COORDINATING WORKING PARTY ON FISHERY STATISTICS
Twenty-third Session
Hobart, Tasmania. 22-26 February 2010
Intersessional Meeting – 2008 (Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada July 8-9 2008)
Author: CWP Secretariat

COORDINATING WORKING PARTY ON FISHERY STATISTICS (CWP)
Inter-Sessional Meeting -- 2008
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada July 8-9 2008
Report

1. Opening and Welcome, logistic arrangements

The CWP Chair, Dr Joanne Fischer, opened the Meeting and welcomed participants (Attachment 1). A Google Groups site was set up for participants to deposit papers, presentations, comments and detailed discussion points. This will allow the participating organizations who could not attend to view the meeting contributions.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

Two items, "4.1 Data requirement for ecosystem assessment" and "4.2 Data requirement for assessing fishery impacts on environments", were proposed to be inserted under Agenda 4. With the understanding that the content would be covered under newly inserted agendas, it was agreed to remove "Agenda Item 3.4 Data collection on fishery regulations and their impacts on monitoring indicators (e.g. area closures, outputs/inputs limitations, ITQ)". CWP Secretary asked to include "Revision of CWP Handbook" under "6.5 Any other business". With those amendments, the Agenda was adopted (Attachment 2).

3. Standardization of MCS-related data and their utilization in monitoring indicators

The CWP Secretary, Sachiko Tsuji, briefly summarized the range of data collected under Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) schemes of fishery. MCS generally collects huge amount of very detailed data by its nature and until recently, the utilization of those data has been restricted for fishery management purposes by flag country and/or management organizations. Recently, increased number of countries and organizations started investigating sharing and full utilization of those information. Discussion was focused along the CWP mandates, e.g. on appropriate utilization, guideline, standardization of data format, rules need for data sharing etc.

3.1. VMS information

The Chair stressed the potential of VMS information as a scientific tool and indicated that a better understanding of VMS and data standardization were key issues. Two presentations were given under this topic.

Gylfi Geirsson of the Icelandic coast guard, an invited expert by NAFO, presented the FAO work collecting the information on VMS implementation through questionnaires. He also introduced the Icelandic consolidated MCS system developed for vessel safety monitoring, where VMS transmission down to every few seconds are used to monitor vessel movement. The questionnaire distributed contained 22 sections plus header and footer in an Excel sheet. Each section contained several questions, most of them to be answered "Yes" or "NO". The Questionnaire was sent out in 3 languages, English, Spanish and France, with explanatory Annexes. The Questionnaire was transmitted to 163 states and 26 organisations, out of which 83 states and 14 organisations replied, i.e. response rate as 51 %, quite high as this type of survey, even including some replies with misunderstandings, in accurate answer as well as un-answered questions. The data will be imported into database for further analyses but a very basic preliminary evaluation indicated an operational aspect of VMS, who is planning to do so and who is not, and data exchanging with other states as well as with RFMOs.

George Campanis of NAFO made a presentation entitled “NAFO Advances in VMS Analyses. Advancements in VMS data analyses”. Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) is primarily considered a monitoring, control and surveillance tool; however, fisheries scientists are beginning to realize the potential of VMS data. Furthermore, science is indirectly served by improvements in compliance i.e. better monitoring means better data, and better data leads to better science. VMS data provides insight into adherence to regulation, fishing footprints, effort statistics, and temporal and spatial changes in fishing distribution. It is expected that current entry-exit catch (COE-COX) reports will become more complete in the coming years due to VMS software improvements. Although this would be a step forward, these reports would not allow for a more detailed assessment of catch and effort. Valuable assessment information on catch composition (bycatch, discards, undersize), gear type and actual fishing duration based on a directed species, is forgone. Employing daily catch reports or electronic logbook transmissions would remedy many of the aforementioned shortcomings reports and provide fisheries managers and scientist with a viable source for CPUE and stock assessment. Speed (SP) and course (CO) is not currently transmitted as part of VMS (POS) position reports. Determining when a vessel is fishing is vital in assessing effort. The VMS does not explicitly identify when a vessel is fishing therefore speed is required. Due to the inherent introduction of error caused by inferring speed, it is recommended that speed be included in all position reports submitted to VMS. It is expected that by receiving speed and increasing the frequency of position reports to 1 hour (currently 2 hours), aggregate fishing-time accuracy can be increased to ~90%. Transmission of course would further increase accuracy, as changes in vessel direction would also be considered using the mean length of the vector (MLV) of consecutive position reports.

There was general recognition on potential values of VMS data for scientific purposes, especially for analyses requiring geo-referenced fisheries data with high resolution including spatial planning and assessment of ecosystem impacts. To date, the usage of VMS data for scientific purposes is rather limited but it is clear that there the data hold considerable scientific potential. It was noted that VMS data often had confidentiality constraints in dealing with vessel identification as well as access to raw data. Missing direct link with key parameters such as gears also limited the value of the current form of VMS data for scientific usage. It was noted that the primary objective of VMS was enforcement whose design was not necessarily most suitable for scientific purpose.

Participating organizations currently had different rules on access and utilization of VMS data. NEAFC and NAFO used summarized VMS data for scientific purpose after converting vessel identification into anonymous. In CCAMLR and IATTC, VMS data was purely for compliance purpose and would not be passed to Secretariats, however, observers, and electronic catch reporting in the case of CCAMLR, would provide detailed geo-reference data of fishery operations. Legal, political and diplomatic aspects of raw VMS data were also noted.

The issue of frequency of position transmission from the VMS was also discussed. Iceland uses transmission down to every few seconds, while NAFO requirement is transmission every 2 hours. It was noted that higher resolution would be essential when used for maritime security and/or monitoring individual vessel behaviors, for example, relating to area closures. On the other hand, VMS data at low resolution (1-2 hour transmission intervals) still has value to acquire wide scale summary information on multi-vessel fisheries. Cost and data processing requirement were noted as additional issues.

It was noted that the CWP could play a role by coordinating and/or setting up global standards especially for communication formats and data types for VMS data. This may eventually constitute a chapter in the CWP Handbook. Some reservations were expressed given many national and regional systems each with their own, sometimes disparate standards. Setting standards for a rapidly evolving technology may quickly result in outdated the standards. It was suggested to seek for further information and advices on communication formats and standard codes currently used, available technology, a list of desirable data entities and what is anticipated may be a more appropriate approach, from broader communities with expertise on VMS issues. In any case, the meeting considered that effort should be focused on setting standards to facilitate communication like a “common language” but not to an extent of contents to be transmitted. It was agreed the discussion to be continued and harmonization of VMS should be included into the agenda of CWP23.

3.2. Electronic log-book

Electronic log-book and Catch Documentation Scheme (CDS) including real time reporting with VMS data has become used or planned to be implemented by increasing number of RFMOs and States. The effort by FAO to standardize CDS/TIS was not successful in the past. In near future, it is expected that those information might be transferred to port states measures as well as trade and market measures. Although there is no urgent need to harmonize the contents, and codes and format used, it is important for CWP to keep a close attention to the details of development to enable to secure comparability among systems when the need arises.

The meeting noted that the CDS of CCAMLAR is in the most advanced stages and asked CCAMLAR to give a presentation at the CWP-23.

3.3. Criteria to determine "IUU" activities and "IUU" vessels

Aim of this agenda item is to get the better understandings on the criteria used by RFMOs when listing certain vessels in "IUU" list, since the legal binding instrument of port state measure currently under development within FAO intends to utilize the "IUU" list as criteria for Port States to deny access to their own ports. The meeting admitted the usefulness to compile information and agreed that those RFMOs adopting "IUU" list should provide its criteria for inclusion to the list to the Secretariat prior to the CWP-23. The Secretariat was requested to compile them together with consolidated list of identified "IUU" vessels.

4. Data need for ecosystem management approach

The CWP Secretariat presented an overall summary of issues including a brief report of High-Level Conference on World Food Security: The Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy, held in Rome, June 2008.

4.1. Data requirement for ecosystem monitoring and assessment

4.2. Data requirement for assessment and monitoring of fishing impacts

Discussion under Agenda 4.1 and 4.2 was merged.

Anthony Thompson of NAFO presented information on its initiative with the Ecosystem Approach. NAFO, in common with other fisheries organizations and following various United Nations General Assembly resolutions, have formally adopted an ecosystem approach to fisheries management. By the end of 2008, NAFO has committed to have various measures in place that will protect the wider marine environment, especially the benthos, from significant adverse impact caused by destructive fishing practices. FAO guidelines on the management of deep-sea fisheries, currently in a late drafting stage, provide the necessary interpretations and detail the mechanisms on how to achieve sustainable fisheries without harming the environment. Within NAFO, the processes are underway for the mapping of vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs), the identification of existing fishing areas, and the establishment of exploratory fishing protocols. The above is all based on the concept of "best scientific advice", and that in turn requires additional data collection. There is a progressive tendency to require information on finer and finer spatial and temporal resolutions preferably on a haul-by-haul basis. Assessment scientists have repeatedly requested more accurate catch estimates, more information on discards, and now as part of the VME encounter protocol, information on benthic substrate-forming corals and sponges. Concurrent developments in VMS have lead to the ability to report on catch and effort in near real time, and so we now have the capabilities to transmit relevant information quickly and efficiently. Indeed, VMS may be the only method of providing accurate effort statistics in a timely manner for use at assessment meetings. There is still a great need for the standardization of collection procedures and protocols, and a clear requirement for international agreement on how to monitor the health of our fisheries and ecosystems.

The following discussion noted that some of required information, especially on encounter with VMEs, could be obtained only from fisheries observer programs, though the fishery observer programs generally costs a lot. While some considered VMS as the only method of providing accurate effort statistics in a timely manner for use at assessment meetings, others noted that VMS is positional

only but a good option for data poor situations. The latter consider it more effective and to have some observer coverage in conjunction with VMS particularly in the context of the Ecosystem Approach.

In any case, the distribution data of both fishery and ecosystem aspects in the very fine resolution was pointed as essential. Good spatial information on fishery efforts and catch of all species including non-landing species were considered as good staring point. In this context, the meeting noted that whole section on catch and efforts of the CWP Handbook should be reviewed and revised to reflect the changes in data requirements emerged corresponding to the shift toward EAF.

The capability to evaluate catch report based on VMS data, especially when using transferred quota and/or operating under charter arrangement was questioned. NAFO assured it possible if 100% coverage of port inspection was secured. NFAO explained that the quota holder owes the responsibility for the utilization of its allocated catch under the NAFO's rule. It was pointed that this rule was not common in global standard set by UN and CWP where flag state is responsible for reporting catch. There is some ambiguity on reporting responsibility under charter arrangement. Some charter arrangements concur with change of flag during the chartered period, while the original flag is also maintained in some cases during the same period.

FAO presented the brief summary on basic principles in selecting ecosystem assessment indicators based on its review work and simulation analysis. Three categories of indicators are needed for management of ecosystem, i.e. those monitoring the pressure on ecosystem, the state of ecosystem, and impacts of management measures. Also, both base line monitoring with long time-series and short intensive measurement with specific aims are needed. Simulation analysis indicated that most indicators currently used have little or no relationship with attribute of interests and the simpler indicators work better. There is no standard solution applicable for all situations but the best combination of biological group to be monitored was suggested.

The concept of ecosystem management approach (EAF), especially its clarity in actual implementation into management measures, was challenged. The EAF is an expansion of a single species management and all tools, guideline and techniques developed under single-species management scheme can be applied in the context of EAF but only with broader prospects and different emphasis. At the same time, the evaluation of ecosystem impacts will require the involvement of broader experts than the current and in some cases, the area closure such as Marine Protected Area has been applied as a single pragmatic measure to protect VMEs without further scientific evaluation. Considering that the concept of ecosystem management has been imposed and already adopted by many RFMOs and nations, pragmatic approach should be taken in ensuring the provision of necessary information to move forward regardless of associated problems. Nevertheless, the importance to keep a view on actual implementation impacts and associated measures was stressed.

The role of CWP in this context was briefly discussed. The meeting agreed as the first step to assemble a list of indicators used and/or agreed by RFMOs or other forum for EAFs. Those lists would be reviewed to identify gaps and plan for the next step as the CWP. As a starting point, the ICES tabled the list of 21 indicators identified to monitor ecosystem qualities.

4.3. Monitoring of incidental catch and non landed catch

FAO made a brief presentation indicating problems relating with the term of "bycatch". This term was developed for those fisheries with clear targeting species and did not fit into multi species fisheries. Also, the term have been used in many different ways and causing confusion. CWP diagram of catch provides a good overview on whole process of mortality when fish encounters fishing gear. While the current CWP Handbook defines "nominal catch" as live equivalent weight of landings, it is important for natural resource management to monitor all mortality covered with this diagram. The diagram and various terms should be reviewed and clarified and it would be better to avoid the term of "bycatch".

It was noted that there are new data requirements in terms of ecosystem assessment that are not included in the Handbook. For example, information related to some gear types are not dealt with, information on catches of non-target species and biological components of exploited stocks and incidental catch is deficient.

4.4. Socio-economic information

FAO introduced the subject by noting that the concept of ecosystem approach of fishery and aquaculture management aims sustainability of both human community and nature supporting and surrounding human community. Socio-economic information is essential to move toward the management with ecosystem approach but currently the weakest area in this forum. It emphasized the need to initiate the process to enhance CWP competence on this area through identifying experts as well as existing standards and guidelines and coordinating review them along the needs for EAF.

EUROSTAT indicated that EU already made quite substantial efforts in harmonizing terminology and definitions related to social and economic components including capital cost, food equivalent concept, and employments with the participation of independent experts and all states representatives. Some of them are not completely satisfactory and further work need to be done. Nevertheless, the product will be good starting point for CWP to look at and to establish coordination with social economic experts. ICES expressed its hope that in future it would be able to integrate socio-economic indicators into its fisheries models.

It was concluded that CWP should gather information and develop inventory on data requirement for EAF, including case studies, standards and guidelines, scientific and socio-economic data collected to monitor impacts of human activity, fishing activities, natural changes, impacts on nature, impacts of climate changes. Those compiled information should be used for review and evaluation at the later stages.

4.5. Impacts of climate change

FAO briefly reported the outcome of High Level Conference held in the previous month in FAO but indicated quite low level of references in relation to fisheries, probably due to the adaptive nature of fishery itself. No specific discussion was occurred.

5. Consolidation of RFB databases

5.1. Integration system of RFB catch statistics
5.2. Closed network among organizations

Agenda 5.1 and 5.2 were discussed in consolidated way.

Marc Taconet of FAO introduced the project plan to integrate RFBs catch statistics into one database corresponding to the UN request that was tasked to FAO by the CWP-22. As a part of project, FAO envisaged to develop an infrastructure to enhance more real time data and information flow among RFBs and established two-year project in experimenting Virtual Grid Technology with a participation of NAFO and Eurostat/ICES as experiment collaborators. The first Requirement Gathering meeting of the project was held in 10-12 June 2008 in Rome and discussed various prospects of new technology and potential problems when consolidating data with different temporal and spatial configurations. At this meeting, it was decided that all exercise requiring data processing should be conducted as analysis done by FAO with a clear indication.

The discussion followed focused on the appropriateness in applying re-allocation data processing in order to make comparable data with non-compatible spatial definition and to estimate within-EEZ In many cases, the data with finer resolution existed than those available in public. When applying re-allocation rules, it would create statistics far from the real situation that is represented by existing but not publicly accessible data. Some considered that it should concentrate to improve accessibility to raw data and currently confidential data. At the same time, it was recognized that as long as using the publicly available data, which is the condition of this case, FAO has a right to pursue its own analysis. The meeting agreed to wait for further progress. Also it was agreed that the secretariat to seek and compile feedback especially on the auspices on the consolidated databases for the further discussion at CWP-23.

5.3. Consolidation of RFB vessel lists

FAO reported the outcome of the Expert Consultation on the Development of a Comprehensive Global Record of Fishing Vessels held in Rome in February 2008. The Expert Consultation noted the broad

range of benefits of global vessel records, in particular in respect of the prevention and deterrence of IUU fishing but also in many other aspects relating including traceability, MCS and vessel safety. From the outset a long-term vision, it recommended to include all fishing vessels regardless its size and operations. As an initial step, it saw a value in combining all existing information into one place in a consolidated way in order to enable global searches.

CCSBT briefly summarized the new development of tuna RFMOs activity in this regard. Tuna RFMOs, led by WCPFC, have had discussions with Lloyds Register-Fairplay (LR-F) and agreed that once tuna RFMOs are able to provide all necessary information, LR-F could assign unique IDs for all tuna vessels over 100 GT. However, some of the information that LR-F requires are not among those that tuna RFMOs request as mandatory. The individual tuna RFMOs would need to change their resolutions correspondingly. No process has been identified for vessels less than 100 GT. It was also noted that due to resource limitations, the consolidated authorized vessel list of tuna RFMOs has not been recently updated.

It was noted that organizations other than tuna bodies do not publicize the authorized vessel list but restrict its usage to members. It was pointed out that country and/or regional identifications are usually subject to change according to change of owner and/or flag.

6. Other business

6.1. CWP for aquaculture

CWP Secretary reported the outcome of Workshop on Establishing a Coordinating Working Party on Aquaculture Statistics (CWP-AS) held in Nakorn Nayok, Thailand, in January 2008 to discuss on appropriate structure of CWP-like mechanism for aquaculture (CWP-AS), following the decision by CWP-22. After reviewing the data and information needs in aquaculture and existing gaps in data collection, needs to harmonize standard for data, information and statistics, relation between capture fishery and aquaculture, and structure and activities of CWP-FS, the workshop reaffirmed the need for a mechanism to identify, establish and harmonize standards for aquaculture data, information and statistics. It recommended CWP-AS to be established within the framework of the CWP-FS, but with its own Terms of Reference (TOR), rules of procedure and composition to reflect the specific needs of the aquaculture sector and developed a detailed proposal of functions and structure of such a body. Eurostat, FAO, OECD, SEAFDEC, and SPC already expressed their interests to join the group. NACA also applied for participating CWP according to the Workshop recommendation, which was accepted by CWP.

Since the COFI Sub Committee of Aquaculture (COFI-AQ) provide the best opportunity to assemble those with interests in and/or competence with aquaculture, the CWP secretary specifically sought for the informal approval to hold the first meeting of aquaculture working in conjunction with the next COFI-AQ to be held in October, 2008, in order not to lose the current momentum.

The following discussion recognized that different expertise would be needed to address aquaculture specific issues than was available in the traditional CWP which had more focused on marine capture fisheries and their management. At the same time it was noted that in addition to the use of common concepts and collection methods, there should be a substantial and increasing interrelationship between aquaculture and fisheries. The meeting preferred to have specialized groups, one on aquaculture and the other on capture fishery, as sister groups with independent equal status, and to use the main session for coordination and harmonization between two groups.

The meeting agreed to discuss and formalize the new structure and way to operate at the CWP-23 and at this moment, supported to initiate aquaculture working group discussion as inter-sessional activity which should be chaired by one of CWP participating organizations.

Eurostat informed that the new EU regulation of aquaculture statistics, a good pilot project, specified detailed information requirements on aquaculture production on would be launched almost at the time of the meeting after the hard work of 18 month period. The new regulation was composed of four chapters, each defining data requirements for general aquaculture production, capture-based

aquaculture, egg and juveniles (voluntarily) and structural information, respectively. Eurostat and DG Mar will collaborate to implement this new aquaculture policy.

6.2. Modification of boundary between Areas 57 and 71

The CWP22 requested SEAFDEC to satisfy three conditions before implementing the proposed change of the northern boundary between fishing area 57 and 71 in the Malacca Strait to be consistence with sub-national boundaries (under the new Framework of fishery statistics in SEA). SEAFDEC confirmed the acceptance by all relevant countries. IOTC and WCPFC agreed in principle and the further official communication is needed which include the coordinate (latitude, longitude) of the new boundary. Based on the latest updated information by Indonesia at the last RTC on Fishery Statistics and Information held in December 2007, Indonesia is now waiting for the approval from the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries for the new arrangement of Fisheries Management Areas. Once this is approved, SEAFDEC can proceed with the formal communication to IOTC and WCPFC.

Malaysia and Indonesia should also report the revised data to FAO to reconcile the historical records. The re-engineering of historical data should start when the new demarcation has already taken effect. Although Malaysia assured that data could be backtracked under the revised demarcation, this should be done in coordination with Indonesia to synchronize the data, and may need certain period of time for preparation.

Since the proposal would include an agreement by concerned RFBs and Countries, SEAFDEC would follow-up and update this matter again at the CWP23.

6.3. Tuna catch data collection in the area with no responsible RFBs

SEAFDEC explained the progress on this issue since CWP-22. Also, WCPFC provided a written report before the meeting. Both organizations have maintained communication toward further collaboration.

WCPFC has received co-funding support from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for a 3-year project in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam to improve tuna catch statistics and tuna fisheries monitoring in east Asia and the west Pacific – including in the South China Sea. The West Pacific East Asia Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (WPEA OFM) will include institutional and capacity strengthening to support a collaborative approach to the sustainable use, conservation and management of highly migratory fish stocks in that region – with collaboration being facilitated through the WCPFC. In 2008 a baseline assessment, including a gaps analysis, is being undertaken in each country to support the detailed design of the 3-year project which ill start in early 2009. The WCPFC is coordinating with several other institutions and organizations in this endeavor – including SEAFDEC and FAO (through the regional office in Bangkok). It is estimated that the Philippines and Vietnam account for approximately 75% of the catch of highly migratory fish stocks from the SCS.

To start the project activity, WCPFC will have the meeting with concerned countries and will invite SEAFDEC to participate. Collaboration of parties concerned in this project will pave the way for possible compilation of Tuna catch Statistics in the South China Sea.

6.4. Review of draft Agenda for CWP-23

The meeting quickly reviewed the current list of items to be discussed at the CWP-23. For preparation for the discussion on “Methodological description of national data collection system”, it was agreed that the participating organizations would provide any information available on support documentations on national data collection system, or the requested format of them to the Secretariat for compilation. The Secretariat was also requested to pursue the issues relating with gear codes and report to the CWP-23.

6.5. CWP handbook

A document “Updating and revision of the CWP Handbook of Fishery Statistical Methods” was tabled by the CWP Secretariat.

Meeting agreed the urgent need to revise the existing Handbook, especially incorporating emerging data requirement corresponding to the shift toward ecosystem approach of fishery and aquaculture

management. All Members expressed their intentions to contribute and review this revision. It was agreed the Secretariat to communicate with participating organizations and to incorporate feedbacks as much as possible into the draft to be tabled at the CWP-23 for further discussion.

6.6. Any other business

SEAFDEC informed the Meeting on the planned Regional Workshop for Streamlined Reporting of Fishery Statistics in Southeast Asia, that will be organized Bangkok, Thailand from 28-31 July 2008 (between SEAFDEC and FAO). This is based on the approved new Framework for Fishery Statistics in Southeast Asia by SEAFDEC Council in April 2008 and endorsed by ASEAN at its 16th Meeting of ASWGFi in May 2008.

The new Framework includes major changes in the "area of coverage" and "statistical usage" to be consistent with SEAFDEC's areas of competence as well as on the "standard definitions and classifications" to be consistent with the current regional requirements and to harmonize with the international standards. The new framework is considered as the minimum requirement for fishery statistics to be reached by the Member Countries to support development planning and management. The new Framework is envisaged as a regional collaborative framework on fishery statistics to facilitate wider sharing of data and information, which will also be used as inputs in the compilation of the Fishery Statistical Bulletin of Southeast Asia to be produced by SEAFDEC in the future.

The Workshop is tasked with the following objectives:

1) To build awareness and create common understanding of national officers in charge of compiling fishery statistics on the new Framework of Fishery Statistics of Southeast Asia as basis for future cooperation specifically for the production of the Fishery Statistical Bulletin of Southeast Asia;

2) To build awareness and create common understanding of national officers in charge of compiling fishery statistics on the streamlined reporting system of fishery statistics from the Member Countries to SEAFDEC and FAO – using the new questionnaires and submission process, mechanism and scheduling; and

3) To discuss and recommend priority areas necessary to support the Member Countries in implementing the Framework of Fishery Statistics of Southeast Asia.

7. Next meeting

Meeting agreed to skip the session in 2009. The CWP-23 should be held in Feb. 2010 in Hobart, Australia, in conjunction with the FSC6 meeting following the invitation of CCAMLR. Secretary to consult with participating organizations on the consideration come out for approval. Time for response should be within 30 days after announcement.

8. Report adoption

Meeting reviewed and agreed the list of recommended actions as Attachment 3. The meeting report will be circulated by email to participants for comment and adoption.

Attachment 1

List of Participants:

COMMISSION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF ANTARCTIC MARINE LIVING RESOURCES (CCAMLR)
Mr David RAMM, Data Manager
P.O. Box 213, North Hobart Tasmania 7002, Australia
Phone: +61 3 62310556
Fax: +61 3 62349965
Email: david@ccamlr.org

COMMISSION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF SOUTHERN BLUEFIN TUNA (CCSBT)
Mr Robert KENNEDY, Data Manager
P.O. Box 37, Deakin West, ACT 2600, Australia
Phone: +61 (2) 62828396
Fax: +61 (2) 62828407
Email: rkennedy@ccsbt.org

EUROPEAN COMMISSION - EUROSTAT
Mr Franco ZAMPOGNA, Directorate for Agriculture and Environment Statistics;
Statistical cooperation, Fishery Statistics Section, EUROSTAT 5,
Rue A. Weicker L-2721, Luxembourg,
Phone: + 352 4301 37268
Fax: +352 430 137318
Email: franco.zampogna@ec.europa.eu

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO)
Mr Marc TACONET, Senior Fishery Information Officer (FIES)
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy
Phone: + 39 06 570 53799
Fax: +39 06 570 52476
Email: marc.taconet@fao.org

INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION (IATTC)
Mr Michael HINTON
8604 La Jolla Shores Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037, U.S.A.
Phone : +1 858 546 7100
Fax: +1 858 546 7133\
Email: mhinton@iattc.org

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE EXPLORATION OF THE SEA (ICES)
Mr Hans LASSEN, Head of Advisory Programme
H.C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46, Copenhagen 1261, V, Denmark
Phone: +45 (45) 33386700
Fax: +45 (45) 33934215
Email: hans@ices.dk

NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION (NEAFC)
Mr João NEVES, VMS Specialist
22 Berners Street, London W1T 3DY, United Kingdom
Phone: + 44 (0) 20 7631 0016
Fax: + 44 (0) 20 7636 9225
Email: joao@neafc.org

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION (NAFO)
Dr Johanne FISCHER, Executive Secretary
2 Morris Drive, P.O. Box 638, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada B2Y 3Y9
Phone: +1 902 468 6582
Fax: +1 902 468 5538
Email: jfischer@nafo.int

Dr Ricardo FEDERIZON, Fisheries Commission Coordinator
2 Morris Drive, P.O. Box 638, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada B2Y 3Y9
Phone: +1 902 468 8598
Fax: +1 902 468 5538
Email: rfederizon@nafo.int

Mr George CAMPANIS, IT Manager
2 Morris Drive, P.O. Box 638, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada B2Y 3Y9
Phone: +1 902 468 8598
Fax: +1 902 468 5538
Email: gcampanis@nafo.int

Dr Anthony THOMPSON, Scientific Council Coordinator
2 Morris Drive, P.O. Box 638, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada B2Y 3Y9
Phone: +1 902 468 8598
Fax: +1 902 468 5538
Email: athompson@nafo.int

Ms Barbara MARSHALL, Information Manager
2 Morris Drive, P.O. Box 638, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada B2Y 3Y9
Phone: +1 902 468 8598
Fax: +1 902 468 5538
Email: bmarshall@nafo.int

NAFO INVITED EXPERT

Mr Gylfi GEIRSSON

Commander, Icelandic Coast Guard

Skogarhlid 14, 105 Reykjavik, Iceland

Ph +354 545 2071

Fax +354 545 2040

e-mail gylfi@lhg.is

SOUTHEAST ASIAN FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT CENTRE (SEAFDEC)
Ms Pouchamarn WONGSANGA, Information Program Coordinator
P.O. Box 1046 Kasetsart Post Office, Bangkok 10903, Thailand
Phone: +662 955 1601, 940 6326 to 29
Fax: +662 940 6336
Email: pouch@seafdec.org

CWP Secretary
Ms Sachiko TSUJI
Senior Fishery Statistician, FIES, FAO
Phone: + 39 06 570 55318
Fax: +39 06 570 52476
Email: sachiko.tsuji@fao.org

Rapporteur
Mr David KULKA
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia

Phone: 902 462 1753
Email: dave.kulka@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Attachment 2

COORDINATING WORKING PARTY ON FISHERIES STATISTICS (CWP)

Inter-sessional thematic meeting: New Data Requirement and Data Sources

Halifax, CANADA, 8-9 July 2008

AGENDA (revised)

1. **Opening and Welcome, logistic arrangements**

   CWP Chair to open the meeting, NAFO may provide Statement and information on logistics

2. **Adoption of the Agenda**

3. **Standardization of MCS-related data and their utilization in monitoring indicators** *(general discussion)*

   NAFO will lead the discussion with presentation on the issue. FAO will present summary of recent developments including a preliminary results of VMS Questionnaire. Informal consultation among participating organizations on issues including identification of areas that CWP should take certain actions will follow.

   a. **VMS information**
   b. **Electronic log-book**
   c. **Criteria to determine "IUU" activities and "IUU" vessels**

4. **Data need for Ecosystem Management Approach** *(general discussion)*

   FAO will introduce overall summary of issues including a brief report of High-Level Conference on World Food Security: The Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy, held in Rome, June 2008, which will be followed by informal consultation among participating organizations on issues including identification of areas that CWP should take certain actions.

   a. **Data requirement for ecosystem assessment**
   b. **Data requirement for assessment and monitoring of fishing impacts**
   c. **Monitoring of incidental catch and non landed catch**
   d. **Socio-economic information**
   e. **Impacts of climate change**

5. **Consolidation of RFB databases**

   a. **Integration system of RFB catch statistics**

   FAO will introduce the plan to integrate RFBs catch statistics for feedback from participating organizations and further discussion on procedures and dissemination requirements

b. Closed network among organizations

FAO will introduce the two-year project in experimenting Virtual Grid Technology to enhance data and information flow among organizations. Feedback discussion from participating organizations to be followed.

c. Consolidation of RFB vessel lists

FAO will report the outcome of Expert Consultation on the Development of a Comprehensive Global Record of Fishing Vessels held in Rome in February 2008. A participating tuna organization will introduce the current status, problem encountered so far, and future plan of the consolidated tuna vessel lists. The meeting will discuss and agree action plan if necessary.

6. Other business

a. CWP for aquaculture

CWP Secretary will report the outcome of Workshop on Establishing a Coordinating Working Party on Aquaculture Statistics (CWP-AS) held in Nakorn Nayok in January 2008 and follow-up activities.

b. Modification of boundary between Areas 57 and 71 *(information only)*

SEAFDEC will report the progress in securing conditions for modification of boundary between Areas 57 and 71 confirmed at CWP-22

c. Tuna catch data collection in the area with no responsible RFBs

SEAFDEC will explain the progress after CWP-22 and lead the discussion.

d. Review of draft Agenda for CWP-23

CWP Secretary will introduce the current version of draft agenda of CWP-23 for inputs and advices from participating organizations.

e. Any other business

7. Report adoption

8. Close of the meeting

منظمة الأغذية والزراعة للأمم المتحدة | 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 | Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Agricultura y la Alimentación

Attachment 3

List of Agreed points:

3.1 VMS information

- CWP to coordinate setting global standards on automated data transmission (i.e. VMS) and data types. Some reservations were expressed. This to be discussed at CWP-23.

3.2 Electronic log-book

- CCAMLR to give a presentation on its e-logbook at the CWP-23.

3.3 Criteria to determine "IUU" activities and "IUU" vessels

- The meeting admitted the usefulness to compile information and agreed that those RFMOs adopting "IUU" list should provide its criteria for inclusion to the list to the Secretariat prior to the CWP-23. The Secretariat was requested to compile them together with consolidated list of identified "IUU" vessels.

4. Data need for Ecosystem Management Approach

- Whole section on catch and efforts of the CWP Handbook should be reviewed and revised to reflect the changes in data requirements emerged corresponding to the shift toward EAF.

- CWP should gather information and develop inventory on data requirement for EAF, including case studies, standards and guidelines, scientific and socio-economic data collected to monitor impacts of human activity, fishing activities, natural changes, impacts on nature, impacts of climate changes. Those compiled information should be used for review and evaluation at the later stages.

5.1 Integration system of RFB catch statistics/5.2 Closed network among organizations

- Secretariat to seek and compile feedback especially on the auspices on the consolidated databases for the further discussion at CWP-23.

5.3 Consolidation of RFB vessel lists

6.1 CWP for aquaculture

- Meeting supported to hold the inter-sessional meeting focusing on aquaculture chaired by a member of CWP participating organizations.

- Meeting expressed preference of having two specialized groups of independent and equal status, one for aquaculture and one for fishery. The formal structure and way to operate will be discussed at CWP-23.

6.2 Modification of boundary between Areas 57 and 71 *(information only)*

6.3 Tuna catch data collection in the area with no responsible RFBs

6.4 Review of draft Agenda for CWP-23

- Members to provide any information available on support documentations on national data collection system, or the requested format of them to the Secretariat for compilation for the further discussion at CWP-23.

- Secretariats to pursue the issues relating with gear codes and report to the CWP-23.

6.5 Other business -- CWP handbook

- Meeting agreed the need to revise the existing Handbook, especially incorporating emerging data requirement corresponding shift toward ecosystem approach of fishery and aquaculture management.

- Secretary to communicate with participating organizations and to incorporate feedbacks as much as possible into the draft to be tabled at the CWP-23 for further discussion.

6.5 Other business – CWP-23

- Meeting agreed to skip the session in 2009. The CWP-23 should be held in Feb. 2010 in Hobart, Australia. Secretary to consult with participating organizations on the consideration come out for approval. Time for response should be within 30 days after announcement.