



COORDINATING WORKING PARTY ON FISHERY STATISTICS

Twenty-fifth Session

Rome, Italy, 23-26 February 2016

**Intersessional Activities of the Aquaculture Group
(Activities 2013-2016)**

Draft Report

Report on inter-sessional activities 2013-2016,

02/02/2016

The activities of the CWP Aquaculture Group during the inter-sessional period from February 2013 to February 2016 focused on the terms of reference of the Task Force for Aquaculture adopted at the CWP-24. In particular:

- Review and comparison of the AQ questionnaires that are currently in use in member organizations and other relevant aquaculture questionnaires, e.g. from the JRC, to identify gaps and overlaps;
- Develop the zero draft of a standard AQ questionnaire in light of the minimum data reporting referred to in the CWP Aquaculture Handbook;
- Develop draft guidelines to support the use of the AQ questionnaire.

The Task Force members of the CWP Aquaculture Group met three times:

1. In June 2014, the aquaculture questionnaires from FAO, GFCM and Eurostat were compared (see summary in Table 1, page 3) to identify overlaps and discuss differences. The EC Joint Research Centre (JRC) also participated at the meeting contributing with details on aquaculture data under the European Commission's Data Collection Framework.
2. In May 2015, a first version of the zero draft standard aquaculture questionnaire was developed, taking into account the minimum data reporting referred to in the CWP

Aquaculture Handbook and current practices and experience of the participating institutions. Some concepts and definitions were also discussed and refined where the CWP AQ Handbook did not provide sufficient guidance. These points are to be included in the guidelines to the zero draft standard questionnaire. Both the questionnaire and guidelines were further elaborated in the follow-up of the meeting.

3. In October 2015, this second version of the zero draft standard aquaculture questionnaire was shaped further in a meeting hold in conjunction with the FAO COFI in Brasil (see minutes of the meeting on page 4/5).

The latest draft, version 3, will be presented to the CWP AQ at the CWP-25 in February 2016 in Rome. The guidelines have been partly included in the questionnaire. Complete, separate draft guidelines have not been finalised yet.

It had not been possible to hold the inter-sessional meetings of the Aquaculture Group in conjunction with the FAO COFI Sub-Committee of Aquaculture as previously foreseen. This issue may require further attention, but generally it seems as if ad-hoc meetings (physical or virtual) to discuss specific issues are more feasible than meetings planned long time in advance.

Draft proposal of activities for the next inter-sessional period 2016-2019, adhering to the ToRs of the CWP Aquaculture Group

1. Continue the work of the Task Force for Aquaculture finalising the standard aquaculture questionnaire and respective guidelines including a glossary with clear definitions of relevant terms and concepts.
2. Enhance the standard aquaculture questionnaire through standard data structure definitions (DSD) enabling a seamless data exchange. To this end,
 - carry out an inventory of dataset structures, code lists, metadata and data exchange formats currently in use in Member organisations and
 - develop a proposal for best practices in form of a global standard DSD for aquaculture statistics.
3. Encourage Members to make use of the standard aquaculture questionnaire, guidelines and DSD.
4. Encourage members to conduct case studies for data collection and analyses of feed and environmental impact and sharing the results.
5. Enhancing regional consultation among Members as well as with partners in a Region.

Table 1 Comparison of aquaculture data collections from FAO, GFCM and Eurostat, June 2014

		Eurostat	FAO	GFCM
AQ production volume (in tonnes)	by species	Y	Y	Y
	by technique	Y	Y	Y
	by environment	Y	Y	Y
	by FAO Major Area	Y	Y	Y
	by culture system	N	N	Y
	by product	N	N	Y
	including ornamental species	N	Y ¹	Y ²
AQ production value (unit price)	by species	Y	Y	Y
	by technique	Y	Y	Y
	by environment	Y	Y	Y
	by FAO Major Area	Y	Y	Y
	by culture system	N	N	Y
	by product	N	N	Y
	including ornamental species	N	Y ¹	Y ²
AQ production of eggs for human consumption	volume	Y	N	N
	value	Y	N	N
AQ production of eggs for on-growing		Y	Y	Y
	transferred to controlled environment	optional	Y	N
	released to the wild	optional	Y	N
	including ornamental species	N		Y ²
AQ production of juveniles (in numbers)		Y	Y	Y
	transferred to controlled environment	optional	Y	N
	released to the wild	optional	Y	N
	including ornamental species	N		Y ²
Input to capture based AQ	volume	Y	N	Y ²
	value	Y	N	Y ²
	including ornamentals	N	N	Y ²
Production centres				

number of centres	N	Y	Y
size of facilities	Y	Y	Y
size of facilities by method	Y	Y	Y
size of facilities by environment	Y	Y	Y
species group	Y	Y ³	Y
product destination	N		Y

¹ separate questionnaire

² incomplete data

³ including aquatic plants

CWP – AQ Task Force meeting, 4. October 2015

Minutes

Participants:

Friderike Oehler (Eurostat), Xiaowei Zhou (FAO), Cherdsak Virapat (NACA), Ruth Garcia-Gomez (SPC); Sachiko Tsuji (CWP Secretariat -- FAO),

1. Participation and venue of CWP AQ inter-sessional meetings

- Due to the low level of participation of CWP AQ Group members, it was decided to consider the current meeting to be a **Task Force meeting**, instead of an inter-sessional CWP AQ Group meeting.
- NACA (the Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia-Pacific) proposed to hold **an inter-sessional CWP AQ Group meeting in Bangkok in September 2016 back to back with the NACA meeting** to which all NACA member countries participate. The high interest of NACA member countries, which are the most important aquaculture producers world-wide, in aquaculture statistics and the work of the CWP AQ Group was highlighted. NACA is an intergovernmental organisation that promotes rural development through sustainable aquaculture. **It was agreed to table the issue at the next CWP-AQ meeting for decision.**

2. Discussion of the draft Standard AQ Questionnaire

- **Format:** The CWP Secretary emphasised that the standard AQ Questionnaire should focus on the contents, including concepts and standard classifications where applicable, of a standard aquaculture data collection only, not on the format, since the format of the actual questionnaire will vary according to the needs and practices of the implementing institutions. Eurostat insisted that a standard data collection and transmission concept and common code lists are as important as the contents of the questionnaire to achieve comparable statistics and allow automatized data processing and that the "format" should thus definitely be discussed in the next step. NACA supported the idea of a standard format and cited the World Meteorological Organization as a good example for automated standard data transmissions centralized in one organization. SPC also showed interest in new developments for data exchange, informing that SPC is currently setting up a new AQ data collection and is planning to use FAO templates.
- **AQ1:** Eurostat asked for an introductory page to the questionnaire, since the purpose, structure and ideas behind this standard questionnaire are difficult to be understood otherwise. Regarding the **unit of measurement**, FAO insisted that numbers should be used for production destined to life ornamental uses since this is the unit being used

Comment [DF(1): Incomplete means that, although these data are requested by the GFCM, not all the countries have transmitted the information entirely

globally for ornamentals. Production of life ornamentals is increasing and weight does not capture this importance. This was supported by SPC. The lengthy discussion on the importance of recording **non-food uses** (live ornamental, industrial, feed/bait, functional, other) concluded to separate human food (in tonnes) from non-food uses (in tonnes) on the first level, and optionally to collect details on live ornamental (in numbers), feed/bait or other uses for non-food production on a second level. Eurostat prefers to separate the production of **commodities** such as caviar and pearls from the production of bulk aquaculture products collected through AQ1, while FAO pointed out the problem of possible double counting of production of relevant species and expressed its preference to use one questionnaire to cover all production as currently the practice at FAO.

- **AQ2/AQ3:** It was decided to merge AQ2 and AQ3 to some extent to avoid duplication. Thus, AQ2 would collect data on the **input to aquaculture** and AQ3 would collect **nursery production destined to be released to the wild**. Data on brood stock, if necessary, would be part of AQ3 as a measure of hatchery productivity and not be counted as input. The unit for both AQ2 and AQ3 will be numbers.
- **AQ2, Seed input:** Different **life stages** may be distinguished for the input of seeds. No decision on which life stages to use was made because the proposed 0+, 1+, 2+, etc. may be the most correct division, but adds very much detail as well and risks to introduce confidentiality. Instead a simple division in fertilised eggs and juveniles could be used. As regards the **source** of seeds three categories were proposed: Domestic production, import and input from the wild. It was argued, however, that data providers may not be able to know whether seeds were imported or domestically produced. Some considered the need to separate public and private hatcheries production.
- **AQ4/AQ+ 5:** There was no agreement whether both "capacity of aquaculture facilities" and "total land and water area use" are necessary. Each measure has its own advantages and uses (productivity of aquaculture entities vs. marine/coastal area development). Also, the source of these data differs with the first being provided on farm level and the second being known from registers. The area of marine production units may be measured through remote sensing. However, if capacity is to be measured, the area alone is insufficient, but total water volume in active use must be recorded.
- **AQ+ 6:** Eurostat would like to use FTE by gender to measure **employment** in the aquaculture sector. The FTE concept is clearly defined, easy to use and it allows global comparability of data. FAO insists on maintaining their current use of full-time, part-time, occasional and subsistence employment to continue time series. A solution would be to use FTE as obligatory measure and further details as optional measures. NACA would like to further divide into national and foreign labour force, but others were concerned about a division into ethical groups.

3. Next steps

The CWP Secretary, together with FAO, will amend the draft Standard Questionnaire v2 taking into account the results of the discussion. The new version will be sent to the participants for their review by the end of the week. Subsequently, common code lists and definitions shall be defined.

