



COMMISSION ON GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Item 4 of the Provisional Agenda

AD HOC INTERGOVERNMENTAL TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP ON AQUATIC GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Second Session

Rome, 23–25 April 2018

PREPARATION OF THE STATE OF THE WORLD'S AQUATIC GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Table of Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	2
BACKGROUND	2
STEPS TOWARDS THE FINALIZATION OF THE REPORT	3
WORKING GROUP COMMENTS	4
GUIDANCE SOUGHT	4
APPENDIX I	5
APPENDIX II	6

INTRODUCTION

The Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (Commission), at its Sixteenth Regular Session, welcomed the draft report on *The State of the World's Aquatic Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture* (Report). It invited countries that had not yet done so to nominate National Focal Points (NFPs) and to submit Country Reports by 30 June 2017, and encouraged countries that had already submitted a country report to submit a revised version.¹

2. The Commission requested FAO to prepare a revised draft Report on *The State of the World's Aquatic Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture* (revised draft Report). It also requested that a second meeting of the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Aquatic Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (Working Group) be convened to review the revised draft Report.

3. This document provides an update on the status of preparation of the Report, for review by the Working Group. The revised draft Report is contained in the document *Revised draft report on The State of the World's Aquatic Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture*.²

BACKGROUND

4. At its Eleventh Regular Session, the Commission agreed that improving the collection and sharing of information on aquatic genetic resources (AqGR) is of high priority and included the preparation of the Report into its Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPOW).³ At its Thirteenth and Fourteenth Regular Sessions, the Commission considered the scope of the Report and decided, at the latter session, "that the scope of the report would be farmed aquatic species and their wild relatives within national jurisdiction. Countries were also invited to provide a species list of nationally important aquatic genetic resources of capture fisheries within national jurisdiction."⁴

5. At its Fourteenth Regular Session, the Commission also agreed on the structure of the Report⁵ and requested FAO to adjust the draft Guidelines for the Preparation of Country Reports for *The State of the World's Aquatic Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture* and to reduce the number of proposed Thematic Background Studies by prioritizing them in line with the agreed scope and focusing on the core issue of genetic diversity.⁶ The Commission called on countries to participate in the process by preparing Country Reports on AqGR and to strengthen related information systems.⁷

6. At its Fifteenth Regular Session, the Commission endorsed a revised timeline for the preparation of the Report, an indicative list of Thematic Background Studies and cost estimates, and invited countries to prepare Country Reports for the Report with the involvement of all relevant stakeholders.⁸ The Commission also agreed to establish the Working Group specifically with the task to guide the preparation of and review the Report.⁹

7. The Working Group, at its First Session, held from 20 to 22 June 2016, reviewed the Draft Report on the State of the World's Aquatic Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, noted that it was a preliminary analysis based on a limited set of Country Reports, that a higher number of Country Reports was needed to finalize the Report and made detailed comments and recommendations with regard to the finalization of the Report.¹⁰

¹ CGRFA-16/17/Report, paragraph 39.

² CGRFA/WG-AqGR-2/18/Inf.2.

³ CGRFA-11/07/Report, paragraphs 60–61.

⁴ CGRFA-14/13/Report, paragraph 76.

⁵ CGRFA-14/13/Report, Appendix H.

⁶ CGRFA-14/13/Report, paragraph 79.

⁷ CGRFA-14/13/Report, paragraph 78.

⁸ CGRFA-15/15/Report, paragraphs 60–61.

⁹ CGRFA-15/15/Report, paragraph 63.

¹⁰ CGRFA/WG-AqGR-1/16/Report.

8. The Commission, at its last session, requested FAO to prepare a revised draft Report, taking into account the information contained in the Country Reports, the Thematic Background Studies, information provided by international organizations, and the comments and recommendations provided by the Commission and the Working Group. It invited countries to comment on the revised draft Report, once it becomes available. The Commission also requested that COFI and, as appropriate, its subsidiary bodies, be consulted on the revised draft Report. Finally, the Commission requested that a second meeting of the Working Group be convened to review the revised draft Report in light of all comments and inputs received.

STEPS TOWARDS THE FINALIZATION OF THE REPORT

Submission of Country Reports

9. In 2012, the Director-General of the Organization invited countries to nominate National Focal Points for the preparation of Country Reports for the Report. Information on National Focal Points officially designated by FAO members is being regularly updated and published online.¹¹

10. In 2015, in endorsing the revised timeline for the preparation of the Report, the Commission agreed that Country Reports should be submitted by the end of 2015 at the latest. Only a limited number of Country Reports was received by that deadline. As of 15 April 2016, 47 officially endorsed Country Reports had been received by FAO and provided the basis of the draft Report, as presented to the Working Group and the Commission at their last sessions.

11. At its Sixteenth Regular Session, the Commission therefore invited countries that had not yet done so to submit their Country Reports, including updated versions, by 30 June 2017. By that date, 92 officially endorsed Country Reports have been received as listed in *Appendix I*. Importantly, the revised draft Report contains data from the 11 leading aquaculture production countries and accounts for more than 90 percent of the aquaculture production globally.

Consultations

12. In response to the Commission's request, FAO invited Commission Members and observers in the beginning of March 2018, through Circular State Letter, to comment by 31 May 2018 on the revised draft Report which was made available on the website of FAO on 13 March 2018.

13. The COFI Advisory Working Group on Aquatic Genetic Resources and Technologies (COFI Working Group) considered the (first version of the) draft Report at its second meeting, held on 19 to 20 October 2017 and the report of the meeting¹² as well as a summary¹³ of it are available to the Working Group. The COFI Sub-Committee on Aquaculture considered the status of preparation of the Report at its Ninth Session, held from 24 to 27 October 2017.¹⁴

14. As the revised draft Report could not be made available to the COFI Working Group and the COFI Sub-Committee on Aquaculture, comments were sought from these bodies in writing in March/April 2018; they are contained in the document *Comments from Members and Observers of the COFI Sub-Committee on Aquaculture and Experts of the COFI Advisory Working Group on Aquatic Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture on the revised draft Report on The State of the World's Aquatic Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture*.¹⁵

15. In response to the Commission's request to also seek relevant information from international organizations, FAO developed a simple survey form soliciting information on AqGR from International

¹¹ <http://www.fao.org/3/a-bs238e.pdf>

¹² CGRFA/WG-AqGR-2/18/Inf.3.

¹³ CGRFA/WG-AqGR-2/18/4.

¹⁴ COFI:AQ/IX/2017/6/Rev.1; COFI:AQ/IX/2017/Inf.8.

¹⁵ CGRFA/WG-AqGR-2/18/Inf.11.

Organizations¹⁶ and distributed it to relevant organizations around the world. Six organizations responded to the survey: the Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO), the Mekong River Commission (MRC), the Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia and the Pacific (NACA), the Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Centre (SEAFDEC), the South Pacific Community (SPC) and the WorldFish Center (WFC).

Thematic Background Studies

16. The Commission, at its Fifteenth Regular Session, endorsed an indicative list of Thematic Background Studies to address specific aspects of the Report.¹⁷ The approved Thematic Background Studies have been reviewed and edited and made available for review by the COFI Working Group and the COFI Sub-Committee on Aquaculture.¹⁸ Selected material from these studies has been incorporated into relevant sections of the revised draft Report. These studies, along with the Country Reports, include information on the use of AqGR and on the numbers of aquatic species for food and agriculture that often have not previously been reported to FAO.

WORKING GROUP COMMENTS

17. The Working Group, at its first session, recommended that the Commission request FAO to continue its work towards the finalization of the Report, for consideration by the Working Group at its Second Session and by the Commission at its Seventeenth Session. The Working Group further proposed a series of recommendations for the revision of the draft Report. *Appendix II* lists the recommendations and explains how they have been addressed.

18. All comments received by 31 May 2018, including those by Members and observers will be considered for the preparation of the final report.

GUIDANCE SOUGHT

19. The Working Group may wish to review the revised draft Report and provide comments and inputs for consideration by FAO. It may wish to recommend to the Commission:

- To take note of the Report;
- To recommend the preparation of a brief summary of the Report for policy-makers;
- To recommend the wide distribution of the Report and the brief summary.

¹⁶ COFI:AQ/IX/2017/Inf.8, *Appendix II*.

¹⁷ CGRFA-15/15/Report, paragraph 60.

¹⁸ <http://www.fao.org/aquatic-genetic-resources/background/sow/background-studies/en/>

APPENDIX I

LIST OF COUNTRY REPORTS SUBMITTED FOR THE FIRST STATE OF THE WORLD'S AQUATIC GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE. ¹⁹

CONTINENT					
Africa	Latin America and the Caribbean	Asia	Europe	North America	Oceania
Algeria Benin Burkina Faso Burundi Cabo Verde Cameroon Chad Democratic Republic of the Congo Djibouti Egypt Ghana Kenya Madagascar Malawi Morocco Mozambique Niger Nigeria Senegal Sierra Leone South Africa Sudan Togo Tunisia Uganda United Republic of Tanzania Zambia	Argentina Belize Brazil Chile Colombia Costa Rica Cuba Dominican Republic Ecuador El Salvador Guatemala Honduras Mexico Nicaragua Panama Paraguay Peru Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Armenia Bangladesh Bhutan Cambodia China Cyprus Georgia India Indonesia Iran (Islamic Republic of) Iraq Japan Kazakhstan Lao People's Democratic Republic Malaysia Philippines Republic of Korea Sri Lanka Thailand Turkey Viet Nam	Belgium Bulgaria Croatia Czechia Denmark Estonia Finland Germany Hungary Latvia Netherlands Norway Poland Romania Slovenia Sweden Ukraine	Canada United States of America	Australia Fiji Kiribati Palau Samoa Tonga Vanuatu

¹⁹ As of June 2017, 92 Country Reports have been received.

APPENDIX II

RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE FIRST SESSION OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE DRAFT REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE WORLD'S AQUATIC GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE AND INCORPORATION IN THE REVISED DRAFT REPORT.

Recommendation by ITWG-AqGR-1	Incorporation in revised draft Report
Identify individual countries in the analysis in addition to the summaries by region or sub-region, as appropriate;	<p>Specific country examples are included in Chapter 5 regarding ex situ conservation, such as Mexico, Peru, Norway, etc., Chapter 2 e.g. on additional species reported through Country Reports, Chapter 4 on examples of in situ conservation and Chapter 7 on national policies.</p> <p>Specific country additions re gender and indigenous knowledge in Chapter 6.</p> <p>A case study on the ex situ conservation programme implemented in Hungary for common carp has been added to chapter 5.</p> <p>A case study on the in situ and ex situ conservation programme designed by Iran (Islamic Republic of) for the conservation of sturgeon species has been added to chapters 4 and 5.</p> <p>A case study on the international cooperation programme developed from the ex situ conservation programme for common carp implemented by Hungary has been added into chapter 8.</p>
Include specific country examples and case studies to illustrate issues, where relevant;	<p>A case study on the ex situ conservation programme implemented in Hungary for common carp has been added to chapter 5.</p> <p>A case study on the in situ and ex situ conservation programme designed by Iran (Islamic Republic of) for the conservation of sturgeon species has been added to chapters 4 and 5.</p> <p>A case study on the international cooperation programme developed from the ex situ conservation programme for common carp implemented by Hungary has been added into chapter 8.</p> <p>Case studies on strains and nomenclature has been added to Chapter 2.</p> <p>Case study on conservation of an endangered stock has been added to Chapter 4.</p>
Provide an analysis by developing versus developed countries, as appropriate;	Done for chapters 2–8 – analysis by economic classes, namely (1) developed countries; (2) developing countries; and (3) least developed countries.
Include some examples of new species and farmed types identified from Country Reports that have not been previously reported to FAO;	Chapter 2 and 3 have included examples of new species and farmed types not previously reported
Revise the references to all countries to ensure they accurately reflect the information	This has been done for all chapters and the last part of sub-chapter 7.2 of chapter 7 has been confirmed to reflect the country report

provided in national reports, in particular in the last part of sub-chapter 7.2 of chapter 7;	
Revise the conclusions of sub-chapter 7.4 of chapter 7 that cannot be inferred from the information contained in the report, in particular on access and benefit sharing regimes;	The conclusions of sub-chapter 7.4 have been revised to reflect information in Country Reports.
Streamline the quotation in the last paragraph of sub-chapter 6.5 of chapter 6;	This has been streamlined.
Use additional information (e.g. from the scientific literature, international, regional and national organizations and networks, and advanced scientific institutions) to complement Country Reports and contribute to a more comprehensive assessment;	Scientific literature has been added to the introduction and conclusions of chapters 5, 6 and 8. An additional section in Chapter 2 has been added to reflect input from international organizations and relevant scientific literature is contained in the Reference section of each chapter.
Harmonize definitions throughout the Report and provide a full glossary of key terms;	Definitions have been harmonized and a glossary has been revised and provided.
Clearly identify all sources of information, including in tables and figures;	Sources of information have been added including for tables and figures for all chapters.
Provide an in-depth analysis of findings, including inter alia on climate change, habitat change and invasive species as drivers impacting AqGR;	Done in chapter 2 in regards to habitat change and 3 in regards to general drivers.
Distinguish between policies and strategies and include soft law instruments, such as codes of conduct and voluntary guidelines;	In general, these concepts have been clarified.
Clarify some of the concepts referred to in the chapters (e.g. in situ conservation and access and benefit sharing regimes);	Key concepts have been clarified in text and in the glossary; areas of continued lack of clarity, e.g. in situ vs ex situ on farm conservation have been identified.
Acknowledge the challenges of collaboration for the management of AqGR, especially for the transboundary conservation of migratory species;	A case study on the in situ and ex situ conservation programme designed by Iran (Islamic Republic of) for the conservation of sturgeon species has been added to chapters 4 and 5.
Include some specific examples of successful AqGR ex situ and in situ conservation programmes and strategies, and stress the complementarity of the two conservation approaches;	A case study on the ex situ conservation programme implemented in Hungary for common carp has been added to chapter 5. A case study on the in situ and ex situ conservation programme designed by Iran (Islamic Republic of) for the conservation of sturgeon species has been added to chapters 4 and 5. A case study on the international cooperation programme developed from the ex situ conservation programme for common carp implemented by Hungary has been added into chapter 8.
Acknowledge the value of aquatic protected areas in conserving AqGR and there must be a balance between conservation and development taking into consideration conditions in different areas;	The value of aquatic protected areas has been demonstrated by the responses from Country Reports and noted in the text.

Demonstrate the close linkages between aquaculture and capture fisheries systems that depend on wild AqGR;	Chapter 2 has included analyses of these close linkages from Country Reports especially in regard to wild relatives
Ensure that information provided complement the information contained in The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture (SOFIA);	Information from SOFIA has been included to complement and compare to the responses from Country Reports in Chapters 2 and 3.
Include an analysis of how effective the various networks contribute to the sustainable use and conservation of AqGR; and	Done in chapter 8 and to a certain extent in Chapter 6.
Highlight key findings and gaps that will require a policy response to improve the sustainable use and conservation of AqGR.	Discussed briefly in Chapter 2 on ABS and in Chapter 6