



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
الأغذية والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

2nd Meeting of the Working Group on the Proposal of the Establishment of the Sub-Committee on Fisheries Management (WG 2)

20 September 2021

Matrix for Analysing Different Options

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- This document analyses the options, including those discussed in WG 1. Please note that some of the options have been modified from those included in the background document submitted to WG1 and some new options have been added.

List of Options

OPTION A: To create a specific and new Sub-Committee on Fisheries Management (SCFM)

Sub-Option A-1: SCFM to be hosted by a Member

Sub-Option A-1bis: SCFM to be hosted by a Member with virtual participation by Members unable to attend it physically (hybrid)

Sub-Option A-2: SCFM to be held in Rome (could be a back-up for A-1 in case of no host)

Sub-Option A-3: SCFM to be held in Rome with virtual participation by Members unable to attend it physically (hybrid)

Sub-Option A-4: SCFM to be conducted virtually on a trial basis to see if there are many agenda items to be discussed

Sub-Option A-5: One of the three sub-committees to be held virtually on a rotational basis

OPTION B: To enhance the utilization of the existing bodies (COFI and the two Sub-Committees)

Sub-Option B-1: To have discussions on fisheries management in a separate session back-to-back with the session of one of the Sub-Committees

Sub-Option B-2: To have a discussion on fisheries management in a separate session back-to-back with the session of COFI, with a shortened period of the session of COFI, if necessary

Sub-Option B-3: To keep the status quo and having the discussion on fisheries management being carried out the plenary session during COFI

OPTION C: To keep two sub-committees, but rearrange the Terms of Reference of COFI and its two Sub-Committees

Sub-Option C-1: SCFT will be converted to the SCFM. SCA and SCFM will deal with trade-related issues, respectively

Sub-Option C-2: SCA will be converted to the Sub-Committee on Fisheries Management and Aquaculture (SCFMA) while keeping SCFT

OPTION D: To establish a working group under COFI to discuss specific topics related to fishery management

Financial Cost (please see Annex for detailed estimates)	Other costs/feasibility (time, human resources, etc.)	Substance (elements affecting the quality of discussion)	
		Pros	Cons
OPTION A: To create a specific and new Sub-Committee on Fisheries Management (SCFM)¹			
- New costs for (1) document preparation (FAO), (2) translation of documents (FAO or the host Member), and (3) Session interpretation (FAO or the host Member)	- New time and human resource allocation for document preparation by FAO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Substantive discussion can take place on issues related to fisheries management and small-scale fisheries, including sufficient allocated time (sufficient time for discussion). - Technical discussions can occur in an appropriate body leaving COFI for policy decisions when topics have been exhaustively debated at the sub-committee level. - Identification of Member officials in charge of those topics to create an important network, particularly to follow-up in the inter-sessional period 	- Difficult for some Members to attend it due to conflicts with existing meetings, lack of personnel to attend an additional international meeting, or lack of funds, leading to possible reduced participation.

¹ Option A has been divided into sub-options (A-1, A-1bis, A-2 and A-3) based on the modality of the meeting. Also, the previous Option D has been moved here as A-4.

Financial Cost (please see Annex for detailed estimates)	Other costs/feasibility (time, human resources, etc.)	Substance (elements affecting the quality of discussion)	
		Pros	Cons
Sub-Option A-1: SCFM to be hosted by a Member			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Logistic costs borne by the host, including meeting venue and meals, FAO Secretariat transportation costs, among others - Possible additional costs to be covered by the host involving a travel of selected developing Members on an <i>ad-hoc</i> basis - New travel costs incurred by Members to send their delegates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to find the host for each session 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The host country can have the possibility of showcasing one success story involving fisheries management to other participants of the Sub-Committee. This aspect can have a result in the session discussions and future replication in different Members. 	
Sub-Option A-1bis: SCFM to be hosted by a Member with virtual participation by Members unable to attend it physically (hybrid)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Logistic costs borne by the host, including meeting venue and meals, FAO Secretariat transportation costs, among others - Possible additional costs to be covered by the host involving a travel of selected developing Members on an <i>ad-hoc</i> basis - New travel costs incurred by Members opting to send their delegates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to find the host for each session 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The host country can have the possibility of showcasing one success story involving fisheries management to other participants of the Sub-Committee. This aspect can have a result in the session discussions and future replication in different Members. - Some Members can opt to participate in the meeting without traveling (Enhanced participation). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hybrid events can create unbalances between the level of interaction between the participation of Members, mainly when a specific topic is being discussed with multiple views and a consensus-driven approach is needed (inequality in participation).

Financial Cost (please see Annex for detailed estimates)	Other costs/feasibility (time, human resources, etc.)	Substance (elements affecting the quality of discussion)	
		Pros	Cons
Sub-Option A-2: SCFM to be held in Rome (could be a back-up for A-1 in case of no host)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New logistics cost entirely borne by FAO - New travel costs incurred by Members to send their delegates 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considering that the session would be developed at FAO HQ, participating countries would have the possibility to meet with more FAO officials not usually attending sub-committee sessions. This would allow exploring additional issues associated with fisheries management having positive corollaries for national development and the overall discussion during the session. 	
Sub-Option A-3: SCFM to be held in Rome with virtual participation by Members unable to attend it physically (hybrid)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New logistics cost entirely borne by FAO - New travel costs incurred by Members opting to send their representatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hybrid meeting problems associated with diverse presence status of Members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some Members can opt to participate in the meeting without traveling (Enhanced participation). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hybrid events can create unbalances between the level of interaction between the participation of Members, mainly when a specific topic is being discussed with multiple views and a consensus-driven approach is needed (inequality in participation).

Financial Cost (please see Annex for detailed estimates)	Other costs/feasibility (time, human resources, etc.)	Substance (elements affecting the quality of discussion)	
		Pros	Cons
Sub-Option A-4: SCFM to be conducted virtually on a trial basis to see if there are many agenda items to be discussed			
- New logistics cost entirely borne by FAO, but lower than compared with a physical meeting		- Members can participate in the meeting without traveling (enhanced participation)	- In-depth discussion may be difficult (limits of virtual communication).
Sub-Option A-5: One of the three sub-committees to be held virtually on a rotational basis ²			
- New logistics cost entirely borne by FAO for the virtual one, but lower than compared with a physical meeting	- Rotation arrangements can create additional difficulties to organize the schedule of possible hosting countries for the already established two sub-committees	- Members can participate in the meeting without traveling when the meeting is virtual (Enhanced participation)	- In-depth discussion may be difficult when the meeting is virtual (Limits of virtual communication) - Problems in the continuation of specific topics at the sub-committee level, when the discussion initially started in a physical environment and will be conducted in a virtual environment - Periodical changes of the working routines and preparation schedules of the sub-committee being conducted virtually

² This option has been newly added.

Financial Cost (please see Annex for detailed estimates)	Other costs/feasibility (time, human resources, etc.)	Substance (elements affecting the quality of discussion)	
		Pros	Cons
OPTION B: To enhance the utilization of the existing bodies (COFI and the two Sub-Committees)			
	- New time and human resource allocation for document preparation by FAO	- Discussion can occur on fisheries management and small-scale fisheries (specific time for discussion).	- Keeping the current Terms of Reference of the two existing sub-committees, any topic enhancement can create misalignments with the activities foreseen initially for each sub-committee. If the topic enhancement is concentrated towards COFI, a possible decline in policy discussion can occur considering technical debates in plenary.
Sub-Option B-1: To have discussions on fisheries management in a separate session back-to-back with the session of one of the Sub-Committees			
- Increased logistic costs borne by the host - New costs for (1) document preparation (FAO), (2) translation of documents (FAO or the host Member), and (3) Session interpretation (FAO or the host Member) - Possible additional travel costs by Members if different experts are needed or if the total duration is more than five days	- The host Member could be willing to host a session on trade or aquaculture, but not necessarily on fisheries management — an implication of additional logistic costs at no choice for the host Member.		- Participants to SCA and SCFT may be different from those for SCFM. This may lead to a lack of experts in aquaculture or trade if an expert on fishery management should attend either of the meetings, resulting in a less active debate at SCA or SCFT (Mismatch of expertise). - If the total duration is not extended, there would be less coverage of topics for SCA or SCFT (Lack of time).

Financial Cost (please see Annex for detailed estimates)	Other costs/feasibility (time, human resources, etc.)	Substance (elements affecting the quality of discussion)	
		Pros	Cons
Sub-Option B-2: To have a discussion on fisheries management in a separate session back-to-back with the session of COFI, with a shortened period of the session of COFI, if necessary			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased logistic costs borne by FAO - New costs for FAO involving (1) document preparation, (2) translation of documents, and (3) Session interpretation - Possible additional travel costs by Members if different experts are needed or if the total duration is more than five days 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The allocation of staff time and the production of working documents on fisheries management can be substantially affected due to the COFI preparation phase. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the duration of those meetings is more than five days, it is more difficult to attend them (Lack of participation). - If the duration of those meetings is five days, the degree of discussion may not be satisfactory (Lack of time). - Any technical decision on fisheries management will have to wait two years before being submitted to COFI. (Lack of time). - No possibility of having the results of the discussions on fisheries management to feed COFI.
Sub-Option B-3: To keep the status quo and having the discussion on fisheries management being carried out at the plenary session during COFI			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could be a viable option only if the time for aquaculture and fish trade issues during COFI is shortened without undermining the quality of the discussion. This would require the elimination of duplication in discussion between SCA, SCFT, and COFI. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considering COFI as a policy governing body, have technical issues discussed in detail in its plenary session can take time from policy discussions and create an incentive of less participation of senior officials at their sessions - Not easy to conduct technical discussion on fisheries management as policy-oriented discussion takes place at COFI.

Financial Cost (please see Annex for detailed estimates)	Other costs/feasibility (time, human resources, etc.)	Substance (elements affecting the quality of discussion)	
		Pros	Cons
OPTION C: To keep two sub-committees, but rearrange the Terms of Reference of COFI and its two Sub-Committees			
- Additional cost if the meeting duration increases		- Discussion can occur on fisheries management and small-scale fisheries (Certain time for discussion).	
Sub-Option C-1: SCFT will be converted to the SCFM. SCA and SCFM will deal with trade-related issues, respectively			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most of the trade topics cannot be decoupled between aquaculture and capture fisheries. They are trade topics affecting fisheries and aquaculture products equally, regardless of their origin. - Discussing trade of aquaculture and fisheries products on separate occasions may not be optimal. (Ineffective discussion) - Participants to SCA and SCFM may not be familiar with trade. This may result in less active debate on trade issues. (Mismatch of expertise).
Sub-Option C-2: SCA will be converted to the Sub-Committee on Fisheries Management and Aquaculture (SCFMA) while keeping SCFT			
		- The current degree of discussion will be maintained on trade issues.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some Members may have to send both experts on fisheries management and aquaculture to SCFMA. If Members have to choose either an expert on fisheries management or an aquaculture expert, this may result in a less active debate at SCFMA (Mismatch of expertise). - Less time will be available for discussion on aquaculture (Lack of time).

Financial Cost (please see Annex for detailed estimates)	Other costs/feasibility (time, human resources, etc.)	Substance (elements affecting the quality of discussion)	
		Pros	Cons
OPTION D: To establish a working group under COFI to discuss specific topics related to fishery management³			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Logistic costs borne by the host - New costs for FAO involving (1) document preparation, (2) translation of documents, and (3) interpretation - Possible additional costs to be covered by the host involving a travel of selected developing Members on an <i>ad-hoc</i> basis - New travel costs incurred by Members to send their delegates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New time and human resource allocation for document preparation by FAO - Less resource is required compared to a sub-committee meeting if the number of topics is fewer than that for the Sub-committee. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Substantive discussion can occur on specific topics related to fisheries management and small-scale fisheries (Sufficient time for discussion). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Difficult for some Members to attend it due to conflicts with existing meetings, lack of personnel to attend an additional international meeting, or lack of funds, leading to possible reduced participation.

³ Previously, the working group would be established under one of the sub-committees, but this has been changed to COFI. This option could be further divided into Sub-option D-1 (a physical meeting), D-2 (a hybrid of a physical and virtual meeting) and D-3 (a virtual meeting). To avoid further complication of this document, these options are not provided here, but such analysis could be similar to those of Option A.