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

Twenty-second Session

Rome, ITALY. 26 February-2 March 2007

Review of progress of recommended actions and other relevant information addressing agenda items

Report by Secretary

This document provides overview of progress made on recommendatsions of CWP-21 as well as information relevant to the discussion of individual agenda items.

Agenda 2: Changes in member organizations since CWP-21

Since the CWP-21, NEAFC applied to become a Member on December 2005 that was approved unanimously in January 2006. Prior to the 22nd Session of CWP, GFCM informed the Secretary on its decision to apply for a CWP membership with a brief description on the organization. The Secretary will process GFCM's application promptly. In meantime, GFCM will attend the meeting as RFMO under FAO.

The CWP Secretary attended the WCPFC 2nd Regular Session of Scientific Committee held in Manila, Philipppines, in August 2006 and made a presentation on CWP and FIRMS activities to encourage its consideration to participate to those activities. With general support by SC and Commission meetings, WCPFC was invited to CWP-22 as an observer. A substantial part of statistical works of WCPFC has been and will be covered by SPC who is a Member since 1996. SPC nominated WCPFC also to represent SPC during this 22nd Session.

FAO staff participated to the latest CPPS meeting on fishery statistics held in September 2006, Lima, Peru and explained CWP activities to the CPPS Member countries. Based on the interest expressed by the CPPS Secretariat, CPPS was invited to participate to the CWP-22 as an observer. SEAFO was also invited as an observer by FAO request.

Agenda 8: Aquaculture statistics

Eurostat notified the ISM that discussion in its Working Group revealed certain problems with the concepts and definitions used in aquaculture statistics and, as a result, it confirmed the need for a body to advise on aquaculture statistics.

The Third Session of the COFI Sub-Committee on Aquaculture held in September 2006 in New Delhi agreed to form a body, similar in nature to the CWP, that would be responsible for issues related to standards for aquaculture data and statistics. FIES staff will take an active role for this. The meeting also noted the urgent need to establish internationally acceptable standards and guidelines for eco-labelling and risk assessment for aquaculture which also have some implication to data collection and monitoring. The Secretary will continue to monitor the progress on this issue and keep inform to the CWP.

Regarding the recommendation on Guidelines for capture-based aquaculture [90], ISM noted the actual difficulties in collecting data on the input to the cages from wild stocks even accepting the concept to separate data for the input and output to capture-based aquaculture. At the same time the importance of this information to the management of wild stocks was stressed. ISM considered that the same concept should also be applied to the rearing of other species. Certain difficulties would exist, for example in eel culture where the input was high in numbers, relatively high in value but low in mass.

Agenda 9.1: vessel classification [94]

FAO first proposed to CWP-19 a plan to simplify ISSCFV (International Standard Statistical Classification of Fishing Vessels) with a hope to improve the reporting rate of fleet questionnaire from countries. In addition, its intention is to separate " vessel type" component strictly limit to vessel structural characteristics. The proposal was finally accepted at CWP-21 after several revisions in consultation with FIIT and other CWP members and the final draft of ISSCFV-2005 was developed following the agreement and presented to the ISM. However, FAO expressed concerns on influences of changes to the current code users, ISM agreed to compile a summary table showing what data are collected on gear and vessel types and how they are used, through questionnaire to RFBs and national authorities. The revision will be on hold until the overall situation to be re-evaluated.

The task to review and compile gear and vessel type code used in vessel-related information including vessel registration and fleet statistics has continued sporadicly but has not been completed. The exercise so far indicated that “gear” and “vessel type” are used in a quite entangled way. Many “gear” codes contain vessel structure component including vessel size and type of storage. “Gear” is more often used to identify fishery and few cases require both “gear” and “vessel type” information.

Many fleet databases and vessel registrations systems adopt their own categories for both vessel size and vessel types. Although there are many common features, those are not necessarily mutually translatable. This seems to be one of causes of low reporting rate and of having majority records in “nei” categories even when receiving reports. Eurostat indicated the similar problems when a revision of ISSCFV first proposed. Simplified vessel breakdown will not resolve this problem.

FAO is now proposing to COFI the establishment of a global vessel list including support vessels and total removal of non-fishing vessels from ISSCFV seems to cause a problem. Gear classification is also under review and revision by FAO/ICES Working Group on Fishing Technology and Fish Behaviour (FTFB). Tuna RFBs made effort to harmonize their gear code under the lead of IATTC and requested CWP to incorporate their harmonized code into International Standard Statistical Classification of Fishing Gears (ISSCFG). ICCAT does not participate to this exercise.

Agenda 9.2: Harmonization of fields and codes in vessel database [104]

Tuna RFBs have continued efforts to consolidate authorized and IUU vessel lists maintained by individual organizations.

FAO is reviewing the fields and codes used invessel database partly for the purpose described under Agenda 9.1 and partly for improvement of HSVAR. If COFI will approve the project of global vessel list, the Expert Consultation on designing technical details is planned as the first step, which will provide a good opportunity to harmonize fields and codes used in vessel database.

Agenda 9.3: Review of UN-LOCODE [106]

FAO presented a brief overview of the UN-LOCODE to ISM as a potential code for fishing ports in fishery statistics. UN/LOCODE is developed and provided in the framework of trade facilitation effort and covers locations used for goods movement associated with trade, including ports, airports, inland clearance depots and freight terminals. This is a dynamic system and the Secretariat accepts requests for inclusion of additional locations and other changes. The version examined indicated changes in 179 records and addition of 931 records out of total 45,111 records. The request will be reviewed and evaluated following to its own criteria. The results of quick examination were encouraging though substantial adjustments would be needed to make the system fully applicable for fishing vessels monitoring. ISM concluded that such a coding system would be primarily useful for management and monitoring. The existence of the UN-LOCODE should be noted and to be examined when a port code system is required.

Agenda 10: Fishery Data Quality Indicators [111,115,122]

The document is ready for publication.

ISM noted that FAO changed its plan of work on fishery data quality to first establish the database on methodologies and processes by the FishCode-STF before having an Expert Consultation. Hence, no guidelines will be ready for presentation to CWP-22 but the work will be continued as recommended by CWP-21, although somewhat delayed. ISM also noted that relevant works were ongoing in several working groups in ICES.

Agenda 13.1: Comparison of fishery data system by RFBs [70] – retained from CWP-20

It is assumed that this recommendation corresponds to the para. 35 of CWP-20 Report: "CWP recognized that methodological descriptions of national fishery statistics programmes provide very useful indications of statistical quality and recommended that such descriptions be collated and made available by CWP agencies as far as possible."

FishCode-STF project has collected methodological information of data collection and fisheries monitoring system with a special emphasis on small scale fisheries using a common inventory framework. Currently, the inventory covers countries in South East Asia, Central America, the Pacific and China. The FishCode-STF project has developed a special database for storing and analyses of the information collected. The database is currently under review with the aim to simplify analytical procedures, after the review and adaptation it will be made publicly available through the FishCode-STF website or FAO FI website.

Agenda 13.2: Submission of trade document information to RFBs[71] – retained from CWP-20

Since the Expert Consultation of Regional Fisheries Mangement Bodies on Harmonization of Catch Certification held in La Jolla, in January 2002, harmonization of catch documentation has been discussed at various fora including FAO COFI, COFI Sub-Committee on Fish Trade and Regional Fisheries Bodies. There was a general consensus that FAO should continue to work on the harmonization of catch certification schemes. FAO provided the recommended Harmonized Trade Document and Instructions for Completion that were examined by the 9th Session of COFI Sub-Committee on Fish Trade (February 2004), but no support was agreed to approve them.

At 10th Session of COFI Sub-Committee on Fish Trade (June 2006), FAO prepared the document that compared the different schemes used by RFMOs without attempting to harmonize the documents. The document also clarified the terminology by referring to the Report of Expert Consultation on Certification in 2002 as "***catch certifications*** *are issued at the point of harvesting and cover all fish to be landed or transhipped.* ***Trade documents*** *are issued only with respect to products that enter international trade.*" Here, the term "trade document" refers to the statistical document of the Tuna RFMOs and the Catch Document Scheme of CCAMLR and the associated re-export certificates. It was noted that the term "catch documentation" should not be used due to its ambiguity. The document concluded that the system of trade documentation, VMS and other catch reporting system is moving steadily towards a system where all data will be transmitted electronically and noted that confidentiality is a key issue in catch and position reporting to flag states and subsequent transmission to coastal states or to the RFMBs[1].

Joint Meeting of Tuna RFMOs held in Kobe, Japan, in January 2007 agreed the IUU fishing, trade and catch tracking programs, transhipments and data collection and reporting as the areas needed for stronger cooperation and coordination among tuna RFMOs. Unification of lists of authorized as well as IUU vessels, data sharing among tuna RFMOs, and establishment of harmonized regulation for transhipment including a global observer scheme for carrier vessel were identified as possible first area of coordination and course of actions was developed.

RFMOs that have implemented trade documents schemes include ICCAT (Atlantic bluefin tuna, bigeye tuna, and Swordfish), IOTC (bigeye tuna), CCSBT (Southern bluefin tuna), and IATTC (bigeye tuna). The CCAMLR Catch Documentation Scheme for tooth fish (*Dissostichus* spp.) differs significantly from trade documentation schemes.

Agenda 13.3: Enhancement of RFBs and the FishCode-STF partnership [83,84]

[1] COFI:FT/X/2006/7 Harmonization of catch documentation.

FAO updated summary of progress of the FishCode-STF project with an emphasis on collaboration with RFBs, which were presented to CWP-ISM. (Februay, 2006).

Agenda 13.4: Follow-up of recommendations from the FAO Expert Consultation on Data Format and Procedures for Monitoring, Control, and Surveillance (MCS).

In accordance with the recommendations of CWP-21, NAFO had contacted and met with the MCS Network. NAFO presented promotion materials of MCS Network at CWP-ISM.

The MCS Network was established to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of fisheries-related MCS activities through enhanced cooperation, coordination, information collection and exchange among national governmental organizations and institutions responsible for fisheries related monitoring, control and surveillance. The Network is a voluntary, no -cost organization started in 2001 which now has approximately 50 members from all regions of the globe. Currently, membership is limited to MCS agencies and organizations charged with MCS responsibilities by their national governments. MCS professionals from a variety of professional disciplines participate, reflecting the belief that successful MCS operations involve many different areas. The Network has a website www.imcsnet.org, meetings and large scale training conferences. Recently, the Network has embarked on a three-year enhancement project, where for the first time it will have financial and personnel resources to enhance its services to its members.

ISM noted that MCS-Network had not identified any specific issues on which collaboration with CWP could be useful. Considering that the Network is more concerned with the practical implementation of fisheries enforcement, the ISM felt that it would not be useful to pursue the original idea of collaboration on MCS standards. However, if the Network in the future would be involved with the development of standards and approached CWP, this standpoint would be reconsidered.

The Secretary visited MCS Network in May 2006 and delivered the result of discussion at ISM with further explanation on mandate, role, and nature of CWP.

Agenda 14: Report from Expert Consultations and other meetings

The UNFSA Review Conference held in May 2006 in New York recommended specifically to FAO to . (a) “establish arrangements for the collection and dissemination of data in accordance with Article 7 of Annex I to the Agreement, where none exists” and (b) “revise its global fisheries statistics database to provide information for the stocks to which the Agreement applies, as well as to high seas discrete stocks on the basis of where the catch was taken.”[2] The 61th Session of UNGA in November 2006[3] reiterated the same recommendations in I-15 and 16 as well as in I-8 in more indicative way.

Although those recommendations specifically address to FAO, FAO considers it preferrable to establish capture database such as requested by linking data collected, compiled and analysed by RFMOs and seek for collaboration from other CWP Members.

The UNGA recommendation (b) requests catch data that can be attributed to stocks which the Agreement applies. Generally, stock specific global catch statistics should be available whenver stock assessment is made. In the other words, catch statistics is an integral part of stock assessment and should be disseminated together as a supporting evidence. In that sense, ICES informed at the 2006 ISM the release of a database presenting the annual catch data by stocks, countries and ICES divisions, which are actually used for fish stock assessments. At this moment, the FIRMS, which provides dissemination

[2] A/CONF/.210/2006/15, Annex, Paragraph 25, 26

[3] United Nations A/61/L.38 . General Assembly. 27 November 2006. Sixty-first session. Agenda item 71 (a)

platform for stock status, does not require the inclusion of corresponding catch statistics. On the other hand, FAO Tuna-Atlas disseminates catch statistics by stock for global tuna and tuna-like species.

However, if statistics only focusing on stock specific catch where stock status is available, the extent of usefulness of statistics would be largely limited and we need to consider another database containing capture data of all species taken with catch location detailed enough to identify stocks. Tuna-Atlas also provides such a data in a consolidated way for global tunas. Also, CWP had integrate data from Eurostat, ICCAT, CCAMLR, CECAF, GFCM, ICES and NAFO for Atlantic for the period of 1950-98 under the lead of Eurostat. Consolidated data file was compiled in a FISHSTAT Plus compatible format. Although there was general agreement to update file annualy as well as to extend this to cover the catches in Indian Ocean and Pacific Ocean, an consolidated global capture statistics of this nature does not exist at this moment. This indicates that consolidation of data from various RFBs is at least feasible.

If the meeting can agree on the development of those two types of additional dissemination system, the Secretary will propose to establish action plans including the followings:

- FIRMS to consult with its partner about the mandatory inclusion of catch data by countries by gear used for stock assessment into stock inventory when assessment was made.
- FAO to coordinate technical Working Group discussion to identify possible data sources as well as practical and effective consolidation mechanism of various RFMOs' data and appropriate dissemination tool.
- FAO to seek for funding to support for system development as well as longer term support for data handling and dissmination,

Data collected by RFMOs are not necessarily fully cover non-target catch and incidental takes of sensitive species. The discussion in the technical Working Group will also help in identifying data gaps, especially when applying ecosystem approach to fisheries management.

Agenda 15: Integrating the regional databases- removing the basis for data [124]

Discrepancies of data disseminated from different organizations have been long-standing issues. Previous exercises among FAO, NAFO, CCAMLR and ICCAT succeeded in eliminating substantial discrepancies. CWP-18 Report noted that the fomer USSR data in the 1970s in CCAMLR Area and time series for Canada, Japan, USA, and former USSR in NAFO Area had remained unresolved. CWP concluded "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 sotck." Accordingly, the lead-agencies were identified along the principle of tuna RFBs for tuna and tuna-like species and individual RFMO for relevant jurisdiction areas and species.

Despite of these efforts, discrepancies cannot be totally removed. The remaining discrepancies are caused by either historical data that even national scientists do not have a capacity to resolve, different reporting agencies from countries between FAO and RFMOs and different timing of data compilation and finalizations. Especially on the second causes, it should be noted that FAO, like other RFMOs, is obliged to respect the views of the national reporting authority. Some countries like Japan try to harmonize data before submitting for those species whose catch is reported to other RFMOs by national scientists, which results in data submitted to FAO being consistent with neither data in RFMOs nor those disseminated in its national statistics.

The creation of a separate database proposed under Agenda 6 may provide one possible solution.

SEAFDEC decided to share the same questionnarie as FAO to unify data reporting process by national authority. SEAFDEC and FAO plan to discuss how to share data processing and evaluation responsibility. The Fishery Statistics Working System currently under development is expected to provide a platform where multiple organizations work on the same data simultaneously.