



联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations

Organisation des Nations
Unies pour l'alimentation
et l'agriculture

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная организация
Объединенных Наций

Organización de las
Naciones Unidas para la
Alimentación y la Agricultura

منظمة
الغذية والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES

Thirty-fourth Session

Rome, 13-17 July 2020

MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE JOINT TASK FORCE FOR INVESTIGATION OF THE PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A NEW SUB-COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES MANAGEMENT (JTF 2)

Executive Summary

This background document provides the background information for COFI/2020/10, PROPOSAL FOR A NEW SUB-COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES MANAGEMENT.

**Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of the Joint Task Force for Investigation of the Proposal to
Establish a New Sub-Committee on Fisheries Management (JTF 2)**

10:10-12:20, Friday, 14 June 2019, in Pakistan Room (A127)

Present: Annex 1

Discussion:

1. Adoption of the Provisional Agenda

The draft provisional agenda was adopted, as attached in **Annex 2**.

2. Introduction of the revised Non-Paper by the Secretariat

The Secretariat introduced the revised Non-Paper (**Annex 3**). He particularly called attention of meeting to the following points:

- The title of the potentially new sub-committee was now proposed as “Sub-Committee on Capture Fisheries”;
- The paper attempted to analyze Option A, “Enhancement the Utilization of the Existing Bodies” from Paragraph 6, with three sub-options, Option B, “To Rearrange the Terms of Reference of the Existing Two Sub-Committee” from Paragraph 21, and Option C, “To Create a Specific and New Sub-Committee” from Paragraph 26, from the aspect how the thematic areas of each Option are interrupted as well as based on the criteria required by the Conference, as prescribed in Paragraphs 33 and 34; and
- The table attached indicated themes to be addressed by the two existing sub-committees and the proposed new sub-committee in order to highlight how those areas interrupt and what are common areas.

3. Discussion and conclusion for BM 3 to further consideration

(1) The Representative of New Zealand questioned the basis of the analysis in Paragraphs 33 and 34 and pointed out that there is still not enough data or analysis for COFI to assess and decide on the new sub-committee against the framework directed by the Conference for any new Statutory Bodies. He also asked for further detail on the analysis of all options in paragraphs 32-34 against the criteria, and expressed that it appeared the analysis was based on a range of assumptions. For example, the assumption that representatives attending COFI meetings are not able to hold technical fisheries discussions and are only capable of high level policy level discussions (not the case for many delegations). This assumption inflates the estimated costs of holding the subcommittee back to back with the COFI meeting. He further mentioned potential

overlaps and duplication between the sub-committee on capture fisheries and COFI. He further expressed the concern of the high cost and time required to attend a third subcommittee for both developed and developing country members, and the risk of a resulting lack of representation at a new dedicated subcommittee. As a consequence New Zealand pointed out that there could be re-litigation of sub-committee recommendations at COFI resulting in a continuation of existing time constraints during COFI week. He suggested there could be more flexible approach such as holding a subcommittee meeting immediately after COFI, to be followed by an intersessional (electronic) work programme to enable sufficient time for FAO to provide technical advice back to COFI. Intersessional Conferences could also be held as necessary in order to promote and debate high priority issues, but these would have the advantage of not creating fixed costs like a subcommittee. He mentioned that all options needed more analysis.

The Representative of Chile underscored that the importance for her Regional Group was representation. Many countries could not send more than one officer to any sub-committee and for COFI, as well as they may not be able to stay more than five days. She also pointed out that the current sub-committees should be also evaluated based on the criteria listed in Paragraph 33, and the impact of the new sub-committee on the existing sub-committees and COFI should be identified.

The Representative of Norway expressed his agreement to the analysis made by the Secretariat and mentioned that only Option C could strengthen COFI. He underscored that the most important reason for proposing the new sub-committee was to make more synergy with COFI, and expressed his preference to Option C in this contest. As a realistic saving option, he proposed to shorten the length of the sub-committee to 3-4 days rather than a whole week. The same could be considered for the other two sub-committees. Also, a revision clause could be added in order to address the uncertainties other parties has expressed regarding a new sub-committee. A new sub-committee could be revised after a period of X sessions, and if it was deemed to not work well, it could be dissolved.

The Representative of Japan also agreed to need more synergy with COFI and mentioned that the government tried to analyze internally the feasibility of the proposal, but had not yet reached any specific idea. He said that he conceptually agreed to the Norwegian proposal, but still needed to analyze the feasibility of the options.

The Representative of Canada proposed more members in the on-going consultative process, and mentioned that she, in principle, supported the proposal to create the new sub-committee, but needed more analysis, in particular from the aspect of financial implications, such as who hosts the new sub-committee and, if FAO could organize the new sub-committee where no country could host the meeting.

The Representative of Brazil mentioned that the position of the government was still evolving, but echoed the concern with regard to representation, which is not only the matter of financial resources, but also human resources. She underscored that it was extremely important to ensure

representation in the sub-committee in order to guarantee legitimacy of the new committee's reports to be presented to COFI.

The Representative of the United States of America echoed the position expressed by the Representative of Canada.

The Secretariat replied to the questions made by the Representatives of New Zealand and explained that Options A and B had some cons, in particular representation to cover capture fisheries. He explained that potential problems of the back-to-back meetings with COFI were: 1) for COFI higher-level officers normally come and may not cover the technical discussions, and 2) in order to keep synergy between the work of sub-committees and COFI there needed some interval. With regard to the potential overlapping between the new sub-committee and COFI, he also mentioned that many of capture fisheries issues were not properly addressed by COFI. With regard to representation, he explained that he had made the analysis pros and cons based on a stand point of "average countries" and "majority of countries" could attend sub-committees and COFI. He also mentioned that participants in the current sub-committees tended to have very specific background in fish trade and aquaculture respectively, while participants in COFI might be more familiar with capture fisheries, but we should know how many countries were facing the problem of representation. He took note that we should elaborate better the paragraph on cross-check with the framework based on the criteria listed and the impact of any changes on COFI should be more emphasized. He also took note of the proposal made by the Representative of Chile to evaluate the existing sub-committees based on the same criteria. With regard to cost reduction he mentioned that it could be worth considering to use only three official languages for the session of the new sub-committee, even though this issue was sensitive. In terms of the FAO expenditure and work of the Secretariat, he mentioned that the matters listed as Terms of Reference of the new sub-committee had been already part of FAO's work and the Secretariat could use the already developed knowledge, which might not impose much additional burden.

The Representative of Chile mentioned that we all knew the importance of capture fisheries and COFI should address them more, but we could not do all and needed a balance and evaluation what is more important and crucial for us. She supported the Representative of Canada to broaden the participation in the process and questioned about the limited number of languages, which could be opposed by the Near East Group and some Members. She also requested a legal and administrative analysis with a time line and relevant statistical information on participation in the existing sub-committees.

The Representative of New Zealand also supported the broader participation in the process. He raised the issue of hosting the new sub-committee, which comes with substantial cost implications (of USD300-400,000 per meeting for the host), and pointed out the potential risk that if no host country is found, the options are for FAO to host in Rome at its own expense (as has happened with existing subcommittees) or there is no meeting in the year. New Zealand also questioned the statement that the new subcommittee would have no increased resourcing implications on the FAO fisheries team, adding that additional travel and briefings would impose increased cost. In terms of fund for developing countries, he questioned whether there was buy-

in from the top-producing fisheries countries to provide financing for the fund. He also pointed that problems for developing countries is not only the cost for participation but also the already busy regional meeting schedule such as those associated with participation in Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) at the regional level. He proposed to organize two days of the sub-committee meeting prior to, or after COFI with a subsequent intersessional work programme and/or focus on a more targeted agenda during COFI, rather than creating another body.

The Secretariat agreed that the new subcommittee would have increased time and cost implications for the FAO Fisheries team and these could be characterized in more detail.

The Representative of Norway disagreed to the proposal by the Representative of the New Zealand. Having a sub-committee meeting prior to COFI would not allow for enough time for COFI's participants to utilize the sub-committee work. In order to give COFI time to analyze and act upon work from a new sub-committee, its meetings should be held in the years when COFI does not have its meeting, just like with the existing sub-committees. He also mentioned that the new sub-committee could create more room for COFI to focus on strategic policy matters, as the technical discussions at the sub-committee level would already have been carried out. He also supported the broader participation in the process.

The Representative of Canada encouraged the FAO Secretariat to look at creative solutions, including perhaps considering making good use of regional forums, such as FAO Regional Conferences or RFMOs, if feasible and practical. This would not exclude holding discussions at the global level as well, if a cost-effective and inclusive solution of combining both regional and global discussions would be possible.

The Representative of Japan echoed the Representative of New Zealand and mentioned that RFMOs had a certain roles in policy discussions, and many island countries had already had interest in RFMOs. He proposed to analyze more in depth on what should be discussed in the new sub-committee for a creative solution, and should take account of the important role of RFMOs, which could reduce the amount of work by FAO.

The Representative of New Zealand pointed out that it is not necessarily to organize meetings with much time and cost for policy discussion during COFI, but we could prepare for it in more flexible manner and meet just prior and/or after COFI to enable more time for the policy discussions during COFI.

The Representative of Norway, in response to the Representative of Japan, mentioned that matters to be discussed at COFI would benefit from being discussed in a sub-committee rather than RFMOs, and gave some examples in that regard. He also expressed some reservation to organizing the meeting of the sub-committee back-to-back with the meetings of RFMOs, at least if it was to be a statutory demand. The host country would then have to host an RFMO-meeting in addition to the sub-committee meeting. He mentioned, in response to the Representative of New Zealand, that working on electronic platforms required quite advanced infrastructure in

order to run smoothly, and it would make participation from developing countries very difficult. This could especially have a negative impact on work being carried out on small-scale fisheries (SSF), which should be a permanent agenda item for the new sub-committee.

The Representative of New Zealand, in response to the Representative of Norway, mentioned that even a topic, such as SSF, could be addressed at the regional level through South-South Cooperation between different regions and supported the utilization of the existing regional mechanisms. He also echoed that it is not practical to organize the sub-committee back-to-back with the meetings of RFMOs.

The Secretariat expressed the usefulness of the new sub-committee in order to exchange regional experiences on SSF, for example, between the Pacific and Caribbean countries, but also the interest in utilizing the existing Regional Mechanisms such as the Regional Conferences. With regard to the regional approach, the Secretariat also referred to an example of the Committee on Forestry (COFO), where six Regional Forestry Commissions are integrated into the process.

The Representative of Chile expressed some difficulty to address fisheries related issues in the Regional Conferences because the representatives from countries are mainly agricultural experts.

The Representative of Norway underscored that COFI needs to emphasize more fisheries management in the global context and relevant technical discussion could add more value to COFI in this regard.

The Secretariat raised the issue of legitimacy again and questioned if the technical inputs from the existing sub-committees to COFI might be insufficient and there might be the lack of legitimacy, and if representation of the regions would be one of the essential criteria.

The Representative of New Zealand mentioned that if the region did not attend the sub-committees, the representatives of region in COFI could not express their regional views and context in the development of international frameworks/guidelines, which could undermine the work on developing sustainable fisheries at the regional level. This could be potential inefficiency in COFI, and therefore representation of all regions at sub-committees was essential.

The Representative of Brazil clarified that she had concerns about the multiplicity of meetings on fisheries and corresponding pressure on human resources, but at the same time understood the need to have more in depth discussion on some issues, such as SSF. She further affirmed that funding for participation might be one way to foster adequate representation.

The Representative of Canada pointed out that there seemed to be two issues related to the evaluation of the existing sub-committees: 1) their legitimacy, i.e. whether in the past their recommendations have been questioned by COFI due to insufficient representation in the sub-committee discussions; and 2) their impact and value, i.e. whether the sub-committee discussions have improved the quality of the discussion at COFI. She added that the answers to these two questions may help identify whether the issue lie mainly in the time and resources pressures resulting from that the increase from two to three sub-committees.

The Representative of New Zealand pointed out the difference between the existing sub-committees and the new sub-committee on capture fisheries, the latter of which has a much broader subject matter area that overlaps to a greater extent with the work of national and regional fisheries management bodies.

The Representative of Norway expressed that this was not an issue with the existing sub-committees under COFI and pointed out that there are also safety mechanisms in elaboration of the provisional agenda for COFI in the Bureau process where too sensitive topics are not accepted in the agenda, and during the COFI Meetings. Not reaching consensus on proposals is already common place in international fora, including COFI, and it is only to be expected that a new sub-committee from time to time will forward proposals that are not accepted by COFI.

The Secretariat also explained the role of technical discussion at the sub-committees and that any issues, on which there has not been any agreement, could be kept discussed more than one session and remained at the sub-committees level.

The Representative of the United States of America mentioned that the government were quite involved in not only COFI but also the existing two sub-committees, and more countries could represent if the relevant documents were circulated to all Members enough in advance and even countries, which could not be involved in the technical discussion at the sub-committees, could also make their preparation in the capitals and send appropriate technical officers to COFI.

4. Next meeting

No discussion was made under this agenda item.

5. Any other matters

No discussion was made under this agenda item.

(ANNEX 1)

**List of Participants in the 2nd Meeting of the Joint Task Force Meeting for Investigation of
Proposal to Establish a New Sub-Committee on Fisheries Management (JTF 2)**

14 June 2019
Pakistan Room (A127)

Members of JTF

Chile: Ms Tamara Villanueva

New Zealand: Mr Don Syme

Norway: Mr Kristoffer Bjørklund

Observers

Brazil: Ms Lucianara Fonseca

Canada: Ms Mi Nguyen

Japan: Mr Naohito Okazoe

The United States of America: Ms Sandrine Goffard

Secretariat

Mr Audun Lem, Mr Marcio CastroDeSouza (Secretary of the Sub-Committee on Fish Trade),
Ms Nicole Franz, Mr Marcelo Vasconcellos, Ms YoonJee Kim, Hiromoto Watanabe (Secretary
of COFI)

(ANNEX 2)

**Agenda for the 2nd Joint Task Force Meeting
for Investigation of Proposal to Establish a New Sub-Committee on Fisheries Management
(JTF 2)**

10:00-12:00 and 14:00-16:00 (or later if required), Friday, 14 June 2019
Pakistan Room (A127)

1. Adoption of the Provisional Agenda
2. Introduction of the revised Non-Paper by the Secretariat
3. Discussion and conclusion for BM 3 to further consideration
4. Next meeting
5. Any other matters

POSSIBLE OPTIONS OF HAVING COFI BODIES TO DEAL WITH “CAPTURE FISHERIES”

The 1st Meeting of the Joint Task Force (JTF 1)

1. The 1st Meeting of the Joint Task Force (JTF 1) for investigating possible options to establish a new Sub-Committee on fisheries management took place on 25 and 26 March 2019, with the presence of the representatives of Chile, New Zealand and Norway.
2. During its 1st meeting, the Joint Task Force reviewed several available options to cover the issue of capture fisheries – both informed by the Secretariat on its non- paper, as well as other possible options discussed during the meeting itself. Nevertheless, the Joint Task Force was not able to reach an agreement on a preferred and single option.
3. In this regard, the Joint Task Force requested the Secretariat to provide further analysis on the following three options for the coverage of the topic of “capture fisheries” by COFI:
 - To enhance the utilization of the existing bodies (COFI and the two sub-committees);
 - To rearrange the terms of reference of the existing two sub-committees; and
 - To create a specific and new sub-committee.
4. The analysis presented herein is based on pros and cons centered on the directions provided by FAO Conference regarding the creation of specialized bodies¹, and taking into consideration particularly the issue of costs to FAO and its members, including the ability of members to participate at the meetings and the particular needs of developing countries.
5. In addition, the Joint Task Force also instructed to assess possible funding options to ensure the participation of developing countries in the debate on capture fisheries in future sessions, regardless of the format to be adopted; the possibility of a built-in clause for general reevaluation of the new operational structure; and alternative options for the location of the meetings and meeting length considerations.

¹ New statutory bodies shall (1) be flexible task-oriented; (2) have time-bound working arrangements; (3) be strictly necessary; (4) be central to the FAO mandate and current priorities; (5) have clarity of the definition of the task; (6) have a positive impact at the level of FAO Members; (7) avoid overlap; (8) create synergy with the work of other bodies; (9) have an inclusive representation of countries; and (10) have an willingness of their members to contribute financially and through non-monetary inputs.
Source: <http://www.fao.org/3/W7475e/W7475e0f.htm#xv> and <http://www.fao.org/3/a-mo153e.pdf>

**A - Enhancement the Utilization of the Existing Bodies
(the FAO Committee on Fisheries -COFI and the two FAO Sub-committees –
Aquaculture and Fish Trade)**

6. In terms of enhancing the utilization of the existing bodies to deal with capture fisheries, the following options were foreseen during the meeting of the Joint Task Force:

- To have discussions on capture fisheries in a separate session back-to-back with the session of one of the sub-committees (A-1);
- To have discussions on capture fisheries in a separate session back-to-back with the session of COFI (A-2); and
- To keep the *status quo* and having the discussions on capture fisheries being carried out at the plenary session during COFI (A-3).

7. In order to analyze the first option (A-1) to have discussions on capture fisheries in a separate session back-to-back with the session of one of the sub-committees, it is necessary to analyze the advantages to attach such discussions to each of the two existing subcommittees.

8. The Sub-committee on Aquaculture embodies technical and policy matters only related to aquaculture, not including fisheries or trade. On the other hand, the Sub-committee on Fish Trade (COFI-FT) covers technical and economic aspects applicable to both aquaculture and capture fisheries.

9. However, the participation pattern of delegates from countries for those sessions of those two sub-committees are quite diverse between them and not necessarily have commonalities in relation to “capture fisheries”.

10. For example, the majority of country delegates attending the last sessions of the two sub-committees were experts of the related areas of each sub-committee – aquaculture, and trade and economics. Only a reduced number of countries sent delegates with specific knowledge on “capture fisheries” to one of the sub-committees.

11. In this regard, having any kind of discussion on “capture fisheries” back-to-back with the session of one of the sub-committees can generate two pragmatic results – either the country is able to send experts on both themes – “capture fisheries” and the specialization topic of one of the existing sub-committees or it will send experts in one area (either on the topics of the existing sub-committee or on “capture fisheries”).

12. The possibility of sending additional experts will have direct cost impacts, particularly for developing countries, and it can cause a reduced participation pattern of those countries in the discussion of one of the three main themes (aquaculture, trade and “capture fisheries”). It is important to observe that all three themes are important topics for developing countries, and many of them already participate in the existing sub-committees with some sort of financial support or reduced number of delegates.

13. On the other hand, taking into consideration the combination of “capture fisheries” to one of the already existing sub-committees, countries can start to reduce the expert participation on one of the covered topics (aquaculture, trade or the new area of “capture

fisheries”). The reduction of expert participation in any of these themes will generate a reduction of the *de facto* debate on the topic. When the delegate attending the meeting is not an expert on the general topic of the session, most probably only instructions from capital will be transmitted reducing the possibility of any solid, technical and inclusive debate. At the moment, taking into consideration the singularities of the sub-committees and the participation of experts from capital in the respective area of the expertise (aquaculture and trade), there is a natural tendency to foster the technical debate at a very specialized level, with fruitful results leading to important policy inputs to COFI.

14. In addition, if both current sub-committees already have one-week long sessions, it is foreseen that any back-to-back session may have implication in the number of items and the main topics covered by the current areas of the sub-committees. One week to cover the current themes (aquaculture or trade) plus additional topics on “capture fisheries” can have substantial implications in the deepness and lengthiness of appropriate topics leading to a proper technical debate.

15. In summary, the option of having discussions on capture fisheries in a separate session back-to-back with the session of one of the sub-committees will have basically three implications involving countries – when a country wants to keep its participation with a specific level of expertise at all the three big themed areas (aquaculture, fish trade and the new area of “capture fisheries”), it will face additional costs. This can be particular critical for developing countries with possible implications for reduced country participation in central topics of important areas. In addition, creating a back-to-back session will also reduce the number of days and the topic coverage of the associated areas of the existing two sub-committees.

16. The second option (A-2) of having discussions on capture fisheries in a separate session back-to-back with the session of COFI will have the same basic specialization and cost implications listed for the sub-committees. Either countries will face additional costs in their delegation to have experts covering “capture fisheries” or they will have non-specialized delegates covering it, with all the corollary of reduced technical debate.

17. However, this option will bring an addition disadvantage – the absence of time for the preparation of follow-up deliberations to be submitted to COFI. The existing schedule of the sessions of the sub-committees are set in a way that their sessions are not coincidental with the year that the session of COFI takes place. The reason for this year intersectional period between the sessions of the two subcommittees and COFI is the intrinsic nature of these bodies. While COFI can be seen, by its terms of reference, as a policy decision body, the sub-committees are technical *fora* in which all the necessary specialized debate takes place in order to set agreed and policy oriented inputs for the analysis of COFI.

18. Therefore, it is necessary a time gap between the technical sessions of the sub-committees and COFI in order to allow FAO Secretariat to prepare the necessary actions of the follow-ups of the debates, recommendations and endorsements of the countries at the sub-committee level to be reported or submitted to COFI. The sub-committees are the technical pillars of COFI, where all technical debate takes place. With this option of backing-to-backing the debate on “capture fisheries” to COFI, any necessary action to be submitted to COFI will take two years, taking into consideration the absence of any preparatory time between the technical session on “capture fisheries” and the session of COFI, which will

happen immediately after the session on “capture fisheries”. This time length poses a considerable constraint for the proper analysis, debate and policy orientation of COFI.

19. The third option (A-3) listed within this framework (“to keep the *status quo* and having the discussions on capture fisheries being carried out at the plenary session during COFI”) is in line with the current functioning of COFI. However, this option also poses problems.

20. First, this option have the potential to limit the debate on “capture fisheries” and/or to reduce the level of representation of country delegates to COFI. When analyzing this option, it is important to recall the general policy orientation of COFI. Based upon its terms of reference, COFI was set to be a policy-oriented body – it is remarkable the level of representation of ministers or the main leading senior officer in charge of fisheries at the country level representing their countries at many sessions of COFI. Inflating the agenda of the sessions of COFI with a specialized debate on “capture fisheries” can have the effect of increasing the number of agenda items covering non policy-oriented issues, creating an incentive of having countries sending experts instead of the senior officials or the main officer in charge of fisheries to foster a policy oriented debate.

To Rearrange the Terms of Reference of the Existing Two Sub-Committees

21. As mentioned before, the Sub-committee on Aquaculture is associated with technical and policy matters only related to aquaculture and the Sub-committee on Fish Trade (COFI-FT) covers technical and economic aspects applicable to both aquaculture and capture fisheries.

22. The theme of “capture fisheries” brought to any of the sub-committees will have strong implications. Any body dealing specifically with “capture fisheries” shall concentrate its discussions on the long-term conservation and sustainable use of fisheries resources, including small-scale fishers and related FAO instruments.

23. Therefore, there are no minimum similarities on the areas to be covered to bring the theme of “capture fisheries” to any of the sub-committees. In the area of aquaculture, “capture fisheries” has a completely different core scientific approach. Although both of the areas will be dealing with the resources (cultivation or wild capture), there are no minimum commonalities from a technical point of view.

24. On the other hand, in the area of trade, the current sub-committee deals with both aquaculture and wild capture. However, the approach is completely different from “capture fisheries”, since the Sub-Committee on Fish Trade can be seen as a “post-harvest” body, which presents a considerably different approach from a resource perspective.

25. In addition, any change of the terms of reference of any current sub-committee, despite the incompatibilities enumerated above, will bring the same problems of country representation and cost implications, as previously discussed in option A.

To Create a Specific and New Sub-Committee

26. The creation of a specific sub-committee to deal with “capture fisheries” will have a positive aspect of setting a balance between the covered areas of the current themed areas of the sub-committees of COFI. Aquaculture and “capture fisheries” as two separate and different sub-committees will cover the production side taking into consideration two areas with completely different production patterns. On the other hand, the sub-committee on fish trade, will deal with the singularities of post-harvest issues involving products originated from both wild capture and aquaculture – with direct implications for both aquaculture and “capture fisheries”, but with no overlapping.

27. However, the creation of a third sub-committee will also impose costs for the countries in terms of participation in an additional session, as well as additional preparation time for FAO Secretariat.

28. Nevertheless, countries will be able to send specific experts delegates to deal with “capture fisheries” – with no overlapping with aquaculture or trade.

29. The cost implication will be no different for the previous options for countries opting to send experts on “capture fisheries” to back-to-back sessions or expanded aquaculture or trade sub-committees.

30. The creation of a new sub-committee, even with costs implications, will have the benefit of devoting a specific session only for the discussion of theme related issues associated with “capture fisheries”, which is central for many countries, including developed countries.

31. In this regard, one possibility of reducing the burden for developing countries in participating in additional session of a new sub-committee would be the possibility of the top developed country producers of capture fish setting a specific mechanism allowing to cover the costs of the participation of a specific number of developing countries in the first 5 sessions of the new-subcommittee (10 years).

32. The issue of additional workload for FAO Secretariat has a multiplicity of dimensions and can be seen as a relative problem. The main technical work to be carried out by the Secretariat will be equivalent to the current one, since the allocated time will be the same of the current time already devoted to prepare the issues on “capture fisheries” presented to COFI. However, the administrative work involved in the preparation of the session, as well as follow-up issues after the session, will be increased for both Professional and General Staff.

Conference Framework for New Bodies

33. Analyzing the framework directed by the Conference^{2 3} for any new Statutory Bodies, all the options previously analyzed (A, B and C) for the theme of “capture fisheries” seem to fulfill the following conditions:

² <http://www.fao.org/3/W7475e/W7475eOf.htm#xv> and

³ <http://www.fao.org/3/a-mo153e.pdf>

- flexible task-oriented;
- time-bound working arrangements;
- strictly necessary; and
- central to the FAO mandate and current priorities.

34. However, for options A and B, taking into consideration the cost implication of participation of developing countries, combined with the biased problem of expert participation leading to an unbalanced debate between the topics of the two existing sub-committees or the policy-oriented pattern of COFI and the theme of “capture fisheries”, the following framework conditions set by the Conference are not completely satisfied:

- clarity of the definition of the task;
- positive impact at the level of FAO Members;
- avoidance of overlap;
- creation of synergy with the work of other bodies;
- inclusive representation of countries

35. The option of the creation of a new sub-committee seems to cover all the requirements set by the Conference, provided that some mechanism is implemented in order to facilitate the attendance of developing countries in the sessions.

Terms of Reference of the New Areas to be Covered

36. The Joint Task Force (JTF 1) agreed on the following terms of reference for “capture fisheries”, either to be adjusted in one of the existing sub-committees or to be set as a new stand-alone one (the text is provided as a new sub-committee to provide a better understanding of substantive parts of the terms of reference):

Subcommittee on Fisheries

The Subcommittee shall provide for consultation and discussion on fisheries issues, advising COFI and the work to be performed by the Organization on related technical and policy matters.

In particular, the Subcommittee shall:

- identify and discuss major issues and trends in global capture fisheries and development determine those issues and trends of international importance requiring action in the domain of capture fisheries, within the particular framework of food security, economic development, small-scale fisheries and poverty alleviation;
- support, assist and provide a technical forum for countries and observers engaged in capture fisheries to discuss and implement measures for the long-term conservation and sustainable use of fisheries resources, within an appropriate policy, legal and institutional framework;
- recommend international action to address capture fisheries and development needs and, in this regard (1) to advise on mechanisms to prepare, facilitate and implement action programmes identified, as well as on the expected

contribution of partners; (2) to advise on the liaison with other relevant groups and organizations with a view to promoting harmonization and endorsing policies and actions, as appropriate; (3) to advise on the strengthening of international collaboration to assist developing countries in the implementation of FAO instruments in the domain of capture fisheries, particularly the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, and against IUU fisheries, such as the Voluntary Guidelines for Flag State Performance and PSMA; ;

- promote and review small-scale fisheries related matters, including the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication
- advise on the preparation of technical reviews and of issues and trends of international significance in the domain of capture fisheries;
- collaborate and provide inputs to the Subcommittee on Fish Trade on issues linking capture fisheries and trade; and
- address any specific matters relating to fisheries referred to it by its Members, the Committee on Fisheries or the Director-General of FAO.

Built-In Revision Clause

37. Regardless of the option adopted, taking into consideration the nuances of the theme of “capture fisheries”, it is suggested that the way the new topic is being addressed shall be revised after a period of 5 sessions (10 years).

Summary of Themes Associated with Aquaculture, Capture Fisheries and Trade

38. In order to facilitate the mapping of major themes associated with aquaculture, capture fisheries and trade, the following non-exhaustive thematic table is presented:

SUMMARY OF THEMES ASSOCIATED WITH AQUACULTURE, CAPTURE FISHERIES AND TRADE

THEME	CAPTURE FISHERIES	AQUACULTURE	TRADE	OTHER
Status and trends of global fish stocks	X			
Fisheries management	X			
Policy and regulatory frameworks (global and regional)	X			
Fisheries and biodiversity conservation	X			
Ecosystem approach	X	X		
Small-scale fisheries	X			
Fishing communities	X			
Inland fisheries	X			Advisory Committee on Fisheries Research
Marine fisheries	X			Advisory Committee on Fisheries Research
Fisheries statistics	X	X	X	Coordinating Working Party on Fisheries Statistics
Fisheries research	X			Advisory Committee on Fisheries Research
Ocean governance	X		X	
IUU fishing	X		X	
Climate change	X			Advisory Committee on Fisheries Research
Fleet information	X			
Global aquaculture development		X		
Capture production information	X		X	
Aquaculture production information		X	X	
Progressive Management Pathway		X		
Aquaculture better management practices		X		
Trade information			X	
Consumption information			X	
Prices information			X	
Employment information	X	X	X	
Socio-economic analysis of fisheries			X	
Socio-economic analysis of aquaculture			X	
Technology development	X	X		
Fish processing			X	
Food safety			X	
Fishery commodity markets			X	
International trade of fish and fishery products			X	
International standards and certification			X	
Harmonization of quality control and inspection procedures and regulations			X	
Economically-viable fishery commodity development			X	