



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

**5th Meeting of the Working Group on the Proposal of the Establishment of the Sub-Committee on Fisheries Management
(WG 5)**

20 April 2022

Revised Matrix for Analysing Different Options

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- This document is a revision of WG4/3 based on the discussion at WG 4.

List of Options¹

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

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 while the other two to be held in person.

Sub-Option A-6: Two of the three Sub-Committees to be held intersessionally on a rotational basis.²

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

OPTION E: To hold a WG for a specific topic (s) related to fishery management and COFI will review the results of the WG and decide whether SCFM will be established or continue to use a WG for specific topics

¹ Please note that whichever option will be selected, an extra-budgetary funding will be required, which shall include support for participation from developing countries to the same degree as past Sub-Committee meetings.

² For example, if COFI 35 decides to hold SCA and SCFM between COFI 35 and COFI 36, SCFT and either SCA or SCFM will be held between COFI 36 and COFI 37.

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)			
- 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.

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. 	

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. 	

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 (see Appendix 1)			
- 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
Sub-Option A-6: SCFM will be established and two out of the three Sub-Committees to be held intersessionally (see Appendix 1)			
- No additional cost		SCFM can be established without causing additional burden on Members	- One of the Sub-Committees will not be held intersessionally. The subjects which would have been discussed at the Sub-Committee may take more time 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 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.
OPTION E: To hold a WG for a specific topic (s) related to fishery management and COFI will continue to discuss whether SCFM should be established or continue to use a WG for specific topics while finding ways to conduct COFI in a more efficient manner to give more time to discussion on issues related to fishery management (see Appendix 2 for further details)			
- Same as Option D	- Same as Option D	- In addition to the pros of Option D, COFI can analyze the utility of WG.	- Same as Option D

³ This option could be further divided into Sub-option D-1 (a physical meeting) and D-2 (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.

(Appendix 1)

Supplementary explanation and analysis of A-5 and A-6

1. Difference between A-5 and A-6

Illustrative example of holding Sub-Committee meetings under A-5 and A-6

	COFI35	COFI36	COFI37	COFI38
A-5	SCA (in-person) SCFT (in-person) SCFM (virtual)	SCA (in-person) SCFT (virtual) SCFM (in-person)	SCA (virtual) SCFT (in-person) SCFM (in-person)	
A-6	SCA (in-person) SCFT (in-person)	SCA (in-person) SCFM (in-person)	SCFT (in-person) SCFM (in-person)	

2. Further analysis on the feasibility and merits of A-6

(1) Merits of A-6

It is well noted that one of the main reasons for some groups to oppose establishment of SCFM is that the number of international meetings will increase. The merit of A-6 is exactly to address this concern by keeping the number of Sub-Committee meetings at the current level. On the other hand, it should be recalled that one of the fundamental reasons why SCFM should be established is that COFI cannot have enough time to consider policy issues related to fishery management. This problem would remain at COFI if SCA and SCFT are held during the preceding intersessional period. Also, if SCA and SCFM are held, for example, COFI would have to spend more time on fish trade related issues.

(2) Selection of the two Sub-committee meetings to be held intersessionally

In case that the rotation system will be used to select two Sub-Committee meetings, it may not be so difficult for COFI 35 to choose the two Sub-Committee meetings to be held in the following intersessional period because it is natural to hold the two existing ones first, i.e., SCA and SCFT. Then, COFI 36 must choose either SCA or SCFT, which may be difficult.

If the rotation system is not used and the two meetings must be picked up, considering the various factors, it will be very difficult for COFI to decide which two meetings should be held for each intersessional period.

(APPENDIX 2)**Details of Option E**

In the case that the WG on the Proposal of the Establishment of the Sub-Committee on Fisheries Management (hereinafter called “the WG on SCFM”) will recommend Option E (the WG on SCFM can recommend other options, too), the following process should take place:

Prior to COFI 35

(1) The WG on SCFM could pick up and recommend to COFI 35 a specific topic(s) related to fishery management to be discussed at the first WG to be held between COFI 35 and COFI 36.

At COFI 35

(2) COFI 35 could decide to hold the WG with a specific topic(s) related to fishery management (WG1), taking into account the topics recommended by the WG on SCFM, if any. At the same time, COFI 35 should establish another WG to consider how to conduct COFI meetings in a more efficient manner (WG2).

Between COFI 35 and COFI 36

(3) If an extra-budgetary funding becomes available, WG1 with that topic will be held. WG2 will be held (presumably several times) and interpretation service will be provided subject to the funding availability.

At COFI 36

(4) COFI 36 will review the results of WG1 and decide whether it will: (i) establish SCFM; (ii) continue to use WG1 for a specific topic(s) related to fishery management; or (iii) neither establish SCFM nor hold a WG1 meeting. COFI 36 will also consider recommendations from WG2 and decide actions as appropriate.