

Report of the Thirteenth Session of the

---

**COORDINATING WORKING PARTY  
ON ATLANTIC FISHERY STATISTICS**

Rome, 11-18 February 1987



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

REPORT OF THE THIRTEENTH SESSION OF THE  
COORDINATING WORKING PARTY ON ATLANTIC FISHERY STATISTICS

Rome, Italy, 11 - 18 February 1987

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
May 1987

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

M-74

ISBN 92-5-102579-7

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner. Applications for such permission, with a statement of the purpose and extent of the reproduction, should be addressed to the Director, Publications Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy.

© FAO 1987

PREPARATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

This document is the Report of the Thirteenth Session of the Coordinating Working Party on Atlantic Fishery Statistics (CWP) held in Rome, Italy, 11-18 February 1987.

Distribution:

FAO Fisheries Department  
FAO Regional Fisheries Officers  
Member Countries  
Participants of the 13th Session  
CARPAS  
CECAF  
EUROSTAT  
GFCM  
IBSFC  
ICCAT  
OECD  
ICES  
ICSEAF  
NAFO  
CCAMLR  
IATTC

For bibliographic purposes this document should be cited as follows:

FAO, Report of the thirteenth session  
1987 of the Coordinating Working  
Party on Atlantic fishery  
statistics. Rome, Italy,  
11-18 February 1987.  
FAO Fish.Rep., (379):29 p.

ABSTRACT

The Report of the Thirteenth Session of the Coordinating Working Party on Atlantic Fishery Statistics (CWP) held in Rome, Italy, 11-18 February 1987, is presented. The EC Commission, FAO, ICCAT, ICES, ICSEAF, NAFO, OECD were the participating agencies. Major topics considered were: review of recommendations and proposals from CWP-12 and progress; agency programmes and publications presenting Atlantic fishery statistics; statistics on discards; review of the operation of the STATLANT system; procedures for handling discrepancies in databases; Ad-Hoc Global Consultation on Tuna Statistics; integration of value data into databases; STATLANT B data; handbook of fishery statistics; aquaculture enquiries; fishing fleet statistics; nationality issues; food balance sheets.

CONTENTS

<u>Sections</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Procedural matters	1
2	Review of recommendations and proposals from CWP-12 and progress	1
3	Agency programmes and publications presenting Atlantic fishery statistics, including an item on statistics on discards	2
4	Review of operation of STATLANT system	9
5	Procedures for handling discrepancies in databases	10
6	Report on the <u>Ad-Hoc</u> Global Consultation on Tuna Statistics, Colombo, 6-7 December 1985	10
7	Integration of value data into databases	11
8	STATLANT B data (Areas 27 and 34)	12
9	Presentation of draft handbook of fishery statistics	14
10	Aquaculture: Report on progress of FAO programme Report on progress in integrating FAO and ICES enquiries	14
11	Parameters on fleet statistics	16
12	Fishing areas for statistical purposes	17
13	Nationality: EC issues	17
14	Periodicity and format of CWP meetings	18
15	Food balance sheets	19
16	Any other business	20
17	Date and place of 14th Session	20
18	Adoption of the Report	20

APPENDICES

I	Agenda	21
II	List of documents	22
III	List of participants	23
IV	Contents of the Handbook of Fishery Statistics	25
V	List of Acronyms used in this Report	26
VI	CWP Sessions	27
VII	Recommendations of CWP-13	28

# COORDINATING WORKING PARTY ON ATLANTIC FISHERY STATISTICS

## Thirteenth Session

Rome, Italy, 11-18 February 1987

### 1. PROCEDURAL MATTERS

1.1 The Secretary of the Coordinating Working Party on Atlantic Fishery Statistics welcomed participants to Rome and introduced Dr. Armin Lindquist, Assistant Director-General, a.i., Fisheries Department, who officially opened the meeting on behalf of the host agency. A list of participants is given in Appendix III.

#### Election of Officers

1.2 Mr. B. G. Thompson, USA, and Mr. J. G. Pope, UK, Chairman of the ICES Statistics Committee, were unanimously elected Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

#### Agenda

1.3 The Provisional Agenda was approved with two additions, namely a Review of the Operation of the STATLANT System, and an item concerning Food Balance Sheets. The revised agenda as adopted is given as Appendix I.

### 2. REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSALS FROM CWP-12 AND PROGRESS

2.1 The CWP Secretary presented his report listing the various recommendations and proposals made by the CWP during its 12th Session, 25 July - 1 August 1984, Copenhagen, Denmark.

2.2 It was noted that the recommendation of CWP-12 to reduce the frequency of distribution of the ISSCAAP list of species had been requested, mainly to reduce the burden of work on FAO, but as it had proved more difficult to implement this change than to continue to distribute the list quarterly, it was decided to drop the recommendation and continue with the existing practice.

2.3 There was considerable discussion concerning the use of data not supplied through the STATLANT System, and it was confirmed that a cautious approach was necessary and revision should be made to official STATLANT data only when they are clearly erroneous beyond reasonable doubt. To avoid offending national susceptibilities, one possible solution was seen to be to group countries or to give species totals, but this was recognized to be of limited help for the FAO database/Yearbook, which gave prominence to country totals.

2.4 It was appreciated that the problem was a difficult one, which required case by case treatment and it was noted that if conditions of access were introduced into GATT negotiations, a further incentive for misreporting could be created. However, recognizing the needs of the user, many participants felt that where it was not possible to correct misleading data, notes should be clearly attached to figures indicating their source and the degree of reliability that could be placed in them.

2.5 It was noted that on some occasions, national offices reported that data were not available when such data were in fact obtainable from trade associations and similar bodies. The use of such data were felt unlikely to create serious problems with national authorities and should be used whenever possible.

2.6 The CWP Secretary confirmed that finally FAO had been able to dispatch questionnaires concerning Conversion Factors used for processing at sea. It was noted that some 54 countries (out of 143) had replied and there was a sufficiently representative cross-section of countries to begin the work of analysis, and the preparation of a report. Due to the very heavy demands on programmers, this work was being undertaken manually.

2.7 It was noted that the paper on logbooks requested by CWP-11 had been issued. The question of supplementary work recommended by CWP-12, was seen to be a matter of priorities and that if time and resources were available, a review of experiences in the use of logbooks in different parts of the world, in different fisheries, should be commissioned.

2.8 Economic and social problems were noted to be largely national problems and the data requirements for their study are often specific to the problem itself. The CWP was not seen as having a major role in this field, although it should, where possible, encourage the standardization of concepts.

2.9 It was noted that FAO had now almost completed revision of the notes accompanying the STATLANT forms but that the work had taken longer and been rather more difficult than expected. Part of this problem had been (and continues to be) the long time taken to process and print a form, especially now that photo-composition was being used. This was noted to be particularly unfortunate, given the fact that several agencies have their annual meeting - from which requests for changes in the form often originate - towards the end of the year. It is thus only possible in some cases to introduce recommended amendments after a delay of two years. If this situation continued it could gradually undermine the confidence originally placed in FAO as the co-ordinating agency for the collection of fisheries data.

2.10 Apart from action taken on the direct recommendations of the CWP-12, a brief review was made of progress towards achieving the medium and longer term objectives formulated by the Ad Hoc Consultation on Global Catch Statistics (23-25 May 1984, Copenhagen). Among the recommendations of that Consultation the work on the bibliography of national statistical sources was nearly completed and would be published during the course of 1987, and an enquiry into aquacultural activities in countries of the world other than the North East Atlantic, which already had its own survey, had been instituted.

### 3. AGENCY PROGRAMMES AND PUBLICATIONS PRESENTING ATLANTIC FISHERY STATISTICS

#### 3.1 FAO Fishery Statistical Programme (Document CWP-13/4)

3.1.1 The major events in the statistical programme of FAO since CWP-12 were noted to have been the introduction of an enquiry into aquaculture, the first meeting of an incipient CWP for tuna, and improved presentation of the Yearbooks, using photocomposition.

Work had also continued on the improvement of the quality of data through inter-agency consultation and detailed comparison of figures in respective databases. A special effort was also being made to improve data on quantitatively minor but commercially valuable aquatic products such as coral, sponges, crocodiles, pearls, etc.

3.1.2 The work of the FAO subsidiary bodies was also noted, especially that of CECAF and the GFCM, which produced statistical bulletins. These were now produced directly from FISHDAB, i.e. the same database as the Yearbooks and the same facilities, e.g. printouts of detailed data were now available for these areas.

### 3.2 EUROSTAT Fishery Statistical Programme (Document CWP-13/5)

3.2.1 The EC Commission's representative, in introducing the report on EUROSTAT's programme of fishery statistics, said that recent work had concentrated on the development of an improved and enlarged CRONOS database. This database is now online.

3.2.2 The development of the statistical register of fishing vessels has continued; the chief advances being the decision of the Federal Republic of Germany to make regular contributions to the register and the arrival of the first Spanish submission. However, with the probable development by the EC Commission of a vessel file for the administration of Community fisheries policies, it is likely that EUROSTAT's work in this sector will be limited to extracting data from an edited copy of this administrative file.

3.2.3 The publication programme has remained unchanged. However, serious consideration is being given to the content of the Yearbook of Fishery Statistics, and to the general usefulness of the Quarterly Bulletin on the quantities and values of landings in EC ports.

3.2.4 The CWP noted that it was important to identify the users of publications, in order that the content corresponded with the demand. It was further recognized that, although formal publications were expensive to produce, and computer databases were becoming more widely accessible to users, publications could still serve a useful purpose by providing the user with an overview of the general situation and by indicating how more detailed information could be obtained.

### 3.3 OECD Fishery Statistical Programme (Document CWP-13/6)

3.3.1 OECD continued to publish the "Review of Fisheries in OECD Member Countries". This publication presents the major events which took place in the fishing industry of Member countries during the previous year. All the information, qualitative as well as quantitative, is provided directly by the Member countries. The most important statistics deal with landings, production from the processing sector and international trade.

3.3.2 In addition, work is also in progress on the up-dating of the Multilingual Dictionary of Fish and Fish Products; a new edition should be published by the end of 1987 or early 1988.

### 3.4 ICCAT Fishery Statistical Programme (Document CWP-13/7)

3.4.1 The ICCAT maintains its policy on data collection, that is, that the best scientific estimates are preferred over the officially published data by national statistical offices. Recently, the Secretariat has been more involved in improving national data collecting systems than before, namely the designing of a new logbook and biological sampling systems for developing fisheries, training of local technicians for data collection, and assisting some countries which have no computer data-processing facilities. Also port sampling by the Secretariat from fleets which unload their catches at foreign ports has been intensified.

3.4.2 In 1986 ICCAT purchased a Digital Micro-Vax II, with VMS operating system. All future data processing will be done by the new system. The nature of data processing has not changed, except that analytical work will increase in the future.

3.4.3 The following statistical publications have been issued by ICCAT since the last session of the CWP:

- i) Statistical Bulletin, Vols.14, 15 and Provisional Vol.16
- ii) Historical Statistical Bulletin, 1970-1979 (Provisional)
- iii) Data Record, Vols. 25, 26(1) and 26(2)

3.4.4 ICCAT has purchased a laser printer and all the statistical publications will be photo-composed in the future. Data tables included in the Data Record will be simplified whereas the data catalogue contained therein will remain as it is.

### 3.5 ICES Fishery Statistical Programme (Document CWP-13/8)

3.5.1 ICES receives both fishery and aquaculture statistics. The fishery statistics include those officially reported by national offices and those brought to assessment working group meetings by scientists, whereas the aquaculture statistics are officially reported.

3.5.2 ICES publishes the Bulletin Statistique annually and also produces and distributes an Advance Release of Tables 1-6 of Bulletin Statistique each autumn. The Bulletin includes the official statistics. Working group reports (circulation within ICES) and the annual ACFM Reports (published as ICES Cooperative Research Reports) include the scientists' best estimates of catches.

3.5.3 There are two major problems associated with the fishery statistics: (i) discrepancies between the official figures and those reported and used by the assessment working groups, and (ii) poor adherence to the deadlines for reporting statistics. Even though the scientific estimates of catch have been used in the assessments, in the last several years some of the scientific estimates have deteriorated, thus greatly reducing the reliability of the assessments.

3.5.4 Some countries fail to submit preliminary statistics (Form 5 and Recommendation 12 Form) or the STATLANT 27B and 27A0 Forms, and the timeliness of reporting is generally poor, thus delaying publication of statistics.

3.5.5 The ICES database for STATLANT statistics is being restructured to provide greater flexibility in the access to and retrieval of desired segments of the 27A and 27B data.

3.5.6 Changes in the reporting of STATLANT data include a further disaggregation of divisions in Sub-areas VII and VIII and the reporting of catch to the nearest 0.1 tonne.

3.5.7 Following the ICES presentation, there was considerable discussion of the problems posed by the misreporting of data. Data could be unreliable for various reasons, but the situation may be less serious for ICES, as scientists have generally been aware of the nature of the errors and have been able to take them into account when making assessments, although as already noted, the quality of data being made available to some of the assessment groups is also deteriorating. The situation is more serious for others who use the officially published statistics and are without access to the documents of the scientific working groups, and who could be seriously misled if not warned of the inadequacies of the data.

### 3.6 ICSEAF Fishery Statistical Programme (Document CWP-13/9)

3.6.1 Efforts since the last meeting of the CWP have mainly been directed at improving data reliability and presentation and at achieving compliance with submission deadlines to ensure timely availability of information for scientific purposes.

3.6.2 The STATLANT series of forms continues to be the basis of the ICSEAF data collection system. Additionally, catch data by one-degree quadrangle are submitted by certain countries on a voluntary basis.

3.6.3 Trachurus trachurus capensis, Scomber japonicus, and Thyrsites atun are subject to total allowable catch regulation, with monthly catch reporting by telex to monitor catch levels in relation to TAC's on a month-by-month basis.

3.6.4 A new table and figure providing historical catch series for twelve important species or species groups have been added to the Statistical Bulletin, and further improvements to data combinations and presentations are planned. Numerous other statistical documents are released during the year, prior to the annual meeting, for use by national offices and national scientists in preparing stock assessments.

3.6.5 The concerted efforts of ICSEAF scientific bodies have resulted in improved statistical coverage by area and better compliance with reporting deadlines. In this line, the deadlines for submitting STATLANT form 47B and forms on biological sampling were advanced one month, to 31 July. The next major goal is to improve the reliability and usefulness of catch and corresponding effort data (47B).

3.6.6 Statistical collaboration with FAO has intensified, particularly in the area of detecting and eliminating discrepancies in the respective databases and of standardizing species item listings.

### 3.7 NAFO Fishery Statistical Programme (Document CWP-13/10)

#### Acquisition of Fisheries Statistics

3.7.1 NAFO continues to collect fishery statistics for the Northwest Atlantic (FAO Major fishing Area 21) through the STATLANT System. There has been a problem in the timeliness of submission of data since 1980. However, there has been some improvement in the timely reporting of STATLANT 21A data for 1985, but this was not reflected in the submission of STATLANT 21B data and this has seriously affected the publication of the Statistical Bulletin in recent years. It was requested that the date for submission should be given greater emphasis on the forms.

3.7.2 Expansion of the computerized database of Northwest Atlantic fishery statistics backward from 1972 has progressed slowly, and at present, the database includes data for all years back to 1962. Finally, it will go back to 1952 - the beginning of data collection by ICNAF.

#### Maritime Boundary between Canada and USA in Relation to NAFO Statistical Boundaries

3.7.3 The International Court of Justice defined the maritime boundary between Canada and the USA, and the Scientific Council examined the implications of altering its subarea/division boundaries to coincide with the ICJ line.

3.7.4 It was decided that the differences in the boundary between 4X and 5Y were of small enough importance in area that no re-allocation of catches was necessary. Inside 5Ze however, the new boundary subdivides this division into two new subdivisions for which catches will be reported separately. These changes will be in effect before the end of 1987.

3.7.5 As it was verified that effort prorating did take place in some national fisheries statistics, the Scientific Council requested the Secretariat to contact statistical offices for information on the extent of prorating of effort data when the STATLANT 21B reports are being prepared. The FAO, as requested, has already modified line 4 (previously unused) to indicate "Percent of prorated fishing effort".

3.7.6 As a result of errors in fishing effort data found in past reports of Canada and the USA, revised editions of Vols.27 to 31, of the Statistical Bulletin were re-issued during 1984 and 1985.

### 3.8 CCAMLR Fishery Statistical Programme (Document CWP-13/11)

3.8.1 At the fifth annual meeting of the CCAMLR in September 1986, the Scientific Committee noted that the flow of STATLANT data from member countries to the Commission has improved and is satisfactory to a large degree, although some gaps in the recent and historical data still exist, and some catches are still being reported as unidentified. A number of gaps in the historical time series have been filled, using data obtained from various ad hoc sources. It was further determined that some of the data missing from the historical time series had been lost or destroyed and are no longer available. New species identification sheets, published with the cooperation of FAO, are expected to ease the problem of unidentified catches.

3.8.2 Agreement was reached to collect and report data on spatial scales finer than that of the STATLANT data for assessment of krill and finfish stocks. Considerable progress has been made in the identification of data that would be useful for monitoring the effects of fishing on Antarctic ecosystems.

3.8.3 Publication of an annual statistical bulletin has been proposed.

3.8.4 Several issues in the CCAMLR report indicated the need for closer co-operation between agencies, and in this connection the meeting expressed concern at the lack of participation of CCAMLR in the work of recent sessions of the CWP.

### 3.9 Statistics on Discards

3.9.1 Discards had not originally been on the Agenda of CWP-13, but there was considerable discussion of this topic, which it was felt worth recording.

3.9.2 Discards can occur for a number of reasons, including:

- i) no market for the species in question;
- ii) catches of undersized fish may be discarded;
- iii) catch may be discarded if a species quota is exhausted in a mixed fishery, or its retention is prohibited;
- iv) catch of less valuable sizes of a species may be discarded so that a catch quota can be fulfilled with more valuable sized fish;
- v) catches may be discarded if caught in quantities greater than a vessel's handling capacity.

3.9.3 ICSEAF formally estimates discard data on an annual basis and ICCAT estimates those discards occurring as a result of regulations. Information is also available in the reports of assessment working groups of ICES, where estimates of discards are made, but they are not assembled or published on any systematic basis.

3.9.4 Various scientific, administrative and industrial users might make use of discard data as follows:

#### 3.9.5 Scientific Uses

- a) Calculation of maximum yield where discarding practices can change:

All fish discarded dead represent a loss of yield. This is particularly important if the discarded fish are immature, with considerable growth potential. Clearly if it is possible to prevent discarding, yield per recruit will increase and in these circumstances a knowledge of the amount and size/age structure of discarded fish is obviously valuable.

b) Calculation of yield change where discarding practices will remain unchanged:

Where discarding practices are not expected to change, calculations of yield change may be made with or without discard information. Curiously, it does not seem to matter much which way the calculations are made (see ICES Doc.CM:1986 Assess:10) particularly if effort or mesh changes are minor. Thus in this case discard data are not of great direct value.

c) Calculation of TAC where discarding practice will remain substantially unchanged:

As in the previous case, TAC's can be calculated using estimates of discarded fish or ignoring them. If the estimates of discard data are variable, they will cause errors in the TAC estimates. On the other hand if discard data are not used and if the discarded proportion varies from year to year, this will cause errors in the TAC estimate.

3.9.6 Roughly speaking with current ICES assessment practices, discard data will be useful for this purpose, if it has a lower coefficient of variation than the annual discard proportion. This situation will not always be the case.

Administrative Uses

3.9.7 Clearly, if under a catch quota or other regulation, fishermen continue fishing but discard fish to avoid being constrained by the regulation, the regulation may be of little value in managing the fishery. Administrators will need to consider which regulations will cause these problems and may need to monitor how well they perform in practice. Where no market exists for discarded fish, administrators may need to know the size of the problem, in order to appreciate the existence of unutilized resources and perhaps to consider ways in which they could be used. Thus administrators would seem to have some use for discard data but not necessarily on a formally reported annual basis.

Commercial Uses

3.9.8 If a fisherman discards some fish, it may be because he cannot find a suitable buyer for it, either because the price is too low, or because there is no buyer at all. Therefore, the existence of discards draws attention to the market mechanisms. If there is a market for the discarded fish somewhere else, then it means that lack of information on supply and demand represents an imperfection in the market medium.

3.9.9 If there is no market anywhere at the present this could change in the future, in that case information on discards could be valuable for new investors.

3.9.10 The economic importance of discards will not make it easier to get reliable statistics on their magnitude, on the other hand, it may not be absolutely essential to have continuous time series and periodic sampling may be sufficient to obtain estimates. In any event, it was suggested that the question of discards should be kept under review.

#### AGENDA ITEM 4: REVIEW OF THE OPERATION OF THE STATLANT SYSTEM

##### New Inland Waters Form

4.1 In response to a request from EIFAC, FAO proposed the introduction of a separate form for European inland water fisheries as an attempt to improve the quality of the data. It was noted that the agency in the country responsible for freshwater fisheries is often different from that for marine fisheries and a separate form would provide a better focus on these fisheries.

4.2 Several participating agencies and national representatives had problems with the definition between marine and fresh waters, where fisheries for both marine and freshwater species exist, e.g. the Baltic. It was noted that the FAO NS 1 returns already distinguish between seas and inland waters, so the same distinction could be made in the case of the STATLANT forms.

4.3 Participating member countries indicated that they could provide some of the information requested, but it would not cover many species and may not cover recreational fishing catches or value of commercial catches. Further doubts on where brackish water catches should be reported were raised. It was noted that previous discussions within the CWP had indicated that this should be left to the discretion of the reporting country.

4.4 EUROSTAT supported the new form and FAO concluded that, although there were some problems, these were not overwhelming. There was sufficient support for the new form, which could help to improve fishery data for inland waters and it would therefore be issued to EIFAC countries during the course of 1987.

##### Language of Species Lists on STATLANT Forms

4.5 FAO sought views on the current system in which forms variously listed scientific or English species names. In particular, it was queried whether the use of English on forms to non-English speaking countries caused difficulty. The representative of the EC Commission said there had been problems when just the English name was used, but the 3-alpha identifier has helped to resolve this problem. Participating member countries were content with the present system, preferring either English or the scientific name, along with the identifier. FAO concluded that there were no strong feelings for any change to the existing system.

##### Confidentiality of STATLANT Data (Document: CWP-13/23)

4.6 The representative of the EC Commission reported on the problems of confidentiality of data experienced by the French on the supply of data for the NAFO area where catches were taken by 1, 2 or 3 vessels. The French authorities are not permitted to reveal these statistics in detail.

AGENDA ITEM 5: PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING DISCREPANCIES IN DATABASES

(Documents: CWP-13/5, 9, 14 & 15)

5.1 The representative of the EC Commission reported on EUROSTAT's work in developing computer techniques for identifying discrepancies between the databases of CWP member agencies. The first stage considered the data for the fisheries of EC Member States in the Northwest and Northeast Atlantic. Collaboration between the Secretariats concerned (ICES, EUROSTAT, FAO and NAFO) had eliminated the majority of these identified discrepancies and the national authorities had cooperated to eliminate the remaining cases. With the completion of the work on establishing the new EUROSTAT database, the study was being extended to cover the catches of non-EC countries in these two major fishing areas.

5.2 Consideration was also being given to the inclusion of the data for other regional agencies (e.g. GFCM, CECAF and CCAMLR) in this study. The unresolved problem of incompatibility of the ICSEAF computer system with those of other agencies prevented the inclusion of ICSEAF data in the automated process; however, a continuing manual check of the FAO and ICSEAF databases suggested that the number of discrepancies for the Southeast Atlantic data was small.

5.3 The ICCAT participant reported on the collaboration between FAO and his organization in eliminating the discrepancies in tuna data on the two databases. This has resulted in extensive revisions to the FAO database, but this in turn, gave rise to the problem of reconciling the revised FAO data with those of the regional agencies. The CWP noted that the major problem was the difference in the area breakdowns used by ICCAT and the regional agencies. It was suggested that this could be resolved by a study of the ICCAT data submitted for 1° x 1° rectangles. This was not a task that could be undertaken by the Secretariats, given the limited resources, and hence its execution would depend on the priority allocated to the work and the availability of funding.

5.4 The CWP agreed that, having largely eliminated the discrepancies in the historic data, it was important to eliminate discrepancies at an early stage in the processing and publication of current data. Regular and frequent meetings between the Secretariats of the particular regional agency concerned, of FAO, of EUROSTAT and, in some cases, of ICCAT, would be necessary. These meetings should be held at the headquarters of the regional agency for ready access to the most detailed data source, and at a time other than the annual meeting of the regional agency.

AGENDA ITEM 6: REPORT ON THE AD-HOC GLOBAL CONSULTATION ON TUNA STATISTICS, COLOMBO, 6-7 DECEMBER 1985 (Document: CWP-13/14 & 15)

6.1 The first meeting of the Ad-Hoc Global Consultation on Tuna Statistics was held in December 1985, and all the regional agencies concerned with tuna statistics (IATTC, SPC, FFA, ICCAT, IPTP and FAO) were present. The Consultation agreed that the mechanism as such, either on a formal or informal basis would be very useful in improving world tuna statistics.

The immediate objectives established at the meeting were:

- i) improvement of global tuna catch statistics through input by regional agencies to the global agency; and
- ii) establishment of a world tuna fleet database.

The long-term achievements expected under such a mechanism would be:

- iii) solving problems caused by flag-of-convenience, joint venture fleets, etc.; and
- iv) standardization of logbooks to be used.

6.2 The CWP was informed that useful consultations have already been held between FAO and ICCAT, FAO and IPTP, and some limited input of data had started from IATTC to FAO.

6.3 It was recognized that one of the difficulties in the operation of such an arrangement was the great distances separating the organizations and the difficulties of justifying the cost of bringing together agencies for a short meeting. It was therefore necessary to arrange meetings to coincide with other meetings at which the agencies would also be present. It was, however, necessary to hold another meeting soon, so that momentum would not be lost.

6.4 The ICCAT representative added some explanation on the background for the establishment of such a mechanism, referring to Document CWP-13/15. He pointed out that it was the CWP's suggestion at its 9th Session, to organize a body, similar to the CWP, for tuna statistics on a world-wide basis, since the problems of tuna statistics are of a special nature, but common to all tuna agencies. He stated that the mobility of tuna fleets between the oceans, the highly migratory and cosmopolitan nature of tuna stocks, and high unit price paid for tuna in the international market, makes the collaboration among regional agencies essential in order to make a complete statistical coverage of tuna fisheries.

6.5 The CWP felt the progress made by the Ad-Hoc Consultation on Global Tuna Statistics to be satisfactory, and recommended that the FAO continues the effort to organize a further meeting of the tuna agencies so that tuna statistics could be improved and discrepancies between databases of the agencies could be further reduced.

#### AGENDA ITEM 7: INTEGRATION OF VALUE DATA INTO DATABASES

(Document: CWP-13/13)

7.1 The CWP Secretary reported on the progress achieved by FAO in its effort to integrate value data into its fishery statistical database, and mentioned some of the difficulties encountered in gathering data exclusively from published national statistical reports.

7.2 The CWP expressed its full support to FAO in this undertaking. OECD stressed the importance attached by the Organization to the economic aspects of fisheries, particularly crucial in some negotiations, e.g. those of GATT.

The technical problems so far encountered should not overshadow the principle that it is highly desirable to acquire catch value data and disseminate them to the known and potential users. EUROSTAT also intends to integrate value data in its database. ICES drew attention to possible implications of information on the relative value of species for biologists, e.g. in establishing catch levels in a multi-species fisheries, and welcomed the availability of more firm estimates than those implicitly used.

7.3 Attention was drawn to the special problem encountered by countries with a centrally planned economy in attributing an internationally comparable value to species. Two of the participants were requested to start enquiries on the difficulties their countries would encounter in providing an estimated ex-vessel price.

AGENDA ITEM 8: USE OF STATLANT B FORM DATA (Areas 27 and 34)

(Documents: CWP-13/16, 8, and CWP-10/30)

8.1 The ICES experience in recent years has revealed a tendency for fewer countries to report STATLANT 27B data, and those countries which do report, sometimes report much later than the 31 August deadline. The data are stored on computer file but, due to their incomplete nature, only monthly catches of selected species are published. In practice, when information of the STATLANT B type is required in ICES for stock assessment purposes, it is usually supplied directly by research institutes and/or national data collections. There are several reasons for this:

- i) Timing - scientific meetings often take place before the submission of STATLANT B data.
- ii) Completeness - since not all countries submit STATLANT B data, it is necessary to obtain relevant catch/area/month data from national scientists.
- iii) Accuracy - scientific estimates of catch frequently differ from official statistics.
- iv) Detail - many assessments are made with respect to areas other than official statistical classifications. Official effort classification may not correspond to scientific conceptions of homogeneous effort groupings. Many techniques for using effort data require catch-at-age data and effort data from a fleet.

8.2 All these reasons lead scientists to accumulate data series in the various ICES assessment working groups by direct submission by national scientists, and there is little formal use of STATLANT B data. In those areas of ICES where assessments are at a less complete stage (sub-areas VII and VIII) it is possible that STATLANT B data could be of more direct value, but the lack of reports by France, Portugal, Spain and UK (England & Wales), makes this speculative. A recent meeting (January 1987) of the Statistics Liaison Working Group asked ACFM and the assessment working groups to review their uses of STATLANT B data. The CWP also suggested that it might be more useful if all countries could agree to produce it to a common level of aggregation - perhaps by month, subdivision, gear and vessel size. There is a feeling that a general overview of catch and effort data is useful as a background to a fishery, even where it is not used directly in stock assessment work.

8.3 The CECAF experience proves the availability of STATLANT 34B data to be rather variable, particularly from the coastal states. In practice, while CECAF scientists make some use of STATLANT 34B data, it appears that CECAF has also moved towards obtaining catch/effort data other than by the STATLANT 34B forms, and as with ICES, this concentrates on groups of vessels with consistent performance.

8.4 Both FAO and EUROSTAT receive copies of STATLANT B data, but neither agency processes the data, nor has received requests for such data.

#### General Trends

8.5 After the extensions of national jurisdiction to 200 miles, a tendency has emerged for more fishing to be conducted by coastal states. This often means that more of the catch is taken by small vessels, which tends both to complicate the data collection process, and increase the potential amount to be reported on STATLANT B forms. This may perhaps partly explain the reduced reporting in the ICES area and the variable performance of coastal states in the CECAF area. STATLANT B data is probably easiest to compile for a distant water large vessel fishery, and these are perhaps becoming a thing of the past. The political implications of detailed published data may also have been a factor in non-reporting.

8.6 Moves towards age- and size-structured assessment methods have, to some extent, reduced scientists' dependence on large compilations of fishing effort data. They still definitely need effort data, but often use associated information, such as catch-at-age data. They thus tend to produce the effort data directly from national sources, at least in ICES. A further problem with fishing effort collection is that the operation of a management scheme (closed area or season, TAC or effort quota) may influence the efficiency of fishing effort. Local knowledge of these effects is needed to interpret the data which again leads to national data being used by scientists.

8.7 Fisheries assessment requirements for STATLANT B data are slight in ICES and becoming less in CECAF. There is still the need for an overall picture of a fishery in catch by area, month and effort terms. This is best supplied by complete coverage from a STATLANT B type reporting system, but perhaps of some agreed lower level of detail. Countries in an area should agree to a highest common factor of reporting and all report to this level. It would help if such results were either published or available from databases on magnetic media.

8.8 Such data would have use for administrators and in the field of economic analysis to complement national data. Economists and statisticians, supporting administrative needs, as well as scientists, would find a total view of a fishery in an area a useful perspective for a variety of reasons, e.g. for observing overall catch rates, for catch projections, for fleet structure and modernization, stocks potentially available for quota swaps, overall catches of stocks for marketing studies requiring monthly data.

8.9 It seems probable, however, that administrators like scientists would find a general overview of a fishery in an area a useful perspective to have, even where it is not used directly.

8.10 ICES and CECAF should be careful moreover to avoid taking action that might prejudice the collection of STATLANT B data in other areas where it is useful.

AGENDA ITEM 9: PRESENTATION OF THE DRAFT HANDBOOK OF FISHERY STATISTICS

(Document: CWP-13/18 including Annexes: A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K and T)

9.1 Mr. D. G. Cross, introduced the handbook and presented final drafts of a number of sections. He pointed out that, because of the size of the publication, the first edition would be limited to English, but that EUROSTAT was studying the possibility of preparing editions in all nine Community languages. Moreover, the scope of the handbook had been restricted to concepts, classifications, and definitions in international usage. Lastly, all listings would be updated immediately prior to publication. Participants were provided with a list of all the sections that would make up the handbook.

9.2 In the ensuing discussion the group suggested that the section on international statistical publications be expanded to include available databases, that a section on fishing gears be added, that the ILO definition of fishermen be used, and that the section on fishing effort be amended slightly to fishing effort definitions. It was also decided that the proposed sectional structure of the handbook was sufficiently clear in itself, and thus eliminated the need for an index.

9.3 The CWP congratulated Mr. Cross for his excellent work and expressed its interest in the earliest possible appearance of the handbook.

9.4 The participants recognized that, by its very nature, the handbook was likely to be subject to frequent updating. Consequently, the CWP recommended that FAO publish the handbook in loose-leaf format. In order to avoid unnecessary delay, it was further recommended that FAO should not wait for all sections to be written, but commence publication with those sections that were ready.

9.5 It was therefore agreed that the latest versions of all sections that were in final form would be sent to all participating agencies for review and comment. A deadline will be set for returning any amendments or remarks. It was noted that the deadline could be extended, on request, if any agency had to forward any section to a national correspondent.

9.6 The CWP asked FAO to consider also issuing the handbook on magnetic media as a series of files for immediate computer use.

AGENDA ITEM 10: AQUACULTURE

FAO Global Enquiry (Document: CWP-13/19)

10.1 Aquaculture statistics have been reported to FAO for 1984 and 1985, using the FISHSTAT AQ Form. The response for 1984 was considered good, with 104 of 182 questionnaires returned, whereas only 73 were returned for 1985. The majority of the returned forms have been completed correctly; most of the problems concerned areas and volumes of water, and methods of culture.

10.2 A further problem was that some countries have methods of culture which are not included on the FISHSTAT AQ Form. This problem has been addressed in the Notes for Completion, and in addition, FAO is planning to issue a glossary of terms.

10.3 The 1984 and 1985 data will be published before May 1987. Results confirm the earlier global estimates of 8 - 10 million tons of aquaculture production (plants and animals); of which about 5 million tons is fish. FAO intends to publish aquaculture figures separately from the commercial catches in the Yearbook. When that happens, the present total catch may decrease somewhat, because aquaculture figures have been included by some countries in their commercial catch figures.

10.4 It was also suggested that now there is a separate AQ return and data on aquaculture will be published separately that the NS 1 return should distinguish aquaculture separately. This would considerably simplify the submission and checking of previous years' data.

10.5 Various points were clarified with respect to definitions and sections in the FISHSTAT AQ Form.

10.6 It was reported the OECD is preparing, as a one-time request, an aquaculture form to gather information on the value of production, as well as the cost of major inputs to the industry.

10.7 The collection of data on diseases in aquaculture was suggested.

#### Report on Progress in Integrating FAO & ICES Enquiries

(Document: CWP-13/8)

10.8 Aquaculture data have been formally reported to ICES since 1982, using the STATLANT 27AQ Form. Since the introduction of the FISHSTAT AQ Form by FAO in 1984, there has been discussion within ICES as to the possibility of eliminating its form. The FAO form requests considerably more information, including value data and method of culture. Following a period of correspondence between ICES and its member country statistical offices and with FAO, ICES decided in 1986 to discontinue any further use of its STATLANT 27AQ Form, and to adopt the FISHSTAT AQ Form for the reporting of aquaculture data in the ICES area, following slight modifications to the form and its notes for completion.

10.9 The 1982-1984 aquaculture data collected by ICES on its STATLANT 27AQ Form will be published in Volume 69 of Bulletin Statistique, and data for succeeding years will be published in subsequent volumes of the Bulletin. These data had previously not been published because of the lack of reporting by a number of countries.

AGENDA ITEM 11: PARAMETERS ON FLEET STATISTICS (Document: CWP-13/21)

11.1 The EC Commission representative presented information concerning the harmonization of vessel size parameters. It was noted that previously, difficulties had been encountered in the administration of Community fisheries policies due to a lack of precision in fleet statistics parameters. A recent Council regulation should overcome this problem. The new regulation gives definitions of vessel length, breadth, tonnage, engine power, date and entry into service which may be used in future legislation on fishery management.

11.2 Because the definitions generally refer to existing international conventions, their implementation should cause no great technical difficulties. They are to apply to all new and modified vessels immediately and to all Community vessels from 18 July, 1994 at the latest.

11.3 These parameters were developed for administrative purposes, but will be incorporated in fleet statistics. The regulation is welcomed by EUROSTAT since it will aid in the removal of anomalies from the fleet statistics data.

11.4 The EC Statistical Register has been compiled annually since 1979 and at present coverage is quite good. Most Member States provide good data concerning the following: base port, type of vessel, gross registered tonnage, length (overall or between perpendiculars), year of launching and power of the main engine. It was noted that availability of these data would allow EUROSTAT to respond fully to almost all demands for fleet statistics.

11.5 The EC Council has recently approved legislation which, in part, calls for the establishment of a Community file of fishing vessels. Although this file will be administrative rather than statistical in nature, many of the data will be similar and thus EUROSTAT envisages replacing its statistical database with an edited version of the administrative file in order to avoid duplication of effort. It was noted that this change will not prejudice data submission to FAO. Until full implementation of the administrative register, EUROSTAT will continue to compile the statistical register.

11.6 The Secretary of the CWP noted that there were continuing problems in two areas. First, it remains unclear whether the data FAO receives include all registered vessels, or only those actually fishing. Information supplied by country representatives present at the meeting suggested that, at least for most nations, only those vessels actually fishing are reported.

11.7 The second problem is in the area of the use of gross registered tonnage (GRT) as a measure of fishing capacity. This item expanded into a general discussion concerning how best to measure fishing capacity. The consensus was that there are problems in the use of many different parameters (e.g. horse power, length) as well as GRT and that FAO should continue to use GRT for the present.

AGENDA ITEM 12: FISHING AREAS FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES

(Documents: CWP-13/10 & 22)

12.1 The CWP took note of the following proposed changes in the boundaries or subdivisions of FAO Major Fishing Areas for Statistical Purposes.

i) Area 71: The Western Central Pacific

- Boundary with the Northwest Pacific. The proposal would have the effect of transferring almost all the South China Sea into the Western Central Pacific.

- Boundary with Eastern Indian Ocean. For biological reasons and, thus, for management and statistical reasons the new boundary would be at latitude 2°20'N.

ii) Area 34: Eastern Central Atlantic

At the 10th Session of CECAF it was agreed to attempt to arrive at a more satisfactory grid system within this area, based on resource and ecological considerations.

12.2 Further, the CWP took note of the agreed maritime boundary change between the United States and Canada in the Gulf of Maine and over Georges Bank and of that recently agreed between Chile and Argentina, which will have implications on the boundary between areas 41 and 87.

12.3 It was noted that the CPPS would like to set up a statistical system and that technical advice could be provided to that organization by the CWP.

12.4 Attention was drawn to the fact that the FAO Major Fishing Area 47 boundary does not correspond exactly either with the ICSEAF Convention Area or with the ICCAT boundary between the Atlantic and Indian Oceans. After discussion it was recommended that FAO should investigate the possibility of making the boundary of Fishing Area 47 coincide with that of the ICSEAF Convention Area or ICCAT. It was also recommended that FAO investigate the possibility of the Yearbook of Fishery Statistics including separately details of catches in ICSEAF Subareas 7 and 8 (FAO subareas 51.8 and 58.7).

12.5 Definitions of other areas and boundaries could still be improved, however, in most cases, modifying boundaries would raise some difficulties such as disrupting historical series. In this context, reference was made to paragraph 13.1 of the Report of the Twelfth Session of the CWP on Changes in Boundaries of Major Fishing Areas.

AGENDA ITEM 13: NATIONALITY - EC ISSUES (Document: CWP-13/24)

13.1 The representative of the EC Commission reported on the ruling of the European Court of Justice that the nationality of a landing should be determined by the nationality of the vessel performing the "essential part" of the fishing operation. The CWP recommended that the ruling of the Court should be incorporated in the definition of nationality. The definition now reads:

- that the flag of the vessel performing the essential part of the operation catching the fish should be considered the paramount indication of the nationality assigned to the catch data and that indication should be overridden only when one of the following arrangements between the foreign flag vessel and the host country exists:
  - a) the vessel is chartered by the host country to augment its fishing fleet; and
  - b) the vessel fishes for the country by joint ventures contract or similar agreement (as opposed to the ad-hoc practice of a vessel selling catches to a foreign vessel or landing catches in a foreign port) and the operation of such a vessel is an integral part of the economy of the host country;
- that when governments negotiate joint venture or other contracts in which vessels of one country land their catches to vessels of another country, and the above criteria are applicable, the assignment of nationality to such catches and landings data can be specified in the agreements.

13.2 The representative of the EC Commission drew the attention of the CWP to the fact that the Canary Islands, Ceuta and Melilla (autonomous regions of Spain) were not considered part of the EC for the purposes of the Common Fisheries Policy. The requirements for statistics were being studied, but there was a distinct possibility that separate STATLANT returns would be required from "mainland" Spain and the autonomous regions.

13.3 He also pointed out that the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man were not covered by the EC's Common Fisheries Policy, but that, since separate STATLANT returns were made by these islands, the only problem was in the publishing of aggregates for the United Kingdom and the EC. On the other hand, St. Pierre & Miquelon should be included in both aggregates for France and the EC.

#### AGENDA ITEM 14: PERIODICITY AND FORMAT OF CWP MEETINGS

14.1 After thorough discussion the CWP decided that it was still necessary to hold a full CWP meeting attended by representatives from national statistical offices, in the same way as for recent sessions. It was agreed that such meetings should be held approximately every three years as a longer interval would lead to a loss of continuity. Five working days are probably sufficient to deal with all matters of interest. It was recommended, however, that consideration should be given to including users of the data, but that the participation should not grow so large as to inhibit free and informal discussion.

14.2 It was noted, however, that since the problem of discrepancies was currently of high priority, more frequent meetings of small groups of agencies were recommended and agencies were requested to make budgetary provision for this. It was also agreed that the inter-agency meeting, normally held at the time of an ICES Statutory Meeting, should again be held in the present inter-sessional period.

14.3 The CWP Secretary drew attention to a request for advice from the CPPS as to how to handle the harmonization of data in member countries, and on the possible production of a regional statistical bulletin. This raised the question of extending the CWP/STATLANT system outside the Atlantic. The meeting welcomed such a move in principle, but drew attention to a number of problems which might arise and therefore recommended that moves in this direction be made cautiously. A principal difficulty could be language, mainly for reasons of cost, hence it was agreed that the official working language should continue only to be English. It was also noted that eventual enlargement of the CWP, to include possibly eight or ten additional agencies, could change the nature of the CWP as presently organized. Finally, if meetings had to be held outside the Atlantic area it would considerably increase the cost to agencies.

#### AGENDA ITEM 15: FOOD BALANCE SHEETS

15.1 The representative of the EC Commission reported on the system of food balance sheets for fishery products, which has existed for many years. Investigations have raised, however, serious doubts about the figures on per capita consumption, i.e. these figures sometimes change considerably from year to year, which is considered to be unlikely.

15.2 The sources of these problems have been investigated and it seems to be that they are caused by the use of different conversion factors, and the fact that the NIMEXE specification for foreign trade in fishery products is not detailed enough to make sound food balance sheets.

15.3 A new system for preparing food balance sheets on fishery products has been set up, the first results of which will be discussed at the next meeting of the EUROSTAT Working Group on Fishery Statistics (19-20 May 1987). This new system is meant to produce food balance sheets per item of foreign trade. It avoids the use of conversion factors and too much aggregation. An important feature of this is to get a reasonable picture of the general flow of products.

15.4 OECD and FAO also compile food balance sheets and produce figures on per capita consumption. However, these figures sometimes show significant discrepancies, mainly due to the use of either live weight equivalents or product weight equivalents. It was noted that, while OECD relies heavily on national correspondents for submission of already calculated balances, FAO performs this task using data available within FAO.

15.5 The CWP spent some discussion on the problem with foreign trade statistics as a necessary part of food balance sheets, which might occur in the future when the foreign trade statistics of the EC will become limited to trade between the EC as a whole and non-EC countries. Trade between EC-countries will no longer be recorded as such. This will make it impossible to complete food balance sheets for individual EC Member Countries, as is done up to now. Therefore, other methods will have to be used, for instance, household surveys.

15.6 The rest of the discussion focussed on the background of the existing discrepancies and the ways to overcome these problems.

15.7 The CWP recommended that intensive inter-agency discussions and consultations should be started in order to solve the problem of discrepancies in food balance sheets.

AGENDA ITEM 16: ANY OTHER BUSINESS

STATLANT Newsletter

16.1 The STATLANT Newsletter comes out twice a year and is edited by EUROSTAT, a task which it is willing to continue. It was suggested that the Newsletter be used to communicate items of interest concerning decisions of the CWP. For example, a report of discrepancies between official and scientific estimates of catch would be an item of considerable interest to readers and is a problem that should have wider circulation. The CWP welcomed this suggestion and thanked EUROSTAT for its rôle in producing the STATLANT Newsletter.

ISSCAAP Group 33 - Redfishes, Basses, Congers, etc.

(Document: CWP-10/39)

16.2 At the 10th Session of the CWP, ICSEAF and ICES were asked to look at the breakdown of this group of species into more meaningful aggregations. Some suggestions were made, and it was recommended that FAO, in co-operation with these other agencies, look into a sensible disaggregation of Group 33.

Species Group Aggregations Used by EUROSTAT

16.3 It was suggested that the current aggregations were not particularly useful and that some classifications more useful to users (e.g. Pelagic/Demersal fish) might be adopted. It was agreed that this should be looked into.

Glossaries of Terms Used in Fisheries

16.4 The Commission of the European Communities is producing glossaries of terms used for fishing gears and fishing vessels and the first of these should be available very soon; they will be in the nine EC languages. Eventually, a glossary of fish species will be produced, translated as far as possible, into the nine EC languages.

AGENDA ITEM 17: DATE AND PLACE OF THE 14TH SESSION OF THE CWP

17.1 It was decided that the 14th Session would be held from 7-13 February 1990 in Miami, or in Paris. The Inter-Agency Consultation would be held in Bergen, prior to the 76th Statutory Meeting of ICES (6-14 October 1988).

AGENDA ITEM 18: ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

18.1 The Report of the 13th Session was adopted on 17 February 1987.

AGENDA

Item

- 1 Procedural Matters
- 2 Review of recommendations and proposals from CWP-12
- 3 Agency programmes and publications presenting Atlantic fishery statistics, including an item on statistics on discards
- 4 Review of operation of STATLANT system
- 5 Procedures for handling discrepancies in databases
- 6 Report on the Ad-Hoc Global Consultation on Tuna Statistics, Colombo, 6-7 December 1985
  - (a) Report on the Consultation
  - (b) Special problems concerning the reconciliation of tuna data
- 7 Integration of value data into databases
- 8 STATLANT B data (Areas 27 and 34)
- 9 Presentation of draft handbook of fishery statistics
- 10 Aquaculture:
  - (a) Report on progress of FAO programme
  - (b) Report on progress in integrating FAO and ICES enquiries
- 11 Parameters on fleet statistics
- 12 Fishing areas for statistical purposes
- 13 Nationality: EC issues
- 14 Periodicity and format of CWP meetings
- 15 Food Balance Sheets
- 16 Any other business
- 17 Date and place of 14th Session
- 18 Adoption of the Report

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

<u>DOCUMENT NUMBER</u>		<u>ISSUED BY</u>
CWP-13/A	General Announcement	FAO
B	Provisional Agenda	FAO
C	Provisional Annotated Agenda	FAO
D	List of Documents	FAO
E	List of Participants	FAO
F	CWP Sessions, Dates, Etc.	FAO
<hr/>		
CWP-13/1	Report of the 12th Session of the CWP	
2	Report of the <u>Ad-Hoc</u> Inter-Agency Consultation, London, 5-6 October 1985	FAO
3	Report by the CWP Secretary on CWP-12 Recommendations, proposals and progress	FAO
4	Agency Programmes and Publications presenting Atlantic Fisheries Statistics	FAO
5	"	EUROSTAT
6	"	OECD
7	"	ICCAT
8	"	ICES
9	"	ICSEAF
10	"	NAFO
11	"	CCAMLR
12	Procedures for handling discrepancies	EUROSTAT
13	Work on value data	FAO
14	Report on the <u>Ad-Hoc</u> Global Tuna Consultation, Colombo, 6-7 December 1985	FAO
15	Special problems of reconciling tuna data	ICCAT
16	Use of STATLANT B data in CECAF	FAO
17	(included in Document CWP-13/8)	
18	Draft Handbook of Fishery Statistics	EUROSTAT
19	Report on Progress of FAO Aquaculture Enquiry	FAO
20	(included in Document CWP-13/19)	
21	Development in EC Fleet Statistics	EUROSTAT
22	Fishing areas for statistical purposes	FAO
23	Confidentiality of STATLANT data	EUROSTAT
24	Nationality: EC issues	EUROSTAT

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

NAFO

Capt. J. E. Cardoso  
Executive Secretary  
Northwest Atlantic Fisheries  
Organization  
P.O.Box 639, Dartmouth  
Nova Scotia B2Y 3Y9, Canada

Mr. D. B. Atkinson  
Science Branch  
Department of Fisheries and  
Oceans  
P.O.Box 5667, St. John's  
Newfoundland A1C 5X1, Canada

EC COMMISSION

Mr. D. G. Cross  
Directorate for Demographic, Social  
and Agricultural Statistics  
Statistical Office of the European  
Communities  
Commission of the European  
Communities  
Jean Monnet Building  
B.P. 1907, Luxembourg (Grand Duchy)

Dr. F. J. Kutsch Lojenga  
Deputy Head  
Directorate of Agricultural  
Statistics  
Central Bureau for Statistics  
Prinses Beatrixlaan, 428  
Postbus 959  
NL-2270 AZ Voorburg, Netherlands

OECD

Mr. J-F. Abgrall  
Principal Administrator  
Fisheries Division  
Organization for Economic  
Co-Operation and Development  
2, rue André-Pascal  
Paris 16, France

Mr. B. G. Thompson  
Chief, National Fishery  
Statistics Program  
NMFS, NOAA, US Dept. of Commerce  
1825 Connecticut Avenue N.W.,  
Washington DC 20235, USA

ICES

Dr. E. D. Anderson  
Statistician  
International Council for the  
Exploration of the Sea  
Palaegade 2-4  
DK-1261 Copenhagen K, Denmark

Ms. G. A. Kuhnle  
Directorate of Fisheries  
Møllendalsveien 4  
Postboks 184  
5001 Bergen, Norway

Mr. J. G. Pope  
Fisheries Laboratory  
Pakefield Road  
Lowestoft, Suffolk, UK

ICSEAF

Dr. P. Kolarov  
Chairman, ICSEAF Standing  
Committee on Statistics  
Research Secretary  
Research Institute of Fisheries  
Boul. Chervenoarmeisky, 4  
9000-Varna, Bulgaria

Mr. R. B. Sacks  
Statistical Assistant  
International Commission for the  
Southeast Atlantic Fisheries  
Paseo de la Habana 65  
28036 Madrid, Spain

ICCAT

Mr. P. M. Miyake  
Assistant Executive Secretary  
International Commission for the  
Conservation of Atlantic Tunas  
C. Principe de Vergara, 17-7  
28001 Madrid, Spain

FAO

Mr. M. A. Robinson  
Senior Fishery Statistician  
Fishery Information, Data and  
Statistics Service (FIDI)  
Fisheries Department  
FAO  
Rome-00100, Italy

Ms. F. de Luca  
Fishery Statistician  
FIDI

Ms. A. Crispoldi  
Fishery Statistician  
FIDI

Mr. G. Marraffa  
Statistical Assistant  
FIDI

Mr. E. Laureti  
Statistical Clerk  
FIDI

Ms. B. Rusin  
Fishery Statistics Division  
Sea Fisheries Institute  
Al. Zjednoczenia, 1  
81 345 Gdynia, Poland

Mr. P. Duncan  
Dept. of Agriculture and  
Fisheries for Scotland  
Chesser House  
500 Gorgie Road  
Edinburgh EH11 3AW, Scotland

Mr. M. Perotti  
Statistical Assistant  
FIDI

Mr. G. Cagnacci  
Research Clerk  
FIDI

CONTENTS OF THE HANDBOOK OF FISHERY STATISTICS

Chapter	First Draft	Revised
Preface	X	X
Methodological notes	X	X
CWP and Member Agencies		
STATLANT system of questionnaires		
Time units	X	X
Countries and areas	X	X
Nationality	X	X
Currencies and funds	X	X
Fishing areas (basic concepts)	X	X
Fishing areas for statistical purposes	X	X
Weight (or mass) units	X	X
Conversion factors	X	
Identifiers for aquatic animals and plants	X	X
Trade classifications		
Supply balance sheets		
Fishermen statistics	X	
Fishing fleet classifications	X	
Fishing gear		
Fishing effort definitions	X	
Aquaculture statistics		
Acronyms and abbreviations	X	
Statistical publications		
STATLANT Newsletter	X	X

(X = Work completed)

LIST OF ACRONYMS USED IN THIS REPORT

ACFM	Advisory Committee on Fishery Management (ICES)
CCAMLR	Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources
CECAF	Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (FAO Regional Body)
CROMOS	EUROSTAT Database
CPPS	Comisión Permanente del Pacífico Sur
CWP	Coordinating Working Party on Atlantic Fishery Statistics
EC	European Communities
EIFAC	European Inland Fisheries Advisory Commission (FAO Regional Body)
EUROSTAT	Statistical Office of the European Communities
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FFA	Forum Fisheries Agency
FIDI	Fishery Information, Data and Statistics Service (FAO, Fisheries Department)
FISHDAB	Fishery Statistical Database (FAO, Fisheries Department)
GATT	General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade
GFCM	General Fisheries Council for the Mediterranean (FAO Regional Body)
GRT	Gross Registered Tonnage
IATTC	Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission
ICCAT	International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas
ICES	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea
ICJ	International Court of Justice
ICSEAF	International Commission for the Southeast Atlantic Fisheries
ILO	International Labour Office
IPFC	Indo-Pacific Fisheries Commission (FAO Regional Body)
IPTP	Indo-Pacific Tuna Programme (FAO Regional Body)
ISSCAAP	International Standard Statistical Classification of Aquatic Animals and Plants
NAFO	Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (previously ICNAF - International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries)
NIMEXE	Nomenclature of goods for the external trade statistics of the Community and statistics of trade between Member States (EC)
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
SPC	South Pacific Commission
STATLANT	STATistical Programme for ATLANTic Fisheries (previously STANA)
TAC	Total Allowable Catch

APPENDIX VI

CWP SESSIONS: DATES, PLACES AND REPORTS

CONTINUING WORKING PARTY ON FISHERY  
STATISTICS IN THE NORTH ATLANTIC AREA

FAO Fisheries  
Report No

1st Session	25-26 May 1960	Bergen, Norway	a/
2nd "	6-8 June 1961	Washington, DC, USA	b/
3rd "	18-21 March 1963	Rome, Italy	No 7
4th "	9-12 March 1965	Rome, Italy	No 21
5th "	10-14 April 1967	Aberdeen, Scotland	No 45

COORDINATING WORKING PARTY ON ATLANTIC  
FISHERY STATISTICS

6th Session	3-7 February 1969	Copenhagen, Denmark	No 70
7th "	10-16 November 1971	Rome, Italy	No 121
8th "	12-20 September 1974	Paris, France	No 156
9th "	17-23 August 1977	Dartmouth, Canada	No 197
10th "	22-29 July 1980	Madrid, Spain	No 242
11th "	21-28 July 1982	Luxembourg, Grand Duchy	No 274
12th "	25 Jul - 1 Aug 1984	Copenhagen, Denmark	No 316
13th "	11-18 February 1987	Rome, Italy	No 379

c/ 14th Session

- 
- a/ Annexe J of FAO Fisheries Report N.3
  - b/ Annexe K of FAO Fisheries Report No.3
  - c/ Proposals for the 14th Session as made by the CWP (13th Session)

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 13TH SESSION OF THE CWP

AGENDA ITEM 6: REPORT ON THE AD-HOC GLOBAL CONSULTATION ON TUNA STATISTICS, COLOMBO, 6-7 DECEMBER 1985

Para 6.5 p.11

The CWP felt the progress made by the Ad-Hoc Consultation on Global Tuna Statistics to be satisfactory, and recommended that the FAO continues the effort to organize a further meeting of the tuna agencies so that tuna statistics could be improved and discrepancies between databases of the agencies could be further reduced.

AGENDA ITEM 9: PRESENTATION OF THE DRAFT HANDBOOK OF FISHERY STATISTICS

Para 9.4 p.14

The participants recognized that, by its very nature, the handbook was likely to be subject to frequent updating. Consequently, the CWP recommended that FAO publish the handbook in loose-leaf format. In order to avoid unnecessary delay, it was further recommended that FAO should not wait for all sections to be written, but commence publication with those sections that were ready.

AGENDA ITEM 12: FISHING AREAS FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES

Para 12.4 p.17

Attention was drawn to the fact that the FAO Major Fishing Area 47 boundary does not correspond exactly either with the ICSEAF Convention Area or with the ICCAT boundary between the Atlantic and Indian Oceans. After discussion it was recommended that FAO should investigate the possibility of making the boundary of Fishing Area 47 coincide with that of the ICSEAF Convention Area or ICCAT. It was also recommended that FAO investigate the possibility of the Yearbook of Fishery Statistics including separately details of catches in ICSEAF Subareas 7 and 8 (FAO subareas 51.8 and 58.7).

AGENDA ITEM 13: NATIONALITY - EC ISSUES

Para 13.1 p.17

The representative of the EC Commission reported on the ruling of the European Court of Justice that the nationality of a landing should be determined by the nationality of the vessel performing the "essential part" of the fishing operation. The CWP recommended that the ruling of the Court should be incorporated in the definition of nationality.

AGENDA ITEM 14: PERIODICITY AND FORMAT OF CWP MEETINGS

Para 14.1 p.18

After thorough discussion the CWP decided that it was still necessary to hold a full CWP meeting attended by representatives from national statistical offices, in the same way as for recent sessions. It was agreed that such meetings should be held approximately every three years as a longer interval would lead to a loss of continuity. Five working days are probably sufficient to deal with all matters of interest. It was recommended, however, that consideration should be given to including users of the data, but that the participation should not grow so large as to inhibit free and informal discussion.

Para 14.2 p.18

It was noted, however, that since the problem of discrepancies was currently of high priority, more frequent meetings of small groups of agencies were recommended and agencies were requested to make budgetary provision for this. It was also agreed that the inter-agency meeting, normally held at the time of an ICES Statutory Meeting, should again be held in the present inter-sessional period.

AGENDA ITEM 15: FOOD BALANCE SHEETS

Para 15.7 p.20

The CWP recommended that intensive inter-agency discussions and consultations should be started in order to solve the problem of discrepancies in food balance sheets.

AGENDA ITEM 16: ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Para 16.2 p.20

At the 10th Session of the CWP, ICSEAF and ICES were asked to look at the breakdown of the ISSCAAP group of species 33 - Redfishes, basses, congers, etc., into more meaningful aggregations. Some suggestions were made, and it was recommended that FAO, in co-operation with these other agencies, look into a sensible disaggregation of Group 33.

