RFMO vs. FAO Codes

FAO CWP on Statistics (t-RFMO)

Miguel HERRERA

Objectives

- Is FAO's intention that RFMO stats can be used for science or just to create a portal including information in a harmonized manner ?

- Map t-RFMO codes into FAO classification:
  - Large aggregates (regardless of targetting and selectivity) ?
  - High resolution (considering targetting and selectivity) ?

- Recommend harmonization of t-RFMO codes ?
  - It is a recommendation from the Kobe Process
  - Does it require adoption from RFMO Science Committees ?
  - Is it always possible to use FAO codes ?

Which codes ?

- Important to the FAO
  - Flags/Countries
  - FAO Areas (can all RFMO produce statistics by FAO Area?)
  - Species/Stocks
  - Gears/Metiers
  - Units of Catch (number, weight frozen, fresh, processed, etc.)
  - Units of Effort (standard or ad-hoc ?)
  - Type of data (sample/raised): not codes per se but important
  - Conversion factors (e.g. processed to round weight)
- All ?
  - Lenght types
  - Conversion factors (length to lenght, length to weight, weight to length, number to weight)

Countries/Flags/Fleets

- Mapping is quite straightforward
  - Country to Country 2-α Codes or 3-α Codes
  - Flag/Fleet to Country 2-α Codes or 3-α Codes
    - E.g. Brasil has many entries in the ICCAT database
- Questions
  - Changes in countries
    - Soviet Union (Russian Federation, Ukraine, etc.)
    - Netherlands Antilles (Curazao)
  - Country groups
    - European Union
    - FIS (France, Cote ´d'Ivoire, Senegal)
    - Various categories of NEI
    - Overseas Territories (France, UK)
  - Other
    - Taiwan Province of China

Species

- Which species ?
  - Each RFMO manages a group of species buth they are not necessarily the same
    - Target species: ICCAT & IOTC have a mandate to manage more stocks
    - Bycatch species & incidental catches (sharks, marine turtles, marine mammals, seabirds, other fish)
  - Need to select a group of species that is consistent or clearly specify what is presented for each RFMO
- Stocks
  - Shall FAO separate statistics by stock (e.g. SKJ East and West ICCAT) ?
  - Do FAO Areas coincide with the área of distribution of stocks ?
- Non-FAO codes
  - Aggregates that do not exist as such for FAO
    - E.g. Aggregates of two marlins, all billfish but swordfish, skipjack tuna & kawakawa, etc.
    - Aggregate to broather categories ?
    - FAO to créate new codes ?

Gears & Metiers

- Does FAO want a high resolution mapping or just aggregation into broad groups ?
  - Is gear selectivity important to the FAO ?
    - If not: Pole-and-Line, Purse seine, gillnet, longline, handlines, trolling, other
    - If it is then the mapping is more complex (fleet + gear + metier ?)
- How good RFMO Gear caracterisation is?
  - Selectivity
  - Targetting
- Does FAO have codes for all RFMO gear aggregates ?
  - PS-LP (IATTC), G/L (IOTC), etc.
  - Aggregate to broader category (e.g. UNCL) or for FAO to créate the aggregate

Other

- Statistics from RFMO áreas overlapping one another
  - IOTC-WCPFC / CCSBT / WCPFC-IATTC
- Statistics from the South China Sea (Mar incognita ?)
- Use of different effort units
  - Is FAO interested in effort ?
    - If so some RFMO manage various types of effort for the same gear type (IOTC)
- Is the reliability of catch/effort estimates important ?
  - Catch units used for CE data (e.g. number of fish JPN LL IOTC)
  - Missing catch (do all RFMOs account for missing catch?)
  - Precision / Bias
  - Sample size (total enumeration or sample?) and coverage
  - RFMO do not report on quality often (only IOTC)
  - Conversion factors used
  - Confidentiality rules and data not published (e.g. less tan 3 boat rule)
    - Are data aggregated or not published?

A tentative way ahead

1. FAO to define the purpose of the datafiles they will display
2. RFMO to explore harmonization of code listings or mapping of those
3. FAO to decide the amount of information they want to display concerning species, data source, coverage and quality
4. CWP to agree on the level of aggregation required
5. CWP to map the existing codes into FAO codes as per the above
6. CWP to solve specific cases for which mapping is not possible at the moment
7. CWP to agree on procedures to incorporate future new codes