



SWOTS OF NAMMCO COMMITTEES

The Chair of NAMMCO, Amalie Jessen, has initiated a SWOT process in NAMMCO as part of an ongoing strategy and capacity building discussion. The SWOT analysis is a tool to see where NAMMCO and the different committees stand in terms of strength, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.

Together with the Chair, the Secretariat has prepared some draft SWOTS for the different committees. Below is also included some background information on SWOTs and a template for a general SWOT on NAMMCO

Background information

A SWOT analysis can be carried out for any *object*. It involves specifying the objectives of the *object* and identifying the internal and external factors that are favourable and unfavourable to achieve that objective. Defining different factors as strengths or weaknesses depends therefore upon their effect on the object's objectives.

As a rule, the *strengths* and *weaknesses* are factors internal to the organization, while *opportunities* and *threats* arise from factors external to the organization. They can be defined as follows:

- Strengths: characteristics of the *object* that give it an advantage over others
- Weaknesses: characteristics of the *object* that place *object* at a disadvantage relative to others
- Opportunities: elements in the environment that the *object* could exploit to its advantage
- Threats: elements in the environment that could cause trouble for the *object*.

TEMPLATE - NAMMCO

<p>STRENGTHS</p> <p>Characteristics of NAMMCO that give it an advantage over other like-organisations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are NAMMCO's strength • What does NAMMCO do better than others • What unique capabilities and resources possesses NAMMCO • What do others perceive as NAMMCO strength 	<p>WEAKNESSES</p> <p>Characteristics that place NAMMCO at a disadvantage relative to others</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are NAMMCO weaknesses? • What do NAMMCO competitors better than NAMMCO? • What can be improved given the current situation? • What do others perceive as your weaknesses?
<p>OPPORTUNITIES</p> <p>External elements that gives NAMMCO an advantage / that NAMMCO could exploit to its advantage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What trends or conditions may positively impact NAMMCO • What opportunities are available to NAMMCO 	<p>THREATS</p> <p>External elements which could hamper NAMMCO fulfilling its goal / could cause trouble</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What trends or conditions may negatively impact NAMMCO • What are NAMMCO's competitors doing that may impact the organisation • Does NAMMCO have solid financial means

DRAFT - NAMMCO COMMITTEE ON HUNTING METHODS (CHM)

<p>STRENGTHS</p> <p>Generally active committee, which has achieved significant improvements in hunting methods.</p> <p>Motivated participants, some passionate and dedicated</p> <p>Transparency with reports of individual data as annexes and report passed to IWC</p> <p>Mix of managers, scientists, veterinarians and users, strong link to TEK, with respect for the different kind of knowledge/input each come with</p> <p>Inclusion of TEK done actively (best committee for that in NAMMCO)</p> <p>Very open forum based on trust</p> <p>Has got a good international recognition, has shared experience and knowledge with non-member countries.</p> <p>Disagreements are worded</p> <p>New people</p> <p>Has the Secretariat as driving/memory force</p>	<p>WEAKNESSES</p> <p>Losing some of the very experienced (long-term) participants, incl. competence of two dedicated and engaged veterinarians</p> <p>New people, less experienced</p> <p>Losing pace because of change of members. The low activity level, or rather lack of new activities in 2016 was probably a result of this change in personal. In 2016, the CHM only responded to request from Council and did not come with new initiatives.</p> <p>Miss clear overview of decisions and recommendations taken.</p> <p>The increasing use of telephone/skype meeting. They are good for routine as usual, but less good for good brain-storming and emergence of new perspectives. It is more difficult to establish a good level of mutual understanding through telepho9n meeting, because many new faces, it is even more important to meet face to face.</p> <p>Lack of long-term planning of meetings means that member countries not include the meetings in their national budget plans (which are decided December/January)</p> <p>Has the Secretariat as driving/memory force.</p>
<p>OPPORTUNITIES</p> <p>Strengthen cooperation with Canada and Canadian Inuit regions, Alaska and Japan.</p> <p>Becomes the internationally leading committee, the reference, for improvement of hunting methods</p> <p>Using TEK for collecting S&L data</p> <p>New people in, new eyes, new perspectives</p> <p>Long term planning of future activities</p>	<p>THREATS</p> <p>Change in participants, leading to less engaged people</p> <p>Lack of travel funding, only telephone/skype meeting, difficult to have new thoughts, brainstorming. The participants know each other less and do not communicate between meetings.</p> <p>Lack of activity plans leads to no funding of travels and projects</p>

DRAFT - NAMMCO COMMITTEE ON INSPECTION AND OBSERVATION (CIO)

<p>STRENGTHS</p> <p>Exists</p> <p>Giving confidence in NAMMCO as an international management organization</p> <p>Has the Secretariat as driving/memory force.</p>	<p>WEAKNESSES</p> <p>No overview of data collected. Miss clear overview of decisions and recommendations taken.</p> <p>No review of the Scheme since 2005, no analysis of cost/benefit</p> <p>No clearly defined goals and strategy</p> <p>Has the Secretariat as driving/memory force.</p> <p>Process for choosing observation specific targets, boats e.g., not documented (random, other processes....)</p> <p>Not transparent enough – overall results not visible except sometimes in Annual Reports.</p> <p>Change in participants, those with experience leaving</p> <p>Little new idea, not very active, no attempt to innovate, rethinking the way it is done.</p> <p>“Quite” committee</p> <p>Not clearly defined and/or communicated what the observation adds to the national inspection, (e.g., does monitoring Norwegian minke whaling add anything when blue box is obligatory).</p>
<p>OPPORTUNITIES</p> <p>Make a new review of achievements and analysis in terms of coverage and cost/benefits.</p> <p>Structure the received data so observation plan can be formed according to the results of analysis</p> <p>Identify where the problems are and focus on these hunts</p> <p>Analyse where the observation really add something besides the national monitoring (e.g Norwegian minke whaling, when blue box is obligatory).</p> <p>Maximising cost benefit by finding new ways of doing things, e.g. in the planning of observers’ time [Having observers on hold] and in seeking for using cost effective technologies.</p> <p>Could envisage not observing every year, but combining two-year budget for concentrating a problematic hunt, for instance hunting activities with high level on struck and lost or hunt that are internationally criticized</p> <p>Using observers for recording S&L and TTD</p>	<p>THREATS</p> <p>Lack of motivated activity leading to factual disappearance</p> <p>If the observation scheme can be contested as non - reliable/valid by other organisation – then it is wasting money for no results</p>

DRAFT - NAMMCO INSPECTION & OBSERVATION SCHEME (IOS)

<p>STRENGTHS</p> <p>Exists, only one active for hunts of marine mammals</p> <p>Random? observations arranged annually</p>	<p>WEAKNESSES</p> <p>Pool of observer candidates too limited and fixed,</p> <p>Training in 2013, but some have not been out.</p> <p>Some observers not well prepared enough (observing Norwegian minke whaling, but not aware of blue box)</p> <p>Expensive program, at the level of SC funding, but maybe too little results.</p> <p>No easy overview</p> <p>Last review of activities in 2005</p> <p>No analyse cost/benefits, no defined goal and strategy</p> <p>Not transparent enough (strategy in target choice, choice of vessels, aim of inspection, results of inspection)</p>
<p>OPPORTUNITIES</p> <p>The only active Observation scheme, should be more visible and <i>role-model</i>.</p> <p>Get inspired by other monitoring scheme from fisheries or hunting</p> <p>Gets new observers, new training program that plans for next 4-5 years</p> <p>Engagement of the responsible control authorities in every member country</p> <p>Rethinking focus, for which hunts is it the most useful. Also for instance on challenges in struck and lost issues</p>	<p>THREATS</p> <p>Not acceptable results, with a coverage at too low/not random/etc to be representative.</p> <p>Lack of transparency behind processes and results</p> <p>Lack of engaged staff and responsible authorities</p>

DRAFT - NAMMCO WORKING GROUP ON BY-CATCH, ENTANGLEMENT and LIVE STRANDINGS (WG BYCELS)

(somewhat speculative, as it does not even have members at this time)

<p>STRENGTH</p> <p>Exists</p> <p>Has a good background as departure point, i.e., the work realised by IWC and other bodies. Can start from there and add advice specific to the different NAMMCO countries' situations.</p> <p>Focus on issues specific to NAMMCO and not treated in other forum, like seal by-catch, ice entrapment.</p> <p>Have a clearly defined ethics/limits in terms of rescue versus euthanasia.</p> <p>As hunting country, not afraid to develop efficient advice, instead of good looking/urban public friendly advice</p>	<p>WEAKNESSES</p> <p>None yet 😊</p> <p>The issues are not direct NAMMCO task. However, they have been raised in several member countries, general guidelines are lacking, as well as a systematic registration of incidents.</p>
<p>OPPORTUNITIES</p> <p>Use existing base for issues common with other bodies (e.g. IWC) and therefore can focus on matters specific to NAMMCO</p> <p>Focus on entanglement prevention (incl. removals of entangling marine debris), seal by-catch, mass-strandings, ice-entrapments, welfare issues related to pollution.</p> <p>Small marine countries, and therefore likely easier to send a message and get it followed.</p> <p>Identify the best meeting form and line of action.</p> <p>Disseminate the image of an organisation caring for welfare in a wide sense (from efficient killing to non-lethal anthropogenic activities)</p>	<p>THREATS</p> <p>Do not have a clearly defined ethics/limits in terms of rescue versus euthanasia.</p> <p>Do not find its own specific niche compared to other bodies</p> <p>Not active/motivated enough, do not impose itself has a driver, <i>de facto</i> not existing</p>

DRAFT - NAMMCO SECRETARIAT (SEC)

<p>STRENGTHS</p> <p>Small secretariat</p> <p>Dedicated staff</p> <p>Team work and sparring</p> <p>Large network</p> <p>Pluralities: Diverse nationalities and life background, therefore diverse ways of seeing/perceiving things.</p> <p>3 nationalities mean three perspectives and 3 ways of defining and getting message(s) out.</p> <p>Multitasking</p> <p>Mix of permanent and temporary positions insuring continuity</p> <p>New GS: new inspiration, drive and pace</p> <p>Lots of thinking linked to the arrival of new GS and new website about what is NAMMCO, what is the message we want out, what is important to tell</p> <p>Work becoming more systematised</p>	<p>WEAKNESSES</p> <p>Small Secretariat</p> <p>Too few staff compared with workload, mostly only able to do routine duties</p> <p>Too few scientists (no time for in depth work, like review and status)</p> <p>No communication staff</p> <p>Potentially two staffs leaving at the same time</p> <p>Lack some systematic in the work</p> <p>No archive system & no library system</p> <p>No user-friendly overview documentation of what has been done in different committees.</p> <p>Because of the presently high level of activity, problems can be identified, but there is no time to diverge from routine to resolve them and performed changes which would allow to systematise and increase work efficiency.</p> <p>Vulnerable, because small</p>
<p>OPPORTUNITIES</p> <p>Extra science and communication staffs would mean more review and overview as well as more communication: message clearer, well supported and communicated.</p> <p>Driving force and small secretariat, so easy possibility for handling</p> <p>Level of activities – prioritizing the work</p> <p>To work on a plan of generation change in the Secretariat</p> <p>To create a long lasting system of archive and document management system for instance by buying a IT-based system like “CBrain / F2”^o</p> <p>[^ohttps://cbrain.dk/leverance/f2-consulting/]</p>	<p>THREATS</p> <p>Become routine work</p> <p>Things missed because no time to prepare meetings properly and follow up</p> <p>Secretariat is one driving force for NAMMCO, but also gives driving direction</p>

