Associations.

d) In Tonga, the Consultant will also undertake a case study of the Fishing Industry Association of Tonga (FIAT) documenting its purpose, function, roles, key relationships, work plan and operational constraints, particularly in regard to funding and operational structure. Account should be given of particular successes or shortcomings noted by FIAT and specific documentation as to how successes were achieved and how shortcomings occurred. Specific consideration will be given to historical funding arrangements and any associated constraints. The Consultant will be expected to meet with all possible relevant stakeholders including FIAT members, other private sector groups or associations (such as the Chamber of Commerce) as well as Ministry of Fisheries and other Government stakeholders. Consideration will then be given to the application of the potential sustainability models identified in the study to the FIAT context. Such consideration should include realistic appraisal of the potential constraints associated with implementation of the sustainability models and summation of the options with the greatest potential application to the FIAT operational context. In considering constraints, particular attention should be given to lessons learned to date and the potential impact of external factors outside of the control of the organization. In considering application, discussion should include options for complimentary strategies such as business planning, consultation and networking policies and procedures and transparency factors.

e) The Consultant will then make subsequent visits to Papua New Guinea and Kiribati to undertake consultation with the respective national associations as per the process outlined in item (d) above.

### Reporting

The study is primarily focused on the identification of practical solutions and strategies for Association sustainability, both in the regional context (PITIA) and in the different circumstances facing each National Association.

As such, the study will produce a report which:

- 1) Clearly documents funding and sustainability practices and strategies in the Associations considered in (a) above, with particular attention to the operation circumstance of the Association which assist in ensuring organizational sustainability.
- 2) Provides analysis of the identified sustainability practices and strategies in the context of how they might potentially be applied to the operation of PITIA and the National Associations.
- 3) Gives detailed analysis of the operational context of the 3 National Associations considered in the study (Tonga, Papua New Guinea, Kiribati) and additional analysis of the potential application of possible sustainability strategies to the organization concerned taking account of the organizational context.
- 4) Provide recommendations to PITIA and the selected National Associations as to strategic steps and processes that may be taken towards organizational sustainability and give consideration to strategies that may be applied to assist in overcoming developmental constraints.

- 5) The report will be provided in MS word format and not be more than 20 pages. Additional support documents should be provided as annexes to the report.

## **Annex 2: Australia/New Zealand Fishing Association Case Studies**

## Queensland Seafood Industry Association

Component	Indicators	Details
<b>Organisation</b>	Name	Queensland Seafood Industry Assoc.
<b>Organisation Structure</b>	Incorporated assoc.? Company? For profit/not-for-profit? Association of associations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Incorporated association, not for profit</li> <li>– Some thought of moving to a company limited by guarantee with a purely expertise based Board – fishers will access industry representation through new councils (see below) – QSIA will provide representation on cross-sectoral issues – also provides legal authority to manage a promotion levy on behalf of the industry if one eventually constituted</li> </ul>
<b>Main purpose, aims/objectives</b>	What are the main objectives/functions of the association?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The QSIA is the seafood industry peak body representing Queensland wild caught fishermen and post-harvest operators. These include licensed commercial fishermen, wholesale and retail merchants along with allied industries that make up the wider seafood sector.</li> </ul>
<b>Established</b>	Year established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Association has a long history – established as the Queensland Professional Fishermen’s League in mid-1900s; became a compulsory membership association called the Queensland Commercial Fishermen’s Organisation in the 1970s (?), then changed name to Queensland Seafood Industry Association around time of change from compulsory to voluntary membership in 2003-4.</li> </ul>
<b>Staff</b>	Number (and roles)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 2 FTEs;</li> <li>– 2-3 part time</li> </ul>
<b>Level of funding (annual)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;US\$100,000</li> <li>• \$100k - \$500k</li> <li>• \$500k - \$1m</li> <li>• &gt;1m</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Around \$350k (see sources below)</li> <li>– Annual - \$125k +GST/yr –;</li> <li>– Will be commencing negotiation on new arrangement</li> <li>– New arrangement will be fee-for-service for consultation</li> </ul>
<b>Funding arrangements</b>	By what arrangements does the organisation receive funds?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Voluntary membership subscriptions – \$118k in 2011 (continues to decline)</li> <li>– Grant from Fisheries Queensland - \$125k annually (expires 30<sup>th</sup> June 2012). Will be commencing renegotiation of grant arrangements shortly. The current arrangement is largely open ended in terms of representative services. The new arrangement will be based on a fee-for-service – i.e. QSIA will undertake consultation services with industry on behalf of Government in return for a fee.</li> <li>– Externally funded projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– GBRMPA Climate Change funding – \$65K</li> <li>– DAFF Climate Change – short project (\$unknown)</li> <li>– East Coast Trawl project – short project (\$unknown)</li> <li>– Skills strategy project – State Dept of Education and Training – 2yr grant (\$unknown)</li> <li>– Native Title – were getting \$75K from Commonwealth AG’s, but recently discontinued</li> </ul> </li> <li>– Staff secondments – Fisheries Queensland currently supplying Line Fishery Project Officer to support the development of a line fishery strategy – 4 month secondment – finishes shortly – very worthwhile</li> </ul>

		exercise– great conduit between industry and govt
<b>Members</b>	Number	– 400-500 (mostly licensed fishers)
<b>Membership structure</b>	Catching sector only? Post-harvest? Types/levels of membership?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– All sectors – fishers, processors, marketers, allied industry (though core membership is still catching sector)</li> <li>– Have previously operated a system of member branches along the coast, with associated committees for each of the 4 main fisheries (trawl, net, line, crab) – very effective structure but difficult to service without substantial funding</li> <li>– In process of establishing new fisheries councils – will be Incorp assoc in their own right – will replace branches – three councils will be established - trawl, inshore (net/crab) and line</li> <li>– QSIA will leave fishery-specific issues to the councils and focus exclusively on cross-sectoral issues – policy and legislation, MPAs, labour, ports, etc</li> <li>– 1<sup>st</sup> cab off rank is inshore council</li> <li>– Line council also in progress</li> </ul>
<b>Voting rights</b>	What are the voting arrangements on policy/governance matters?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– One member, one vote</li> <li>– Fishery committee structure largely diminished in past 6 months as councils being established</li> </ul>
<b>Membership coverage</b>	What proportion of the potential members are members of the assoc.? If high, why? If low, why?	– Approx. 22% - (500 members out of a total of 2250 licence holders in Queensland; this doesn't count support businesses and marketers who are also potential members)
<b>Governance structure</b>	What arrangements/structures oversee the assoc.'s effectiveness? Board? How elected/appointed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The QSIA Board is charged by the AGM with doing its business out of session. The Board has statutory responsibility of the legal and financial obligations of the Association. The Board comprises: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– the President</li> <li>– the Treasurer</li> <li>– Fisheries Directors</li> <li>– Directors for marketing, retail, training and promotion, business development and RD&amp;E</li> </ul> </li> <li>– This representative composition ensures that the Board provides expertise and direction on behalf of the broader membership on all issues of interest to the seafood industry. The Board meets a minimum of four times per year.</li> <li>– The President of the Association is elected from its membership serving a two year term. The President chairs the Annual General Meeting and is an ex-officio member of each of the Industry Councils.</li> <li>– Under direction of the then Fisheries Minister expanded Board to incorporate non-catching sector people in 2009</li> </ul>

<b>Policy making structures</b>	How are policies made? Organisational priorities set? How are members consulted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– See Council discussions</li> </ul>
<b>Mechanisms to deal with ‘free riders’</b>	Does the association have measures in place to deal with ‘free riders’?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– None – used to have compulsory membership, but no more</li> <li>– Strictly speaking under grant agreement with Govt, they had to consult with all stakeholders – which they did</li> <li>– Will be similar under a service agreement</li> </ul>
<b>Influencing Policy, Business Environment</b>	How does the association influence Govt policy and the general business environment surrounding the industry?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Recognition as the peak body for fisheries sector in Queensland</li> <li>– Integration into all relevant Government decision making processes/advisory structure</li> <li>– Very well positioned as the ‘first port of call’ on fisheries issues in Queensland – reputation/position built up over several decades</li> </ul>
<b>Organisational successes</b>	List some of the main successes of the assoc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Significant input into shaping management plans for key fisheries – e.g. East Coast Trawl Plan; Coral Reef Fin Fish Fishery</li> <li>– Significant input into shaping outcomes of marine park planning processes with potential to impact on industry – e.g. reduced impact of GBRMP rezoning by approx. ½ and secured over \$200m in structural adjustment funding; similar input/outcome under Moreton Bay Marine Park</li> <li>– Successfully negotiated with incoming State Govt for a \$10m for net licence buyout – good win – negotiated with WWF and Sunfish</li> <li>– Influenced Commonwealth marine planning processes to avoid closures to fishing in the Fraser Island area</li> <li>– Planned organisational restructure may be seen as a key success in 10yrs time</li> <li>– Cyclone Yasi responses – securing disaster relief funding for fishers in the wake of Cyclone Yasi</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	What are some of the main reasons effective fishing industry assoc. are effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Recognition as the peak body</li> <li>– Professionalism/commitment of staff</li> <li>– Organisation is ‘always there’ – a constant voice on behalf of industry</li> <li>– Good communication structure – effective conduit for communication between govt and industry</li> <li>– Established a hard won reputation for professionalism – will provide support for good government policies (including those that involve short term pain for fishers where longer term benefits will result), but can ‘hit hard’ against bad Govt policy</li> <li>– Member of national assoc body network (previously ASIC, but more recently National Seafood Industry Alliance) – plugged into, and can influence, national issues</li> </ul>
<b>Constraints</b>	What are the main constraints to being more effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Funding/resources – executive staff needs to spend considerable amount of time chasing funding from members/potential members; diverts resources/focus from core objectives</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Lack of market based collected levy to promote industry – must be addressed – most other sectors in Australia have one</li></ul>
<b>Other comments</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-</li></ul>

## Northern Prawn Fishing Industry Pty Ltd.

Component	Indicators	Details
<b>Organisation</b>	Name	NPF Industry Pty Ltd
<b>Organisation Structure</b>	Incorporated assoc.? Company? For profit/not-for-profit? Association of associations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Company (ASIC)</li> <li>– Shareholding based on gear SFRs</li> </ul>
<b>Main purpose, aims/objectives</b>	What are the main objectives/functions of the association?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Further interests of shareholders</li> <li>– Biologically, ecologically sustainable and profitable industry</li> <li>– Never really had much time to get into strategic planning; Assoc. largely deals with external management issues and intra-industry issues</li> <li>– Even more so since co-management – more things being dealt with directly with NPFI, rather than going through MAC process</li> </ul>
<b>Established</b>	Year established	– 2007 (previously five separate assoc's/groups – loose non-incorporated assoc. called NPF Industry Organisations)
<b>Staff</b>	Number (and roles)	– 1 FT exec officer; 1 PT contractor (need two more people)
<b>Level of funding (annual)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;US\$100,000</li> <li>• \$100k - \$500k</li> <li>• \$500k - \$1m</li> <li>• &gt;1m</li> </ul>	– AUD\$300-350k total
<b>Funding arrangements</b>	By what arrangements does the organisation receive funds?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 70k from memberships;</li> <li>– 75k from AFMA levies;</li> <li>– variable amounts through external project funding (e.g. FRDC)</li> <li>– 100k for promotion levies (contributed directly by members)</li> </ul>
<b>Members</b>	Number	– 19 entities (companies, individuals, etc)
<b>Membership structure</b>	Catching sector only? Post-harvest? Types/levels of membership?	– Reason for association's being is the catching sector, however many businesses also vertically integrated catching/processing/marketing/exporting
<b>Voting rights</b>	What are the voting arrangements on policy/governance matters?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Voting based on SFR holdings (shares)</li> <li>– Try to get consensus, but sometimes comes to a vote</li> </ul>
<b>Membership coverage</b>	What proportion of the potential members are members of the assoc.? If high, why? If low, why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 85% of SFRs are covered by membership</li> <li>– Some antipathy still amongst some isolated individuals (some own licenses but lease them out – not active participants)</li> </ul>

<b>Governance structure</b>	What arrangements/structures oversee the assoc.'s effectiveness? Board? How elected/appointed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Board of directors</li> <li>– Chair – Ron Earl</li> <li>– CEO – Annie Jarrett</li> <li>– Directors (5) (70% of SFR holdings represented)</li> <li>– Annual election (in theory)</li> </ul>
<b>Policy making structures</b>	How are policies made? Organisational priorities set? How are members consulted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– CEO</li> <li>– Board</li> <li>– More reactive than proactive – out of necessity</li> </ul>
<b>Mechanisms to deal with 'free riders'</b>	Does the association have measures in place to deal with 'free riders'?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Not much can be done – co-management agreement with AFMA says consult with everyone</li> <li>– Voluntary banana prawn promos – free riders get benefit</li> <li>– Haven't been a problem so far and have majority anyway – will only be a problem if they are working against the organisation</li> </ul>
<b>Influencing Policy, Business Environment</b>	How does the association influence Govt policy and the general business environment surrounding the industry?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Sit on MAC</li> <li>– Members of Commonwealth Fisheries Association</li> <li>– Meet with relevant Departments</li> <li>– Work with relevant politicians on both sides</li> <li>– Good relations with AFMA; co-management</li> <li>– Haven't gotten into public 'rock throwing' – try to work through issues</li> </ul>
<b>Organisational successes</b>	List some of the main successes of the assoc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Co-management arrangements with AFMA- implemented through contract</li> <li>– Industry proactive on ecosystem issues – widely regarded as one of the best managed tropical prawn fisheries internationally</li> <li>– Industry funded adjustment</li> <li>– Always been on front foot in addressing major issues (tiger prawn stock depletion, ecosystem)</li> <li>– Voluntary promotion - \$100k pa industry funded – domestic marketplace – put NPF banana prawns on map</li> <li>– Kept most people in the tent – solidarity important</li> <li>– Retained good staff</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	What are some of the main reasons effective fishing industry assoc. are effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Good professional industry; good committed staff</li> <li>– Proactive on major issues</li> </ul>
<b>Constraints</b>	What are the main constraints to being more effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Funding and resources</li> <li>– Influenced by external factors – e.g. AFMA cost recovery influences capacity to pay NPFI</li> <li>– Could be doing more in co-management space – e.g. keen to take over scientific observer programs</li> <li>– Occasionally difficult relationship with AFMA on some issues</li> </ul>
<b>Other comments</b>		

## Commonwealth Fisheries Association

Component	Indicators	Details
<b>Organisation</b>	Name	Commonwealth Fisheries Assoc
<b>Organisation Structure</b>	Incorporated assoc.? Company? For profit/not-for-profit? Association of associations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incorp assoc. (Tasmania)</li> <li>- Not for profit</li> <li>- No tax advantages from not-for-profit status</li> </ul>
<b>Main purpose, aims/objectives</b>	What are the main objectives/functions of the association?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See website (comfish.com.au)</li> <li>- Enhance profitability, sustainability of commonwealth fisheries; foster pride in the industry</li> </ul>
<b>Established</b>	Year established	- 2003
<b>Staff</b>	Number (and roles)	- 1 FT CEO; 1 PT secretary/treasurer (2 days/wk)
<b>Level of funding (annual)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;US\$100,000</li> <li>• \$100k - \$500k</li> <li>• \$500k - \$1m</li> <li>• &gt;1m</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- \$250k – internal voluntarily provided</li> <li>- Some project based funding</li> </ul>
<b>Funding arrangements</b>	By what arrangements does the organisation receive funds?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Funding voluntarily provided by members</li> <li>- Industry associations – fee based on GVP – large, medium, small (5k – 1.5k)</li> <li>- Individual members - \$500/yr</li> <li>- Corporations - \$20k/yr</li> <li>- Also some project funding – e.g. MPA work – essentially a recovery of costs rather than providing any ability to use those funds for other purposes</li> <li>- \$30k pa for liaison from AFMA</li> </ul>
<b>Members</b>	Number	- 19 separate member entities in total - 8 member associations (e.g. SETFIA, NPFI, etc); 5 corporate members (Austral, Raptis, ABSTIA); also individuals from fishers without assoc.
<b>Membership structure</b>	Catching sector only? Post-harvest? Types/levels of membership?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See above</li> <li>- Mainly catching, but most corporates and other members are vertically integrated</li> </ul>
<b>Voting rights</b>	What are the voting arrangements on policy/governance matters?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One man, one vote</li> <li>- Hasn't been a problem that an assoc. has the same voting rights as an individual member</li> <li>- Try to get consensus on most issues</li> </ul>
<b>Membership coverage</b>	What proportion of the potential members are members of the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- -95% of Commonwealth fisheries production</li> <li>- CFA has strong industry assoc. members - strong because well-funded and industry restructured already</li> </ul>

	assoc.? If high, why? If low, why?	– economically and environmentally sustainable
<b>Governance structure</b>	What arrangements/structures oversee the assoc.'s effectiveness? Board? How elected/appointed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Board – annually elected, except CEO</li> <li>- Min of 3 members plus Chair and CEO</li> <li>- All volunteers</li> <li>- Standard AGM election process</li> <li>- Possibly an error to elect Chair annually – should be elected every 2 yrs</li> </ul>
<b>Policy making structures</b>	How are policies made? Organisational priorities set? How are members consulted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Executive (Board) sets priorities</li> <li>- Have strategic planning session – set vision, mission, goals etc</li> <li>- Regular executive phone hook ups</li> <li>- 2 face to face general meetings per year</li> </ul>
<b>Mechanisms to deal with 'free riders'</b>	Does the association have measures in place to deal with 'free riders'?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Have accepted that there will always be free riders – no measures to deal with</li> <li>- Actively encourage non-members to join</li> <li>- Can spend plenty of time chasing – not worth designing elaborate mechanisms to deal with free riders</li> <li>- Have 95% anyway</li> </ul>
<b>Influencing Policy, Business Environment</b>	How does the association influence Govt policy and the general business environment surrounding the industry?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regular meetings with Govt- every 4-6 weeks with main Depts</li> <li>- CEO in Canberra – close proximity to decision makers</li> <li>- Regular contact with Ministers/offices</li> <li>- Sit on multiple advisory bodies; (e.g. AFMA, MPA work, FRDC, etc)</li> <li>- Recognition as the peak body for Commonwealth fisheries</li> </ul>
<b>Organisational successes</b>	List some of the main successes of the assoc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Carbon tax – ensuring industry was exempted</li> <li>- 457 immigration labour agreements – set up to allow industry to address labour shortages</li> <li>- General influence on policy direction – e.g. harvest strategy policy</li> <li>- MPAs – adjustment policy, boundaries</li> <li>- Promoting the fact that there is a Commonwealth industry</li> <li>- Harvest strategy policy; influence on \$220m structural adjustment package</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	What are some of the main reasons effective fishing industry assoc. are effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See other comments below – stable sources of funding; integrated into Govt processes; maintain credibility; recognition as peak body; professionalism; committed individuals</li> </ul>
<b>Constraints</b>	What are the main constraints to being more effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Funding – security of funds; level of funds – both are an issue</li> </ul>
<b>Other comments</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- member industry assoc. are strong because they have stable funding – stability is critical – can employ people and be confident you can pay them</li> <li>- the ones that work best are the ones that have a compulsory funding base – can do a broader spectrum of things – promotion, better coordination with government</li> </ul>

## Oceanwatch Australia

Component	Indicators	Details
<b>Organisation</b>	Name	Oceanwatch
<b>Organisation Structure</b>	Incorporated assoc.? Company? For profit/not-for-profit? Association of associations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Company limited by guarantee (PTY LTD)</li> <li>– Also on register of environmental organisations, gives tax deductibility (like a charity)</li> <li>– Not-for-profit</li> </ul>
<b>Main purpose, aims/objectives</b>	What are the main objectives/functions of the association?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Main objectives are environmental</li> <li>– Not really a management lobby group; advocate on behalf of the environment, with a particular focus on fisheries issues</li> <li>– Not a peak body</li> </ul>
<b>Established</b>	Year established	– 1989
<b>Staff</b>	Number (and roles)	– 17 full-time (8 Seanet extension officers; 1 FT exec officer, 1 FT accounts; 1 FT admin; 1 EMS; 1 exec chair; 1 project manager - land based NRM; 1 Seafood Industry partnerships in schools; 2 Tide to Table)
<b>Level of funding (annual)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt;US\$100,000</li> <li>• \$100k - \$500k</li> <li>• \$500k - \$1m</li> <li>• &gt;1m</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– \$1.8m in total</li> <li>– 3% of funding from levy; 97% through external projects</li> </ul>
<b>Funding arrangements</b>	By what arrangements does the organisation receive funds?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Funded through levy on plastic crates going through SFM - 5c by fishers, 5c by SFM and 5c by buyer</li> <li>– Raised \$120k in 1989; now about \$60k because of changes to market circumstances (more foam boxes; more activity outside of market)</li> <li>– Some shortcomings – e.g. never thought of capturing other means of product</li> <li>– Need to adjust for changes in market and costs etc</li> <li>– Never tried to increase level; concerned that industry would scrap levy all together</li> <li>– Levy is useful to demonstrate industry willingness to be engaged on environmental issues</li> <li>– Other 97% through project based funding – competitive funding rounds – outside sphere of core fishing industry funding (little work for FRDC but mainly outside) – i.e. most funding through general Government NRM style funding rounds.</li> <li>– Caring for Country; NSW Catchment Management Authority</li> <li>– Seanet</li> </ul>
<b>Members</b>	Number	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 3 members; Sydney Fish Market, Masters Fish Merchants, NSW Fish Co-ops Assoc.</li> <li>– Together with Oceanwatch, these three form NSW Seafood Industry Council (peak body)</li> <li>– Major supporter is SFM; without SFM others wouldn't support.</li> </ul>
<b>Membership</b>	Catching sector only? Post-	– See above

<b>structure</b>	harvest? Types/levels of membership?	
<b>Voting rights</b>	What are the voting arrangements on policy/governance matters?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Only thing to vote on is to accept auditor’s report</li> <li>– Otherwise, members are quite hands off</li> </ul>
<b>Membership coverage</b>	What proportion of the potential members are members of the assoc.? If high, why? If low, why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– NA</li> </ul>
<b>Governance structure</b>	What arrangements/structures oversee the assoc.’s effectiveness? Board? How elected/appointed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Skills based board; convention that each of the members put forward one director;</li> <li>– Board composition is: 3 member directors + exec chair+ Peter Dundas-Smith (management/industry politics) + indigenous rep + PR person + Tim Mirabella (fisher) + Felicity Horn (WAFIC) + Dave Pollard (research – just resigned – will replace with another research person)</li> <li>– At AGM list of names put forward for members to endorse;</li> <li>– Constitution allows for directors to be replaced outside of the AGM if they resign.</li> <li>– Directors re-confirmed each AGM – ie Directorships are annual</li> </ul>
<b>Policy making structures</b>	How are policies made? Organisational priorities set? How are members consulted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Operate through strategic plan, endorsed by board; members hands off.</li> <li>– Vision, strategies, performance indicators, achievements – almost a prospectus on Oceanwatch</li> <li>–</li> </ul>
<b>Mechanisms to deal with ‘free riders’</b>	Does the association have measures in place to deal with ‘free riders’?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Levy through the fish market – authority unclear</li> <li>– Regulatory requirements often critical; need some form of compulsion; otherwise no ‘magic bullets’</li> </ul>
<b>Influencing Policy, Business Environment</b>	How does the association influence Govt policy and the general business environment surrounding the industry?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Historically lobbying of Govts a bigger part of org than it is now; somewhat constrained by Govt funding</li> <li>– Sit on whole swag of committees</li> <li>– Prepare submissions</li> <li>– Becoming more difficult to engage in general govt policy processes; need to find money from other sources because of minimal internal funding</li> <li>–</li> </ul>
<b>Organisational successes</b>	List some of the main successes of the assoc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– See strategic plan</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	What are some of the main reasons effective fishing industry assoc. are effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Engaged educated experienced staff</li> <li>– Strategic awareness amongst staff – all know what company strategy is and their role in achieving</li> <li>– Close engagement amongst staff; all staff are true believers</li> <li>– Autonomy for staff; choose your own adventure (as long as aligns with start plan); if have a particularly interest pursue it.</li> </ul>

<b>Constraints</b>	What are the main constraints to being more effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Under current configuration, can't see how they could be more effective – all staff are 'true believers'</li><li>- All are committed to the cause – prepared to work for less money</li><li>- Apart from that, more money; although if had fully funded program would still be chasing money to expand it.</li></ul>
<b>Other comments</b>		

## New Zealand Seafood Industry Council (SeaFIC)

Component	Indicators	Details
<b>Organisation</b>	Name	<b>New Zealand Seafood Industry Council (SeaFIC)</b>
<b>Organisation Structure</b>	Incorporated assoc.? Company? For profit/not-for-profit? Association of associations?	Company, a standard private company under the Companies Act 1993. (“not-for-profit” has a very tight legal definition in New Zealand that would not apply to SeaFIC). However, SeaFIC does not collect more funds in levies than it requires to cover agreed expenditure.
<b>Main purpose, aims/objectives</b>	What are the main objectives/functions of the organisation?	To promote the generic interests of stakeholders in the New Zealand seafood sector including both wild capture and aquaculture sub-sectors. The defence of property rights , representation to government, communications and public relations, provision of technical and policy advice to stakeholders.
<b>Established</b>	Year established	1997
<b>Staff</b>	Number (and roles)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 13.5 FTEs. Chief Executive,</li> <li>• Administration (3)</li> <li>• Policy (1.5 including 0.5 contract position)</li> <li>• Science (3)</li> <li>• Communications (3)</li> <li>• Trade Access (1)</li> <li>• Food Safety (1)</li> </ul>
<b>Level of funding (annual)</b>	• >1m	\$NZ 3million per annum
<b>Funding arrangements</b>	By what arrangements does the organisation receive funds?	A Commodity Levy under the Commodity Levies Act 1990
<b>Members</b>	Number	22 shareholders , being fishery stakeholder organisations such as RLIC. These organisations represent around 1,500 quota owners and 400 marine farmers.
<b>Membership structure</b>	Catching sector only? Post-harvest? Types/levels of membership?	SeaFIC shareholders are also organised into sub-sectoral organisations (see figure 1 below)
<b>Voting rights</b>	What are the voting arrangements on policy/governance matters?	Shareholders voting rights are proportional to their general SeaFIC levy payments for a given year
<b>Membership coverage</b>	What proportion of the potential members are members of the assoc.? If high, why? If low, why?	There are some fisheries that are not represented in the shareholding structure of SeaFIC. This includes some small shellfish fisheries and the tuna fisheries. These account for approximately 5% of stakeholders in the New Zealand seafood industry
<b>Governance</b>	What arrangements/structures	SeaFIC has a Board of 8 Directors, elected on a 3 yearly cycle. Governance is reinforced by the standard

<b>structure</b>	oversee the assoc.'s effectiveness? Board? How elected/appointed?	provisions of the Companies Act 1993 which requires full disclosure to shareholders. SeaFIC is also subject to independent financial audit
<b>Policy making structures</b>	How are policies made? Organisational priorities set? How are members consulted?	Ultimately the Board is entitled to determine policy but the annual SeaFIC business plan is consulted on prior to levy setting. SeaFIC also consults widely with stakeholders prior to making significant submissions to Government. The Policy Council (a stakeholder consultative forum open to all convenes 4x per annum). The Policy Council has no binding authority over the Board who are only required to note recommendations from that forum.
<b>Mechanisms to deal with 'free riders'</b>	Does the association have measures in place to deal with 'free riders'?	The Commodity Levy Act requires SeaFIC to renew the general levy order every 5 years by achieving majority support (by both number of levy payers and by levy value) for the continuation of the levy. Within the 5 year order, SeaFIC is obliged to consult on both the annual business plan and the matching annual levy. Approval of the plan and the levy in any year is the responsibility of the SeaFIC Board.  Second tier or stock specific levies (collected on behalf of shareholders by SeaFIC must be able to demonstrate that 2/3 of levy payers participated in processes to approve the levy and 2/3 of those participants supported the levy (i.e. the approval threshold is 2/3 x 2/3).
<b>Influencing Policy, Business Environment</b>	How does the association influence Govt policy and the general business environment surrounding the industry?	The Ministry of Fisheries is required to consult with 'affected parties' which normally includes SeaFIC. SeaFIC employees engage directly with officials on technical matters, such as within stock assessment working groups and on the development of regulations. The SeaFIC chief executive engages with senior officials and the SeaFIC Board engages with members of Parliament or Ministers. SeaFIC also publishes 'Seafood New Zealand' magazine, has a website and maintains media relations. It has not been a party to litigation but has provided financial and technical support to stakeholders involved in litigation with the Government.
<b>Organisational successes</b>	List some of the main successes of the assoc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engagement in the setting of TACCs and sustainability measures that has increased the proportion of non-controversial outcomes</li> <li>• Eliminating overcharging and improving the quality of expenditure on services purchased by the Government and recovered by levies and charges on the industry.</li> <li>• Achieving 'Approved Service Delivery Organisation Status' so that its subsidiary Fishserve can own and operate the registries supporting the operation of the QMS</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	What are some of the main reasons effective fishing industry assoc. are effective?	Agreement over common interests and purpose. This entails an agreement that certain matters are legitimate areas of competition and individual interest.
<b>Constraints</b>	What are the main constraints to being more effective?	The slowest sets the pace for everyone and in terms of public image, the worst behaved set the benchmark for perceptions about the sector.
<b>Other comments</b>		Source of Information: Alistair MacFarlane

## New Zealand Rock Lobster Industry Council

Component	Indicators	Details
<b>Organisation</b>	Name	New Zealand Rock Lobster Industry Council (RLIC)
<b>Organisation Structure</b>	Incorporated assoc.? Company? For profit/not-for-profit? Association of associations?	Company. RLIC shareholders (9 CRAMACs) are Incorporated Societies organised within Quota Management Areas (QMAs). CRAMAC participants are both quota and annual catching entitlement (ACE) owners in a particular fish stock eg. CRA8.
<b>Main purpose, aims/objectives</b>	What are the main objectives/functions of the association?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To enter into contractual arrangements with Ministry of Fisheries (MFish), Scientists and other service suppliers on behalf of CRAMACs individually and collectively.</li> <li>To negotiate and supervise such contracts</li> <li>To carry out financial administration on behalf of CRAMACs including bill paying, invoice raising,</li> <li>To manage levy collection</li> <li>Representation and Advocacy for the commercial rock lobster sector</li> </ul>
<b>Established</b>	Year established	1996
<b>Staff</b>	Number (and roles)	Executive officer (contracted) representation and advocacy, management of RLIC. Business Manager (employee) financial management, research contract monitoring (MFish), liaison with Bank and Auditor, project reporting to CRAMACs, AGM paper preparation, minute keeping. Administration Manager (part time employee) Data entry, record keeping, ballot organisation, communications.
<b>Level of funding (annual)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$US500k - \$1m</li> </ul>	\$NZ 660k stock specific levies (second tier levies collected by SeaFIC) \$NZ 10k (approx) contract services to other seafood sector organisations
<b>Funding arrangements</b>	By what arrangements does the organisation receive funds?	RLIC applies for stock specific levy rates to be attached as secondary levies to the SeaFIC primary levy under the Commodity Levies Act. Each CRA stock has a unique rate depending on local expenses (4 CRAMACs employ staff directly) but funding for internal RLIC activities is raised by a levy based upon TACC tonnage (i.e constant rate per TACC tonne).
<b>Members</b>	Number	9 CRAMACs covering a total of approximately 400 quota owners and 282 vessel operators/ACE owners.
<b>Membership structure</b>	Catching sector only? Post-harvest? Types/levels of membership?	Generally both quota and ACE owners are allowed to participate in CRAMAC meetings and votes although theoretically decisions about levying are reserved to quota owners (the levy payers). Voting also applies to TACC setting, area subdivision or amalgamation, local management measures that are more rigorous than MFish regulations.
<b>Voting rights</b>	What are the voting arrangements on policy/governance matters?	CRAMAC directors approve the RLIC budget (currently \$360K of the \$670K raised by levy).
<b>Membership coverage</b>	What proportion of the potential members are members of the	Levy approval support varies by area (from 70% to 89%). The threshold for a compulsory levy in any area is 66%.

	assoc.? If high, why? If low, why?	
<b>Governance structure</b>	What arrangements/structures oversee the assoc.'s effectiveness? Board? How elected/appointed?	Each CRAMAC has a right to one RLIC share and the right to appoint 1 director on RLIC. (two have not taken up their shares) The CRAMAC appointed directors, in turn, select an independent chair for RLIC.
<b>Policy making structures</b>	How are policies made? Organisational priorities set? How are members consulted?	Bottom up process. CRAMACs determine what they want and what they are prepared to pay for, RLIC manages efficient delivery on their behalf. Policies are confirmed at well attended RLIC meetings that are held 6 times per annum.
<b>Mechanisms to deal with 'free riders'</b>	Does the association have measures in place to deal with 'free riders'?	Levies supported by more than 66% of quota shares in an area are binding on all, subdivision and amalgamation require support to the Minister's satisfaction. All other management measures have no measures to prevent free riding (they rely on voluntary compliance with codes of practice etc.)
<b>Influencing Policy, Business Environment</b>	How does the association influence Govt policy and the general business environment surrounding the industry?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can demonstrate high levels of support from the sector over many years</li> <li>• Track record of responsible positions on sustainability and resource abundance</li> <li>• Sufficient capacity to do things itself (not just lobby)</li> <li>• Constructive attitude towards other interested parties (customary/recreational/environmental)</li> </ul>
<b>Organisational successes</b>	List some of the main successes of the assoc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gained control of rock lobster research priorities and choice of research providers from MFish</li> <li>• Suggestions for achieving better value for money on cost recovered funds by MFish adopted</li> <li>• Voluntary research projects delivered (electronic logbooks and post-harvest research)</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	What are some of the main reasons effective fishing industry assoc. are effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision making provides for local autonomy but service delivery is aggregated and professional.</li> <li>• Processes/tools to discipline/prevent free-riders</li> <li>• Excellent and frequent communication with members and target audiences</li> </ul>
<b>Constraints</b>	What are the main constraints to being more effective?	The lack of a statutory collective action framework constrains the ability of rock lobster quota and ACE owners to implement timely and customised management measures that are enforceable.
<b>Other comments</b>		Information provided by Daryl Sykes

## **Annex 3: List of Persons Consulted**

### ***PITIA***

Charles Hufflet, Chair

Tima Tupou, Executive Officer

### ***PNG***

Pete Celso, Chair, FIA (Deputy Chair, PITIA)

Kema Mailu, Executive Officer, FIA

Blaise Paru, Equatorial Marine Resources Ltd

Sylvester Pokajam, Managing Director, NFA

Presley Kokwaiye, Provincial Support Officer - NGI Provinces & OIC- Model Fisheries Cooperatives, NFA

Ghandi Tarube, NFA

### ***Kiribati***

Barerei Onorio, Chairman, NTA

Ekeuta Ieremia, Vice Chairman, NTA; Chair, Causeway Fishermen's Association

Iannang T, Secretary, MFMRD

Beero Tioti, Deputy Secretary, MFMRD (and staff)

Capt. Rui Natake, Principal, Kiribati Fisheries Training College

Natario Kiati – Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development

Watati Irata, Senior labour Officer, Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development

### ***Tonga***

Tricia Emberson, Secretary, FIAT (Secretary/Treasurer, PITIA)

Dave Edwards, (company)

Dr Sione Vailala Matoto, CEO, MAFFF

L. Amoma Johansson, President, Tonga Chamber of Commerce

Semisi Fakahau, Independent Advisor

Tom Nakao, Director of Biosecurity, Compliance and Trade, Grower's Federation of Tonga

Naomi Wise – Business Development Advisor

### ***Others***

Maurice Brownjohn, ex-Chair, PNG FIA; ex-Vice Chair, PITIA

*Pacific fishing industry associations study*

Graham Marsh, Treasurer, Niue Fishermen's Association

Theofanes Isamu, Palau (Tuna) Fishing Association

***Australia-New Zealand Case Study Associations***

Winston Harris, Chief Executive Officer, Queensland Seafood Industry Association

Annie Jarret, Chief Executive Officer, Northern Prawn Fishing Industry Ltd

Brad Warren, Executive Officer, Oceanwatch Australia

Martin Exel, Chair, Commonwealth Fisheries Association

Alistair MacFarlane, Deputy CEO, New Zealand Seafood Industry Council (SeaFIC)

Daryl Sykes, New Zealand Rock Lobster Industry Council

***SPC***

Jonathan Manieva, DevFish II Project Officer

***FFA***

Hugh Walton, DevFish II Coordinator

Donald Papaol, FFA

## Annex 4: Relevant regional funding programs

Grant Program	Origin of Funds	Program details	Contacts/further information
DevFish II	EU	<p>The Development of Tuna Fisheries in the Pacific ACP Countries Project (DEVFISH) is a European Union funded regional project, aims to give Pacific Islands a fairer slice of economic benefits from tuna fishing. DEVFISH II, jointly administered by FFA and SPC, will over 5 years provide 8.2 million Euros worth of assistance for two broad purposes - fisheries development and control of illegal fishing.</p> <p>Assistance under DEVFISH will include:</p> <p>NATIONAL FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES. The project will continue to implement 3 existing action plans, and to develop new national plans to outline and enable sustainable fisheries management.</p> <p>TRANSPARENCY &amp; INDUSTRY INVOLVEMENT. Assistance will find new ways to strengthen industry associations and artisanal fishers' representation in decision making, and provide training and advice on fishing access agreements and licenses to national government staff.</p> <p>COMPETANT AUTHORITIES. To export fish to the EU, countries need an EU-approved 'Competent Authority' to certify fish exports meet EU export standards. Support will be provided for meeting requirements associated with sanitary inspection and EU catch certification (which contain requirements to certify fish is not caught illegally).</p> <p>EXPORT EXPANSION: Training and expertise to expand exports within sustainable limits will be provided - such as training fishing companies to improve vessels and fish handling practices.</p> <p>FISHING COMPANY GROWTH: Focusing on small and medium enterprises, DEVFISH will provide training and technical assistance with a focus on strengthening management and filling skill shortages constraining growth and profitability, within sustainable limits.</p> <p>PILOTING NEW TECHNOLOGIES: Projects may include trials of palm oil as boiler fuel in processing plants, the trial of other clean technologies, and replacement of 2-stroke with 4-stroke engines for artisanal fisheries.</p>	<sup>9</sup>
ACP Fish II	EU	<p>The ACP FISH II Programme is a 4.5-year programme financed by the European Development Fund on behalf of ACP (African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of states) countries. The aim of the programme is to improve fisheries management in ACP countries so as to ensure that fisheries resources under the jurisdiction of these countries are exploited in a sustainable manner. Approximately €2,827,913 has been committed to Pacific regional projects. The expected results of the Programme, which became operational in June 2009, are –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improved fisheries policies and management plans at regional and national levels</li> <li>2. Reinforced control and enforcement capabilities</li> <li>3. Reinforced national and regional research strategies and initiatives</li> <li>4. Developed business supportive regulatory frameworks and private sector investment</li> <li>5. Increased knowledge sharing on fisheries management and trade at regional level</li> </ol>	<sup>10</sup> , <sup>11</sup>
Japan Trust Fund	Government	The Japan Trust Fund (JTF) has been in service to support capacity building of the small island developing states (SIDS) in	

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.ffa.int/node/448>

<sup>10</sup> <http://acpfish2-eu.org/>

<sup>11</sup> [http://acpfish2-eu.org/uploads/Programme\\_Documents/Regional%20Action%20Plans/Regional%20Action%20Plan%20Pacific%20EN.pdf](http://acpfish2-eu.org/uploads/Programme_Documents/Regional%20Action%20Plans/Regional%20Action%20Plan%20Pacific%20EN.pdf)

	of Japan	the WCPFC area from 2007 to 2011 as a 5-year program with a total of approximately US\$ 2 million fund.	
<b>Project Development Fund (PDF)</b>	US Treaty	Under the terms of the US Treaty funding arrangements agreed in 2003, US\$1,777,999.95 shall be paid annually to a Project Development Fund administered by FFA in accordance with procedures agreed between the Pacific Island parties. All parties to the Treaty have equal access to the funds in the PDF (i.e. approx. \$111,125 per party). Proposals for the utilisation of PDF funds will be submitted through established official channels for communication between FFA and FFA member countries.	
<b>EU Fisheries Partnership Agreements (FPA)</b>	EU	Fisheries Partnership Agreements are bilateral fishing access agreements between the EU and third party countries. FPAs specify an amount of EU fishing activity allowed in a zone, as well as a range of other measures (e.g. governance strengthening, requirements for local landings, employment of local fishers, etc), in return for an agreed fee. In the Pacific, FPAs are in place with Kiribati, Solomon Islands and FSM, although there appears to be interest in other locations. While the overall objectives of FPAs are consistent, the details are negotiated on a country by country basis and opportunities may exist for national associations to influence the outcomes of the agreements in association with national fisheries agencies (e.g. to promote development initiatives of national importance).	
<b>PIPISO – Capacity Building Fund</b>		The Capacity Building Fund (CBF) was established to support National Private Sector Organizations in building their capacity to provide better services to their members, and to build capacity of NPSOs to contribute effectively to national policies related to private sector development and investment at national, sub-regional and regional level. PIPISO aims to distribute capacity building assistance evenly to all the 14 members in a clear and transparent manner. Capacity building assistance is tied to the strategic plan developed by the NPSOs. Capacity building assistance for NPSOs can cover the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short Term Training</li> <li>• Development of NPSOs Strategic Plan and Operational Policies</li> <li>• Private and Public Dialogues</li> <li>• Trade Agreements Workshops and Meetings</li> <li>• Special Studies</li> </ul>	12
<b>PIPISO – Business Development Fund</b>		To be eligible for the CBF, an NPSO must be a member of PIPISO and its subscription fees are fully paid for the current year. The Business Development Fund is established to assist, small and medium enterprises (SMEs <sup>1</sup> ) of the Pacific Island Countries (PIC) and community-based organization with commercial interests which are characterized by limited financial resources, a lack of access to capital, and often an undue reliance on debt. The BDF aims to enhance economic development of the private sector through the facilitation of market research and increased market access, capacity building in product development and development of promotional materials. BDF grants are offered on a cost sharing basis. The various categories under the fund include: market research, exploration visits, conference participation, promotional material and capacity building and training. To be eligible an organisation must be a member of their National Private Sector Organization.	13
<b>The Commonwealth Foundation – Civil</b>		CSRG grants are for activities that involve the participation of people and organisations from more than one developing Commonwealth Foundation member country. Grants often cover the cost of airfares, accommodation and subsistence,	14

<sup>12</sup> [http://www.pipso.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=43&Itemid=76](http://www.pipso.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=43&Itemid=76); [info@pipso.org.fj](mailto:info@pipso.org.fj)

<sup>13</sup> [http://www.pipso.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=42&Itemid=75](http://www.pipso.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=42&Itemid=75)

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.commonwealthfoundation.com/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=pi8MLhMAcl%3d&tabid=219>

<b>Society Responsive Grants</b>		though we will also contribute towards the monitoring, evaluation and reporting of an activity. Up to 15% of the award can be spent on administration costs and overheads. Activities we typically support include training courses, workshops, seminars, conferences, cultural festivals, exchanges and study visits. Normally, funding of up to £12,500 is available, although the average award is about £5,000. The direct beneficiaries of your activity must be at least 50% women. All countries except Fiji, Vanuatu, Nauru and Tuvalu are eligible to apply. In 2008, the Tuvalu National association of Fishermen received £7,745 to hold a workshop on small business management and outboard motor repaid under this program.
<b>Centre for the Development of Enterprise</b>	EU	The Centre for the Development of Enterprise (CDE) is a joint institution of the ACP Group of States (African, Caribbean and Pacific) and the European Union, created within the framework of the Cotonou Agreement. The Center provides non-financial services (technical assistance, studies, training) to ACP companies and to joint initiatives undertaken by ACP and EU economic operators in various economic sectors, with the main aim of enhancing the competitiveness of ACP enterprises. The CDE's objectives are (i) to facilitate ACP-EU business partnerships, (ii) to facilitate the development of enterprise support services in ACP countries (capacity building within private sector organisations and service providers), (iii) to lend support to investment promotion activities and organisations, and (iv) to support transfer of technologies and management skills. To be eligible businesses must have assets of between €80,000 and €10m, and at least 5 employees. The CDE will support 2/3 of the cost of any intervention, with the remaining 1/3 to be paid by the SME, which can be in kind. <sup>15</sup>
<b>Foundations (Moore, Packard)</b>		A number of philanthropic foundations run funding programmes that might be relevant to Pacific fishing industry associations. Programmes are most likely relevant to environment rather than development issues.
<b>NZ AID (e.g. Pacific Island Countries Participation Fund)</b>	NZ	The objective of the Pacific Island Countries Participation Fund is to increase attendance by Pacific Island citizens at regional and international conferences, where their attendance will strengthen ownership of regional and international development processes. Countries within the scope of the programme are: The Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, French Polynesia, the Fiji Islands, Kiribati, Nauru, New Caledonia, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, the Republic of Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Wallis and Futuna, and Tokelau. The PIC Fund will support applications from organisations only (legally incorporated bodies). New Zealand-hosted and regional meetings in the Pacific will take priority. Funding may cover all or some of the cost of travel, accommodation, meal allowances and conference fees. <sup>16</sup>
<b>National fisheries agencies</b>	Various	Various national fisheries agencies may offer small grants or fee-for-service arrangements that are available to national or local fishing industry associations (e.g. PNG's NFA offers small grant funding to support artisanal fishing cooperatives).

<sup>15</sup> Regional Field Office for the Pacific, Level 2, 73 Gordon Street, Suva, Fiji Islands, P.O. Box : 11943, T: +679 3313090; [www.cde.int](http://www.cde.int)

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.aid.govt.nz/funding-and-contracts/other-funds/pacific-island-countries-participation-fund>

## Annex 5: Action matrix

This table distils the main observations and recommendations in the report into action matrix. Not all areas for possible future work are presented as ‘hard and fast’ recommendations. Many are presented as options for consideration and require discussion amongst the association’s membership and any actions arising should be developed in partnership with members. Likewise, some will require cooperation from external parties (e.g. national fisheries administrations). Specific actions are presented for each of the case study associations, as well as general actions that could be taken by any of the existing Pacific associations.

Observations and recommendations	Possible actions	Timeframe
<b>PITIA</b>		
Association objectives/services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review current association objectives; refine into core set of priority objectives, with focus on improving international competitiveness of Pacific fishing businesses</li> <li>Examine existing scope of services; prioritise services that best promote agreed priority objectives</li> <li>Evaluate whether existing membership structure best supports commercial focus, or whether alternative models – e.g. direct membership from commercial companies - would more clearly define PITIA’s core constituency; examine any implications for existing associations</li> <li>Examine staffing/resourcing needs based on agreed core objectives/services</li> <li>Ensure clarity around roles/responsibility/mandate of PITIA and member associations</li> </ul>	Short term
Leveraging resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examine opportunities to leverage external resources to achieve PITIA member aims – e.g. influencing delivery of external aid programmes; influencing FFA/PNA positions at WCPFC</li> </ul>	Ongoing
Fishery specific policy committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examine development of fishery/sector specific policy committees to lead policy development on behalf of the association (e.g. purse seine, southern longline, tropical longline, pole and line, post harvest)</li> </ul>	Medium term
Locally based foreign fleets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review PITIA relationship with locally based foreign fleets in association with existing members</li> </ul>	Short - medium term
Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review and further develop PITIA website as a (i) first port of call for information on the Pacific fishing industry, (ii) information dissemination tool for industry</li> <li>Examine opportunities for other communication tools – e.g. regional fisheries magazine funded through advertising</li> </ul>	Short-medium term
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss ongoing opportunities for funding support with regional organisations</li> <li>Ensure at least modest contributions from members to demonstrate commitment/credibility</li> <li>Review opportunities for external funding assistance (e.g. Annex 4); seek external funding based on agreed core priorities</li> <li>Examine practicalities of direct corporate membership of PITIA</li> </ul>	Short-medium term

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examine opportunities for staff secondments from regional agencies to assist with specific initiatives – e.g. preparing funding applications</li> </ul>	
<b>FIAT</b>		
Representative arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resolve future representative arrangements, including FIAT’s role, with industry and MAFFF</li> <li>Clarify relationship between FIAT and the proposed Fisheries Council of Tonga</li> </ul>	Short term
Development forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reinvigorate high level fisheries development forum including representatives of FIAT and key government agencies – e.g. MAFFF, Commerce, Port Authority, etc</li> </ul>	Short-medium term
Independent Executive Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appoint executive officer independent of main companies to remove perceptions of influence (as funding allows)</li> </ul>	Medium term
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explore opportunity to establish a voluntary export levy through established exporters; review other sources of external funding assistance (e.g. Annex 4)</li> <li>Explore opportunities for external funding assistance with MAFFF including practicalities of accessing PDF, using funds from foreign licence fees to support domestic development</li> </ul>	Short-medium term
<b>FIA</b>		
Business Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalise Business Plan in consultation with members, including additional detail on proposed new governance arrangements and funding mechanisms</li> <li>Formalise necessary changes to governance documents through AGM</li> <li>Promote new changes to both industry and government</li> </ul>	Short term
NFA Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop policy proposals/Board papers on key industry issues to influence Board direction on development issues</li> </ul>	Ongoing
Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review existing communication mechanisms; examine opportunities for member newsletter/magazine, including sponsorships</li> <li>Review and update FIA website</li> </ul>	Short-medium term
Presence outside Pt Moresby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examine mechanisms to increase FIA presence outside Pt Moresby (e.g. regional tours by FIA Executive)</li> <li>Examine opportunities to station regional staff in key locations (e.g. PIMZ)</li> </ul>	Medium-long term
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examine opportunities for NFA to provide practical assistance to promote membership of FIA (e.g. provision of licence lists; distribution of FIA membership application forms with licence renewals)</li> <li>Examine opportunities to increase existing membership fees, particularly for larger members</li> </ul>	Short term
<b>NTA</b>		
Development forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish a structured forum between NTA and senior government officials to discuss development challenges and opportunities</li> </ul>	Short term
Operational priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a set of operational priorities in association with members to facilitate discussions with Government, and aim to achieve early ‘wins’ to establish credibility/benefit of association</li> </ul>	Short term
Membership arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure clarity around membership and voting arrangements, and clarify the roles and responsibilities of the NTA and three member organisations</li> </ul>	Short term

Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Canvass possible funding mechanisms with membership, including the establishment of a levy on exports through the KFC.</li> <li>• Discuss possibility of accessing external funding pools (e.g. PDF, FPA) for specific initiatives with MFMR</li> <li>• Discuss practicalities of implementing a fee on foreign licences to support domestic development initiatives including the NTA</li> </ul>	Short-medium term
<b>General</b>		
Funding models	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review funding models identified and confirm preliminary evaluation of suitability against national/regional circumstances</li> <li>• Confirm preferred future funding model amongst membership, in context of capacity to pay, resources required to meet association objectives and potential external funding options available.</li> </ul>	Short term
Government support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine possible means of Government support to the association (e.g. compulsory memberships, recognition as a peak body, supply of licence lists, secondment of staff, etc) in the context of national/regional circumstances;</li> <li>• For countries which licence significant foreign fleets, examine opportunities for the establishment of dedicated funds to support domestic development</li> <li>• Identify preferred options and discuss with relevant Government officials ‘what’s possible’, together with an action plan to implement agreed measures</li> </ul>	Short term
External funding support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review available options for possible external funding support outlined in Annex 4, in light of member/organisation priorities.</li> <li>• Make contact with relevant programmes to discuss eligibility requirements and application procedures (examine whether assistance is required with applications; seek support from national or regional agencies, where required)</li> </ul>	Ongoing
Selling the benefits of membership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine opportunities to better communicate the benefits of membership to current and potential members – e.g. materials summarising past achievements and future organisation priorities; site visits to key potential members</li> </ul>	Ongoing
Independent directors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate current Board composition; determine whether performance/influence could be enhanced with additional skills (e.g. financial; policy)</li> <li>• Determine terms available for independent directors (e.g. paid/unpaid?; term? voting rights?)</li> <li>• Invite suitable candidates</li> </ul>	Short-medium term
Operational plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop operational plans outlining association priorities; incorporate discrete initiatives where possible that can be funded by external agencies, taking into account possible external funding sources in Annex 4 (and elsewhere if available).</li> </ul>	Short term
Association executive training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (for regional agencies) Consider the development of a tailored association executive training course/workshop covering key topics to help run an effective association as well as better contribute to domestic development</li> </ul>	Medium term

Websites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evaluate and upgrade current web presence where necessary taking into account any feedback from members</li></ul>	Short-medium term
----------	---	-------------------