

July 2001

E



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

COORDINATING WORKING PARTY ON FISHERY STATISTICS**Nineteenth Session****Nouméa, New Caledonia, 10-13 July 2001****REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CWP-18****Author: Secretariat**

REVIEW OF FOLLOW-UP TO RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CWP-18

CWP recommended that its members should in general regard as the most reliable source of data those held by the regional body which has assessment responsibility for the stock. It also recommended that FAO should introduce a more systematic way of adopting such data in its data set, automating the process as much as possible. To establish this process, lead agencies need to be identified on a species and area basis. CWP recommended that FAO in consultation with the regional fishery agencies develop a table for this. The table of lead agency designations should then be circulated to all agencies and finalized, if possible, at an inter-sessional meeting. (Para.81)

FAO has made efforts to include in its database the fishery statistics provided by the regional bodies as much as possible. Data for Antarctic fishing areas are regularly taken from those assembled by CCAMLR. Regarding the data disseminated by the four regional tuna agencies (IATTC, ICCAT, IOTC and SPC), in the last year FAO has replaced the tuna data provided by several national correspondents with those of the tuna agencies. However, after careful consideration FAO has decided that it is not appropriate to implement at this time a system of blanket replacement of statistics reported by countries to FAO with regional agency statistics, as envisaged in the CWP recommendation. This is discussed further in document CWP/19/FAO.FAO.

CWP found good grounds for further exploring the proposal of a single publication in electronic form of the entire database of North Atlantic catch statistics. CWP therefore recommended that Eurostat, FAO, ICCAT, ICES and NAFO investigate the possibility for producing a publication following the ICES proposal. ICES undertook to take the lead on this issue. (Para.89)

This was completed and is reported in documents CWP/19/EUROSTAT, CWP/19/ICES and CWP/19/FAO.

Based on the Eurostat proposal (Doc. CWP-18/8-Eurostat) concerning the FAO major fishing area 7 (the former USSR) inland fisheries statistical data, CWP observed that it would not be possible to break down the USSR data for marine fisheries and reassign them to individual republic states before the breakup of the USSR. Looking to the future, CWP agreed that disaggregation of data, particularly for the Baltic States, would be valuable. CWP recommended that FAO and regional organizations should look into the possibilities during the inter-sessional period. (Para. 105)

There is little progress to report on the disaggregation of inland production of the former USSR area into catches from freshwaters of individual Republics. Contacts have been established with a prospective consultant but work is not yet under way (CWP-18 para. 105).

NAFO inter-sessionally had proposed a new definition for the measure of effort for boat seines. CWP noted responses from regional organizations had suggested minor editorial changes. Accordingly, NAFO presented to CWP the new definition for adoption. CWP recommended acceptance of the new global definition should read as follows: “Boat seines (Danish etc). Effort measure: hours fishing per day. Definition: number of times the gear was set or shot per day, times the estimated mean set or shot duration.” (Para.106)

Changes to the STATLANT 21 B to reflect a new effort measure for Boat Seines have been implemented. (CWP- para. 106)

CWP noted that regular archiving is an essential action for all fishery data sets and databases and recommended that the relevant section in the capture Guidelines should be supplemented with further advice and direction in this regard. Individual agencies should take all due measures to ensure that archiving occurs on a regular basis and in the most contemporary format available. Agencies should also give consideration to the formal drafting of a ‘Doomsday’ plan to secure their data from permanent loss should circumstances destroy the on-site repository for such data. (Para.111)

ICCAT reported that it has taken action in this regard.

CWP commended the new Guidelines on the Routine Collection of Capture Fishery Data and recommended that FAO provide copies to all agencies and distribute the publication as widely as possible. (Para.113)

The Guidelines on the Routine Collection of Capture Fishery Data have been widely distributed at workshops, seminars and regional meetings; they have also been translated into French (CWP-18 para 113)

The meeting also considered the proposed revised formulation of the criteria for determining the nationality of catches. The proposed formulation has been revised to reflect the changes suggested, and is set out in the following paragraph. CWP accepted the revised formulation as a refinement of the previous version and recommended that it be applied as widely as possible, by CWP organizations and States. (Para.118) CWP recommended the revised formulation for determining the nationality of catch data. (para 119)

FAO has adopted the revised definition, but retained the chapeau from the original definition.

Applying these criteria, CWP-17 recommended changes in relation to four major fishing area boundaries: (1) between Areas 47 and 51, (2) between Areas 51 and 57, (3) between Areas 57 and 71 and (4) between Areas 57 and 81, subject to the agreement of national fisheries statistical authorities of the countries fishing these waters and assurances that historical time series can be adjusted. The inclusion of industrial tuna catches in these areas into the appropriate FAO statistical area aggregates is possible as data are available by 5° x 5° (and sometimes 1° x 1°) grid areas. Maps showing the proposed changes are provided in Annex 5 of the CWP-17 Report. (Para.121)

On changes to four major area boundaries, action has varied:

Between areas 47 and 51: No action has been taken pending the establishment of SEAFO. The SEAFO establishment process opposed the proposal (on the basis of an objection from Spain) and is also debating the location of its northern boundary (on the basis of proposals from Angola) and consulted FAO for its opinion on this .

Between 51 and 57: Change has been effected with the agreement of Sri Lanka and India; catches of Sri Lanka in the FAO database have been attributed to area 57 (formerly they were allocated to Area 51); there was no need to act on India data, because the catches of the Madras State had not been correctly attributed to major area 51 before the change.

Between area 57 and 71: Discussions have been undertaken with Indonesia, but a firm approval of the proposal has been delayed by important changes in the Fishery Department structure.

Between areas 57 and 8: CWP 18 recommended that FAO should implement the moving of the southern boundary between 57 and 81 from the present 150 degrees east to 140 degrees east. Australia is the only country affected by the change and the Chairman of BRS Fisheries Statistics Working Group, present at the CWP-17 meeting in Hobart, supported in principle the proposal. Although Australia agreed in principle, their preference was for 141 degrees east, this being the border between South Australia and Victoria States. FAO further discussed with IOTC and SPC the proposal of using for convenience the 140 meridian, rather than 141 degrees east. A compromise could be reached striking the border at 140 all the way North to parallel 40 and then cut a rumb line to match the border between the South Australia and Victoria states at 141 east. There is no legal implication in changing such borders, which have been established for statistical purposes. The change will only be reflected in the FAO statistical Yearbook, since catches of Victoria State will be re-assigned to area 81. Australia has been approached for providing fishery production statistics of Victoria State by species, before the modification can actually be implemented in the database.

CWP-18 recommended that the modification to the boundary between major fishing areas south of Australia should be implemented immediately as Australia (the only major country affected) has agreed. CWP also recommended that FAO should follow up the recommendation concerning modification to the boundary between areas 51 and 57 between India and Sri Lanka in order to have this implemented as soon as possible. (Para.123)

See above.

CWP recommended that a table of terminology relating to the Precautionary Approach used by different organisations should be prepared by FAO based on input from the regional organisations. This document should be available for the Expert Consultation of the Precautionary Approach: Tuna Biological and Technological Research. This meeting is planned in March 2000. (Para.145)

An intersessional meeting was held to discuss this, organized by ICES, and the report (CWP/19/2(B)) was provided to the Expert Consultation.

Despite trends in the opposite direction, CWP recommended that efforts should be pursued with classification maintenance agencies to make the classification more detailed, especially for species of little volume of trade, but for which there are conservation concerns. (Para. 161)

FAO and Eurostat discussed with the World Customs Organization the mechanism for revising trade classifications but no initiative has yet been taken in order to develop a more detailed classification for fishery commodities .

Although some of the possible reasons for discrepancies among fishery trade data of CWP agencies were identified, CWP recommended that Eurostat, FAO and OECD should investigate the causes of discrepancies in published data and should attempt to eliminate these discrepancies or, where the differences were due to the use of differing concepts in the compilation of the data, provide adequate documentation in the publications explaining the concepts used. (Para.162)

Due to late recruitment in 2000 of commodities statistician, there is no intersessional action to report on the resolution of trade discrepancies in databases of FAO, OECD and Eurostat. (para 162).

CWP noted the usual absence of data on foreign landings and trans-shipments from official foreign trade data and recommended the CWP agencies publishing fishery trade data to intensify their efforts to obtain the foreign landings and trans-shipment data from the national authorities. (Para.163)

The CWP agreed that there is an urgent need for an international standard format which accommodates the reporting of position, fishing activity, catch and other data through VMS. The format should allow very extensive flexibility in the data elements to be included. One such possible standard which seemed to meet these criteria is the “Danish standard” adopted by many agencies in the Atlantic, but there may be other candidates. The CWP strongly recommended that an international standard be developed and promoted, and that FAO consider facilitating this process as a matter of urgency. Presentation of the “Danish standard” and other candidate standard formats on the FAO Web site would assist this process. (Para.170)

The “Danish standard” is gaining wider acceptance. FAO has published technical guidelines on the application of VMS and has been developing a VMS strategy document in consultation with IMO. A VMS web site is also being developed.

An inter-sessional meeting is proposed to finalize the table designating lead agencies for catch statistics (and effort if available) for particular species in particular areas as recommended in paragraph 81 above. It would be desirable to also consider the methodology and logistics of adopting data from the lead agencies referred to in 1 above. The Secretary should take the lead in arranging this meeting which could possibly be held in conjunction with the FAO ACFR Working Party on Status and Trends in Fisheries which will meet in November 1999. (Para.171)

See notes above under recommendation of para. 81.

An inter-sessional meeting of agencies concerned with dissemination of North Atlantic catch statistics (Eurostat, FAO, ICCAT, ICES and NAFO) as recommended in paragraphs 88 and 89 is also proposed. ICES will take the lead in arranging this meeting which will probably take place in the first quarter of 2000. The same meeting may also be an appropriate occasion to consider historical statistics of the former USSR, and particularly the Baltic States, as recommended in 105 above. (Para.172)

See notes above under recommendations of paras. 89 and 105.

CWP-18 recommended that the title of the STATLANT Newsletter be changed to the CWP Newsletter and that it be made available on the Web with links from the CWP site on the FAO Fisheries Web site. CWP-18 recommended that Eurostat and FAO should cooperate to implement this. (Para.174)

CWP recommended that the Handbook of Fishery Statistics be also made available as a CD ROM and on the CWP Web site when it has been completed in the revised version. Consideration should also be given to renaming it, possibly as the "CWP Compendium on Fisheries Statistics". (Para.175)

Work on the revision and completion of missing chapters of the Handbook has progressed, but is not completed and therefore the recommended dissemination on CD ROM is postponed. The title proposed for the revised edition is "CWP Handbook of Statistical Standards" (para 175).

The table prepared at the 1993 Ad Hoc Consultation on High Seas Fishery Statistics for Regional Fishery Agencies summarizing the statistical programme of each agency has been extensively quoted and is generally considered to be useful. CWP-18 recommended that it should be modified and updated and that each agency should provide by 30 October 1999 to the CWP Secretary a brief description for each of following attributes for each agency to be included in a revised version of the table: (Para.176)

Six agencies provided this information to the Secretary. In addition, tuna agencies developed more detailed tables describing their data sets on a species basis.