


October 2002

	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
---	--	--------------------	--	--	--

FISHERY COMMITTEE FOR THE EASTERN CENTRAL ATLANTIC**SIXTEENTH SESSION****Tenerife, Spain, October 22-24 2002****INDICATORS TO ASSESS THE PERFORMANCE OF REGIONAL FISHERY
BODIES**

Introduction

1. The Second Meeting of FAO and Non-FAO Regional Fishery Bodies or Arrangements was held in Rome on 20 and 21 February 2001¹. Among the issues discussed were indicators to assess the performance of Regional Fishery Bodies. Documents related to this meeting may be found on the FAO Website, starting from the following link: <http://www.fao.org/waicent/search/default.asp>.

Indicators to Assess the Performance of Regional Fishery Bodies

2. The First Meeting of FAO and Non-FAO Regional Fishery Bodies in 1999 concluded that there was a need to measure the performance of regional fishery bodies in sustaining fisheries, managing the environment and their resulting benefits for their respective members. The Secretariat advised that document FI: RFB/II/2001/3, prepared in response to the above conclusion, set out a general framework of indicators against which the performance of RFBs in meeting their mandates and responsibilities might be measured. It concluded that performance assessment would need to take account of wide differences in the mandates and roles of RFBs and the varying degree of their evolution. For this reason, the document could not make any specific recommendations but only gave a basis for general review of performance evaluation and indicators in those various areas. It was pointed out that some of the indicators of governance contained in Technical Guidelines No. 8 of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries could also be used for this purpose.

3. Most representatives were of the view that evaluation was a matter for the RFB itself, that it might enhance the performance of RFBs and that some kind of indicators of performance would be useful in this respect. The participants found the paper prepared by the Secretariat to be a good general set of criteria for self-evaluation. However, many participants were also of the view that the general definition of an indicator framework for RFBs was quite complex and that the issue needed to be further studied/discussed within their own regional fishery bodies. Some participants suggested that the results of this thought be further discussed at subsequent meetings of regional fishery bodies and arrangements.

4. Participants exchanged experiences on current performance assessment methods. It was indicated, for instance, that some Secretariats' outputs were self-assessed when reviewing work programmes and budgets, or when deciding on the re-appointment of the Secretaries. One participant indicated that, in addition, external auditors had been used to review the corporate plan of the body.

5. Most participants indicated that evaluation of the performance of members of RFBs was more challenging and sensitive. For example, it was suggested that the level of budget/financing and the rate of attendance at meetings could be an indicator of member's commitment. However, it was noted that some developing countries' meeting attendance might reflect a lack of financial means rather than a

¹ Report of the Second Meeting of FAO and non-FAO Regional Fishery Bodies or Arrangements. Rome, 20-21 February 2001 *FAO Fisheries Report*. No. 645. Rome, FAO. 2001. 26p

lack of interest in the body's activities. The effectiveness of inspection schemes and the degree of compliance by members with fisheries management decisions were also mentioned as a means of performance evaluation. In most cases, it was felt that quantitative assessments of performance of members could be difficult.

6. Some participants indicated that a number of indicators were already in use. In the Baltic Sea, indicators of sustainable development were regularly evaluated covering the biological (e.g. spawning stock biomass, fishing mortality, recruitment), economic (e.g. landing per country, fishing effort, average per caput consumption) and social (e.g. full time fishermen per country) dimensions of fisheries.

7. While supporting in principle the need to develop performance indicators and related guidelines, participants stressed that regional fishery bodies do vary in mandate, species coverage, economic situation of members, governance systems, etc. Therefore, it was difficult to establish indicators that were generally applicable to all RFBs. It was also pointed out that the costs of some evaluation methods such as external audits or formal quality control systems (such as ISO 9000) could prove onerous.

8. In conclusion, the Secretariats of RFBs were asked whether: (i) the development of indicators and reference points for regional fisheries was considered timely and opportune; and (ii) whether there was a need to start a process to elaborate further material in this respect.

Suggested Action by the Committee

9. The attention of the Committee is drawn to the information above. The Committee is invited to provide input to the third meeting of the Regional Fishery Bodies scheduled for 3rd to 4th March 2003.