

**Report of the**

---

**SECOND MEETING OF FAO AND NON-FAO REGIONAL FISHERY  
BODIES OR ARRANGEMENTS**

**Rome, 20-21 February 2001**



**Report of the**  
**SECOND MEETING OF**  
**FAO AND NON-FAO REGIONAL FISHERY BODIES OR**  
**ARRANGEMENTS**

**Rome, 20-21 February 2001**

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS**  
**Rome, 2001**

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries

ISBN 92-5-104583-6

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this information product for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders. Applications for such permission should be addressed to the Chief, Publishing Management Service, Information Division, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy or by e-mail to [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org)

© FAO 2001

## PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

This is the final report approved by the Second Meeting of FAO and Non-FAO Regional Fishery Bodies or Arrangements held in Rome on 20 and 21 February 2001.

FAO.

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.

### ABSTRACT

The Second Meeting of FAO and Non-FAO Regional Fishery Bodies or Arrangements was held at FAO Headquarters, Rome, on 20 and 21 February 2001. The Meeting discussed some external factors that might impact on the work of regional fishery bodies (RFBs) and fisheries management, indicators to assess the performance of RFBs and cooperation in global trends and status reporting in fisheries. It also reviewed a number of emerging issues in fisheries, in particular, illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing, developments in CITES criteria for listing commercially-exploited aquatic species and opportunities and challenges for coordinated activities on ecosystem-based management of fisheries.

The Meeting reached a number of conclusions regarding matters meriting the attention of RFBs governments and FAO. It acknowledged in principle the need to develop performance indicators and related guidelines, suggested that thought be given to the issue within their respective RFBs and that the results of this study be further discussed at subsequent meetings of RFBs.

The Meeting saw merit in the concept of an international plan of action (IPOA) on status and trends reporting and suggested that the draft of the IPOA-STATUS&TRENDS be carefully considered. It expressed support for the draft IPOA on illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing and noted that the IPOA ultimately would contribute to reduce and eventually eliminate the incidence of IUU fishing. The Meeting expressed the need for both effective criteria and process in making decisions, on listing and delisting in CITES and emphasized the need for inclusion of appropriate scientific evaluation in the process. The Meeting agreed that there was a need for closer collaboration between RFBs and Regional Seas Convention bodies (RSCs). It also agreed that the issues on external factors impacting on the management of fisheries and indicators to assess the performance of RFBs together with other thematic issues to be identified should be reviewed at its third meeting. The Meeting agreed to change the title of the Meeting of FAO and Non-FAO Regional Fishery Bodies or Arrangements to "Meeting of Regional Fishery Bodies".

Distribution:

Members of the Committee

Other interested nations and international organizations

FAO Fisheries Department

FAO Regional Fishery Officers



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Pages</b>
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF SOME EXTERNAL FACTORS THAT MAY IMPACT ON THE WORK OF REGIONAL FISHERY BODIES AND FISHERIES MANAGEMENT	1
INDICATORS TO ASSESS THE PERFORMANCE OF REGIONAL FISHERY BODIES	3
COOPERATION IN GLOBAL TRENDS AND STATUS REPORTING IN FISHERIES	4
ILLEGAL, UNREPORTED AND UNREGULATED (IUU) FISHING	6
DEVELOPMENTS IN CITES CRITERIA FOR LISTING COMMERCIALY-EXPLOITED AQUATIC SPECIES	8
OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES FOR COORDINATED ACTIVITIES ON ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT OF FISHERIES	10
TOPICS/AREAS FOR DISCUSSION AT THE THIRD MEETING	12
DATE AND PLACE OF THE THIRD MEETING	13
ANY OTHER MATTERS	13
ADOPTION OF THE REPORT	13
 <b>APPENDIXES:</b>	
A. Agenda	15
B. List of Participants	17
C. List of Documents	22
D. Opening Statement by Mr Ichiro Nomura, Assistant Director-General, Fisheries Department	24

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. The Second Meeting of FAO and Non-FAO Regional Fishery Bodies or Arrangements was held on 20 and 21 February 2001 at FAO Headquarters, Rome. Representatives from 24 regional fishery bodies, namely, nine FAO and 15 non-FAO bodies, participated. Representatives from the FAO Coordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics (CWP), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), and the Chairperson of the FAO Advisory Committee on Fisheries Research (ACFR) also participated at the Meeting. The List of Participants is given in Appendix B.

2. Mr Ichiro Nomura, Assistant Director-General, Fisheries Department, opened the Meeting and welcomed the participants on behalf of the Fisheries Department. He underlined the importance of the substantive issues to be discussed at this Meeting and stressed that continued dialogue would enhance closer collaboration between FAO and non-FAO fishery bodies or arrangements in their mutual endeavour to achieve responsible management and utilization of fishery resources. The full text of the Assistant Director-General's statement is shown in Appendix D.

3. The Meeting adopted the Agenda presented in Appendix A. A list of documents placed before the Meeting is given as Appendix C.

4. The Meeting unanimously elected the following as office bearers:

Chairperson:	Mr Robin Allen, Director, Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC);
Vice-Chairperson:	Mr Estebán de Salas, Executive Secretary, Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR);
Rapporteur:	Mr Tissa Amaratunga, Assistant Executive Secretary, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO).

5. The above officers will hold office until the beginning of the Third Meeting.

6. The FAO Fisheries Department provided the Secretariat for the Meeting.

7. The participants from RFBs pointed out that in most cases they were representatives of the Secretariat only and were not mandated for decision making. Therefore, comments made could only be considered as personal or expert advice.

## **REVIEW OF SOME EXTERNAL FACTORS THAT MAY IMPACT ON THE WORK OF REGIONAL FISHERY BODIES AND FISHERIES MANAGEMENT**

8. The Secretariat introduced Agenda Item 4 on the basis of document RFB/II/2001/2 which had been prepared in response to a recommendation of the First Meeting of FAO and Non-FAO Regional Fishery Bodies or Arrangements, held in 1999.

9. The Meeting commended the Secretariat for the comprehensive review of the subject, which addressed issues that were not touched upon during its first meeting. It was pointed out that the discussion focused on experiences of delegates within their own RFBs. Attention was drawn to the fact that land-based activities did not only affect nearshore waters but also enclosed and semi-enclosed seas, and that pollutants also reached open oceans. A particular problem of the Baltic Sea was the damming of rivers for hydroelectricity resulting in a drastic decline of wild salmon runs and the necessity for an extensive stocking programme.

10. The Meeting noted that the concerns of particular RFBs naturally reflected the concerns of their Member States and their region. Some participants stressed the primacy of the fisheries management mandate of their RFBs. Others viewed their mandate in a broader perspective which included ecosystem effects and environmental issues within fisheries management. Some delegations suggested that studies should be undertaken to determine the impact of large predators on fisheries, while a delegation pointed out that it was mandated by its convention to minimize the impact of fisheries on all predators.

11. The Meeting recalled that, about 30 years ago, it was the fisheries sector and RFBs that drew the attention of the public to the degradation of the marine and aquatic environment and advocated measures for the protection of seas and rivers against pollution. In this connection, it was pointed out that many RFBs had special committees that dealt with environmental issues.

12. Several participants pointed out that intensive monitoring of the quality of the marine environment was carried out mostly by Regional Seas Conventions (RSCs) and the results published in periodic reports on the state of the marine environment. The data collected could provide good background information which might be used by RFBs in ecosystem-based management of fisheries and thus indirectly address some of the external factors. Some delegations suggested that it could be advantageous therefore if RFBs liaised closely with other international bodies and programmes, particularly RSCs, which might have information on external factors that would contribute to their analysis and decision making.

13. The Meeting acknowledged that with the rapid development of new information technology, it was conceivable that RFBs could build on their strengths and successes to date and begin to explore the extent to which they could take a wider range of external factors into account in their advisory/regulatory functions.

14. Some RFBs which lacked resources and thus had a limited opportunity to address external factors were of the opinion that the issue should effectively be addressed by the national authorities of Member States.

15. After lengthy discussion, the Meeting considered that it was essential to strengthen routine consultations between fisheries stakeholders and other interested bodies and to engage some of the issues raised directly within their workplans/agenda.



16. The Meeting noted with satisfaction the good cooperation that was developing between some RFBs and a number of RSCs, as well as the strengthening of cooperation among RFBs since the First Meeting of FAO and Non-FAO Regional Fishery Bodies. In this respect, it took note of the meeting of scientists of tuna management organizations that was held in Phuket, Thailand, in March 2000, and the meeting of scientists of salmon commissions (NASCO, IBSFC, and NPAFC), planned for March 2002, in Vancouver, Canada.

## **INDICATORS TO ASSESS THE PERFORMANCE OF REGIONAL FISHERY BODIES**

17. The Secretariat, in introducing the documents relevant to the above agenda item (RFB/II/2001/3, RFB/II/2001/Inf. 5 and Inf. 7), noted that, according to some studies, the roles of regional fishery bodies had gradually evolved beyond their original advisory functions during the Twentieth Century. This evolution had gained impetus since the adoption of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the recent international agreements and initiatives, notably the FAO Compliance Agreement, the UN Fish Stocks Agreement, and the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. A number of processes had been underway to strengthen the roles of regional fishery bodies in the conservation and management of living marine resources.

18. In this regard, 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 sustainable fisheries and environmental management and 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 the 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.

19. 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.

20. 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 provided a good general set of criteria for the 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.

21. Participants exchanged experiences on existing 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.

22. 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 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.

23. 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.

24. While supporting in principle the need to develop performance indicators and related guidelines, participants stressed that, in view of the various nature (in term of mandate, species coverage, economic situation of members, governance systems, etc.) of regional fishery bodies, it was difficult to establish indicators which were generally applicable to all of 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.

## **COOPERATION IN GLOBAL TRENDS AND STATUS REPORTING IN FISHERIES**

25. The Meeting was presented with document RFB/II/2001/4. It noted that information on status and trends of fisheries was one of the priority areas identified by the First Session of the Advisory Committee on Fisheries Research (ACFR) which had been endorsed by COFI at its Twenty-third Session in 1999. A Working Party on Status and Trends in Fisheries, established by ACFR at its first meeting in November 1999, reviewed the analysis and dissemination processes for information on status and trends of fisheries and identified shortcomings and constraints. It recommended the development of an international plan of action on status and trends of fisheries (IPOA-

STATUS&TRENDS) for consideration by COFI. The recommendation was endorsed by the Second Session of ACFR in December 1999, which agreed that the Working Party should continue its work in the preparation of a draft International Plan of Action for review at its Third Session in December 2000. At its Third Session, ACFR refined the draft IPOA and recommended that it be submitted to the Twenty-fourth Session of COFI in February 2001, for consideration and guidance on further action. The Meeting was informed that the proposal for improved status and trends reporting in fisheries was in line with its view and recommendations from its First Meeting (Rome, 11-12 February 1999) regarding the roles of RFBs in information exchange and dissemination.

26. The ultimate goal of the draft IPOA was to provide a framework, strategy and plan at the national, regional and global levels for improving information and knowledge of fishery status and trends as a basis for fisheries policy-making and management for the conservation and sustainable use of fishery resources. With this overall objective, the actions required in the short, medium and long terms were outlined.

27. The Chairperson of ACFR pointed out that status and trends analysis and dissemination were fundamental, underpinning activities of RFBs and FAO, as well as many national institutions. He highlighted the importance of FAO's reports on the status and trends of fisheries, while also noting inherent limitations of the internalized process used by the Secretariat for preparing these reports. In addition, in many instances, such analyses were often seriously hampered by a lack of reliable data and insufficient analytical capacity at the national level. The draft IPOA would seek to enhance the collection and analysis of basic data at the national level. It would further seek to share responsibility for the assembly and synthesis of status and trends information from the national to the regional and global levels in a more comprehensive and systematic way through RFBs and FAO.

28. The Meeting recognized that there were increasing demands for transparent processes for the analysis and dissemination of information on status and trends at the national, regional and global levels. The draft IPOA was intended to increase transparency and to make analyses more explicit, including identifying uncertainties.

29. It was suggested that the quality of data needed to be addressed and that consideration should be given to systematically indicating the quality of data in databases. It was further suggested that the process that had been employed in the analysis should be described.

30. At the request of participants, details on the present status of the FAO project "Fisheries Global Information System" (FIGIS) were provided. It was explained that FIGIS was a tool for dissemination of fishery information through a collaborative partnership involving FAO, RFBs and national centres of excellence. As such, it could also facilitate the implementation of the IPOA-STATUS&TRENDS. The roles and responsibilities of FIGIS partner organizations would be clearly stated in partner agreements, and so far memoranda of understanding had been agreed between FAO and six RFBs. In response to concerns expressed about the dissemination of confidential

information, it was clearly stated that FIGIS would only disseminate public domain information which partner RFBs agreed to contribute according to their mandates, and that information contributed by RFBs would be clearly attributed to them and be completely under their control.

31. The Meeting expressed support for the development of FIGIS independent of IPOA-STATUS&TRENDS. The Meeting also agreed that FIGIS would provide a good facilitating mechanism for improved collation, analysis and dissemination of information on status and trends of fisheries through evolving cooperative initiatives among FIGIS partners.

32. The Meeting recognized the essential need to improve data collection and the analysis in some cases and dissemination of information on status and trends of fisheries and fishery resources. Participants saw merit in the concept of an IPOA on status and trends reporting and suggested that the draft of the IPOA-STATUS&TRENDS be carefully considered.

### **ILLEGAL, UNREPORTED AND UNREGULATED (IUU) FISHING**

33. The Secretariat, introducing document RFB/II/2001/5, advised the Meeting that FAO had taken steps, in compliance with directives of the Committee on Fisheries, to formulate a draft International Plan of Action (IPOA), including consultation with regional fishery management organizations (RFMOs), cooperation with the Government of Australia in convening an expert consultation, and convening of a technical consultation. The formulation also took into account various initiatives within the United Nations system, notably the Rome Declaration on the Implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries adopted by the FAO Ministerial Meeting on Fisheries in 1999 and the UN Commission on Sustainable Development.

34. The ensuing discussion focused on the section of the draft IPOA dealing with RFMOs. The meeting acknowledged that IUU fishing was a widespread international issue that impacted on the work of management organizations and expressed support for the draft IPOA, noting that it should ultimately reduce and eventually eliminate the incidence of IUU fishing. However, the meeting also recognized differences in incidence and scope of IUU fishing between high seas and inshore fisheries and between marine and coastal and inland capture fisheries.

35. Many RFBs indicated that IUU fishing was a serious problem in their respective areas and that these organizations were addressing the problems generated by IUU fishing in ways that were largely consistent with the provisions of the draft IPOA. Example of the situation in some RFBs were given below:

- CCAMLR had taken strong measures to counter the high level of unregulated fishing and the special environment of the Antarctic. Among others, it had taken measures related to trade (catch documentation scheme), port authority, transshipments, vessel monitoring systems, political approaches to non-

member countries whose vessels were known to fish in CCAMLR waters, contact with other international organizations and increased its budget substantially to be in a condition to develop these measures immediately;

- The General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) recognized the importance of addressing IUU fishing and expressed similar concerns to the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) with respect to large pelagics. It was anticipated that the Commission would focus more sharply on IUU fishing in the future;
- For several years, ICCAT had taken measures to combat IUU fishing, measures that are consistent with those in the draft IPOA.
- IUU fishing was a major problem for the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC), in particular due to large long-line fleets, with over 70,000 tons of unreported catch. Of special concern was the large long-line fleet from Taiwan Province of China. The view was expressed that when arrangements were put in place for the implementation of management measures, some means would need to be developed to engage Taiwan Province of China, in view of its significant role in the region's tuna fishery.
- The North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission (NPAFC) advised the meeting that illegal salmon fishing had been taking place in its area of competence by large-scale driftnet vessels. Members of the Commission were working together to strengthen enforcement and improved coordination.

36. The meeting took note that in the Baltic Sea, the International Baltic Sea Fishery Commission (IBSFC) had put in place requirements for vessels to be authorized to fish, together with other measures such as monthly catch reporting systems.

37. The meeting also noted the action being undertaken by the Latin American Organization for Fisheries Development (OLDEPESCA) in working with its members that operate open vessel registries. In the case of one OLDEPESCA member, this work had resulted in a reduction of fishing vessels on its registry from 1,571 to around 100. These remaining vessels were now subject to vessel monitoring and data reporting requirements.

38. One delegation expressed the view that trade-related measures should not be used to combat IUU fishing.

39. It was noted that the practicalities of timing and recording of information as called for in paragraph 73 of the draft IPOA should be carefully considered as vessels could change their status in a short period of time.

40. With respect to IUU fishing in small-scale fisheries, the Meeting noted that action was being taken to address this phenomenon. This included licensing and registration procedures that were supported by the monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) programme.

41. The Meeting noted further that IUU fishing had not been identified in the southeast Asian region as a priority fisheries issue. This was because IUU fishing was seen as a high seas fishing problem rather than an issue for coastal or inshore fisheries. Nonetheless, the Representative of the Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) reported that members of SEAFDEC were taking action to address some of the causes of IUU fishing such as the need to implement vessel registration systems. It was further noted that there was a need to sensitize fishers and fishing communities about IUU fishing. The link between poverty and IUU fishing in small-scale fisheries should not be overlooked.

42. The Meeting did not express unanimous view about the effects subsidies could have on the sustainability of fishery resources and, in that context, on IUU fishing. The Secretariat noted that the reference to such transfer payments stemmed from situations where these payments resulted in overcapacity.

### **DEVELOPMENTS IN CITES CRITERIA FOR LISTING COMMERCIALY-EXPLOITED AQUATIC SPECIES**

43. The Secretariat introduced Agenda Item 8, referring to document RFB/II/2001/6. Some background on the mandate and role of CITES was provided, and the intention of listing on each of the three Appendices was briefly described. The growing interest within CITES in commercially-exploited fish species had led some FAO member countries to request FAO to undertake a review of the CITES criteria as they applied to commercially-exploited aquatic species. The Secretariat explained the progress made in the review to date, especially referring to the conclusions and recommendations of the Technical Consultation on the Suitability of the CITES Criteria for Listing Commercially-exploited Aquatic Species, held in June 2000.

44. The Secretariat drew the attention of the meeting, in particular, to the following recommendations of the Consultation. The Consultation agreed that the existing criteria and guidelines needed to be reviewed to consider the specific characteristics of commercially-exploited aquatic resources, taking into account differences in life histories and between taxonomic groups. There was also a need to improve understanding of the listing of species in Appendix II, and there were differences of opinion as to whether it related to reducing the risk of extinction and/or promoting sustainable use. These differences needed to be resolved. A further significant outcome from the meeting was identification of the need for encouragement for the use of national competence in fisheries in the elaboration of proposals for listing in CITES of resources exploited by fisheries in marine and large freshwater bodies. It was suggested that a Working Group should be established within FAO to consider problems and potential solutions in relation to listing fishery resources under Article II, particularly those listed on the basis of paragraph 2(b) [the “look-alike” provision]. Finally, the Secretariat drew attention to the request from the Technical Consultation that the Fisheries Department of FAO should play a facilitating role in improving dialogue and communications among member States, RFMOs and CITES.

45. In the ensuing discussion, many representatives indicated that the role of CITES and the nature of the listing criteria had not been directly addressed by their RFBs. In one case where there had been discussions within the RFB, the representative referred to concerns with the criteria relating to the distinction between species and stocks, and also that the numbers of individuals occurring in fish stocks at even low population abundances were orders of magnitude greater than numbers referred to in the CITES Guidelines. Another Representative stated that the Member States of that RFB were of the opinion that CITES should not be involved in fisheries. The Representative referred to the substantial changes in the legal and institutional frameworks of fisheries since the CITES Convention entered into force in 1975. It was pointed out that since then, the international community had adopted a number of international instruments, including the UN Law of the Sea, the Compliance Agreement, the UN Fish Stocks Agreement, and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. Parallel to this, there had been the establishment and/or strengthening of some RFBs. The view of that RFB was therefore that aquatic species being harvested commercially, regardless of its stock status, should be managed by the appropriate fishery bodies, taking into account the provisions of recently adopted international instruments rather than placed on a CITES Agenda.

46. Concern was also expressed by some representatives about the difficulties associated with delisting of species once they had been placed on an Appendix. It was agreed that suitable criteria and a process should be developed to ensure timely delisting when a species had recovered sufficiently to justify this. Another representative stated that a particular RFB found CITES a useful mechanism for complementing the management capacity of their Member States which frequently suffered from limited capacity and resources to manage all resources effectively.

47. Most of the remaining discussion focused on the CITES process for listing species rather than on the criteria themselves and there was considerable interest in Recommendation 12(d) of the FAO Technical Consultation which called on the Fisheries Department of FAO to play a facilitating role in improved dialogue and communications among Member States, regional fisheries management organizations and CITES. This recommendation arose from the directive of Article XV of CITES which requires the CITES Secretariat, when they receive a proposal for listing or delisting of a marine species, to “consult intergovernmental bodies having a function in relation to those species”. The role and responsibility of FAO in this regard were debated and most representatives expressed the view that CITES must take direct responsibility for liaising with the appropriate intergovernmental body and that this responsibility should not be delegated to FAO. The FAO Secretariat indicated that it would be possible for FAO to fulfil a role in providing assistance and facilitating communication but that there would be problems associated with FAO being held responsible for this task. It would also not be appropriate in most cases for FAO to comment directly on the validity of proposals as they did not have the data or expertise to undertake this task and in such cases they could only refer to other organizations with the mandate and capacity to undertake such evaluations.

48. The representative of CITES stated that the CITES Secretariat attempted to comply with the requirements of Article XV and that on the whole it was successful in doing so. However, it was difficult for CITES to be fully informed of which intergovernmental bodies were involved with the species which could be proposed for listing and that FAO could provide valuable assistance in this regard. He also pointed out that CITES informed all CITES Parties of all listing proposals and suggested that the RFBs should take steps to ensure that their member countries notified them when they received a proposal falling within individual mandates of the RFBs.

49. The Chairperson of ACFR reminded the meeting of the need to have both effective criteria and an effective process in making decisions on listing and delisting. He suggested that the criteria needed to be improved, but that it would probably be impossible to develop criteria that would be suitable for all species and that an effective scientific evaluation process would also be required.

50. The Meeting suggested that communication within the parties involved in issues related to fisheries in CITES should be improved and that RFBs should, as much as possible, be involved in the work of CITES, particularly for those species falling under their jurisdiction, including species taken as by-catch.

#### **OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES FOR COORDINATED ACTIVITIES ON ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT OF FISHERIES**

51. The Secretariat introduced document RFB/II/2001/7 which highlighted recent developments in consolidating ecosystems approaches into fisheries management. It was recognized that such approaches were still at an early stage of development by regional organizations competent for fisheries and marine and coastal environment. As there were a number of major Regional Seas Conventions in force, and many RFBs involved with management of oceans and their resources, there was a need to strengthen cooperation and coordination between these bodies. In this connection, the Secretariat referred to activities undertaken by RFBs as summarized in Annex 9 of the document.

52. The Representative of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) stressed the interest of this agency of the UN system to strengthen relations between RFBs and regional and global organizations concerned with aquatic resources and environment. He recalled that when this issue was discussed at the Third Meeting of RSCs in Monaco in November 2000, the meeting endorsed the proposal for increased coordination of activities with other international organizations and, in particular, RFBs.

53. The Representative of IBSFC, referring to Agenda 21, informed the meeting that a programme of work was prepared jointly with other regional bodies dealing with the Baltic Sea marine environment. A Global Environmental Facility (GEF) project for the Baltic Sea region which might start this year for a five-year period had been designed. The project had two components: one marine-based component and one land-based component. The main objective of this project was to secure a healthy ecosystem and sustainable fisheries development.



54. The Representative of ICCAT noted that, although his organization was not mentioned in Annex 9 of document RFB/II/2001/7, ICCAT had been carrying out environmental-related activities including work on associated and independent species and by-catch. A scientific sub-committee had been created to deal with these issues.

55. The Representative of the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO) also noted that although NAMMCO was not mentioned in Annex 9, the ecosystem management approaches had been on NAMMCO's agenda since the inception of the organization. The Representative informed the meeting that a working group under NAMMCO Scientific Committee remained active and was working in the complex problem of understanding multi-species interaction and the role of species in the ecosystem and that information on this subject would be made available to the Meeting at future meetings.

56. The Representative of OLDEPESCA stated that all programmes and research activities of OLDEPESCA included components related to ecosystem-based fisheries management.

57. The Representative of IATTC stated that ecosystem modeling was being used to support the work the Commission was doing with issues related to by-catch. He informed the Meeting that mutual observer status had been established between IATTC and the Comisión Permanente del Pacífico Sur (CPPS) which permitted the exchange of information on data of mutual interest and the participation at meetings organized by either of the organizations. The Representative also informed the Meeting that the Secretaries of both organizations had recently co-sponsored a technical meeting that examined climate change and its effect on fisheries in the Eastern Pacific Ocean. There was similar cooperation with PICES.

58. The Representative of SEAFDEC underlined the relevance of ecosystem-based fisheries management to tropical fisheries and pointed out that SEAFDEC was considering undertaking some appropriate activities in this area.

59. The Representative of CCAMLR informed the Meeting that CCAMLR was very much involved in the work of the Committee of Environmental Protection of Antarctica, in the implementation of the agreement of the Antarctica Treaty contracting parties, and actively participated in the meetings as appropriate. The Representative further stated that the CCAMLR web site contained a large amount of information with regard to CCAMLR's approach to ecosystem management. It was pointed out that part of the content of Annex 9 of document RFB/II/2001/7 which described CCAMLR activities should be amended to reflect the current situation.

60. The Representative of ICES informed the Meeting that ICES had developed research programmes on fisheries and ecosystems and a new advisory committee had been created to deal with overlapping issues between RSCs and RFBs.

61. The Secretary of the Western Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC) observed that the Cartagena Convention for the Wider Caribbean generally covered the same geographical area covered by WECAFC and that this could facilitate cooperation between the Caribbean RSC and WECAFC. Initial contact was made to identify one possible activity of common interest.

62. The representative of IOTC explained that, although its mandate was restricted to tuna and tuna-like species, the Commission had authorized collection of data on non-target, associated and dependent species (NTADs). Nevertheless, few data were available as logbook programmes of contracting and collaborating countries did not currently cover these species. Environmental anomalies were currently studied in relation to their effect on fish stocks. While there was no evidence of any cetacean mortalities in relation to purse seine fishing, predation of cetaceans on longline-caught fish was of increasing concern. Studies would also be conducted to establish whether FADs acted as environmental traps for both target species and NTADs.

63. The Secretary of the Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (CECAF) Scientific Sub-Committee acknowledged the excellent collaboration that existed between CECAF and the large marine ecosystem project for the Gulf of Guinea financed by GEF. The Representative expressed the wish to see this collaboration strengthened as the CECAF Scientific Sub-Committee had recently established a working group to deal with environmental matters related to artisanal fisheries.

64. The Representative of UNEP described the role that the Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS) had played in providing the framework and information on marine ecosystem at a global level. He also stated that UNEP and IOC were cooperating to re-tool GOOS in order to re-adjust its objectives to the new development in the marine ecosystems and fisheries global requirements.

65. The Meeting agreed for the need for closer collaboration between RFBs and RSCs. The Meeting also agreed that document RFB/II/2001/7 elaborated by FAO and UNEP be updated. In this connection, the Meeting requested that representatives of RFBs should provide the Secretariat with any contribution in this respect before 31 March 2001.

#### **TOPICS/AREAS FOR DISCUSSION AT THE THIRD MEETING**

66. The Meeting agreed that two agenda items should be kept under review, namely, some external factors affecting the management of fisheries, and indicators to assess the performance of regional fishery bodies. It was agreed that the Chairman liaise with the secretariats of RFBs during the intersessional period to compile additional themes for the Agenda of the Third Meeting together with justification for proposing such themes.

67. The Meeting agreed that the Chairman, in consultation with FAO and regional fishery bodies, would work out mechanisms for preparing documentation for the next session.

### **DATE AND PLACE OF THE THIRD MEETING**

68. The Meeting agreed that the Third Meeting of Regional Fishery Bodies be held immediately after the Twenty-fifth Session of COFI in 2003.

### **ANY OTHER MATTERS**

69. The Meeting agreed to change the title of the Meeting of FAO and Non-FAO Regional Fishery Bodies or Arrangements to “Meeting of Regional Fishery Bodies”. It further agreed that the Meeting was, in principle, for the secretariats of regional fishery bodies.

70. The Meeting noted the diversity of its membership in terms of mandates and rules and suggested that, in order to better provide for issues unique to inland fisheries, consideration should be given to a possible back-to-back meeting, or a meeting within the margins of the main meeting for those RFBs which had interest in inland fisheries.

### **ADOPTION OF THE REPORT**

71. The meeting adopted this report on 21 February 2001.



**APPENDIX A****AGENDA**

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable
3. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur
4. Review of some external factors that may impact on the work of regional fishery bodies and fisheries management
5. Indicators to assess the performance of regional fishery bodies
6. Cooperation in global trends and status reporting in fisheries
7. Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing
8. Developments in CITES Criteria for listing commercially-exploited aquatic species
9. Opportunities and challenges for coordinated activities on ecosystem-based management of fisheries
10. Topics/areas for discussion at the Third Meeting
11. Date and place of the Third Meeting
12. Any other matters
13. Adoption of the Report



**APPENDIX B****LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON  
FISHERIES RESEARCH**

M. SISSEWINE  
Northeast Fisheries Science Center  
Woods Hole, MA 02543  
U.S.A.  
Tel: +508 495 2233  
Fax: +508 495 2232  
Email: [michael.sissenwine@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.sissenwine@noaa.gov)

**ASIA-PACIFIC FISHERY  
COMMISSION**

V. HONGSKUL  
Senior Fishery Officer  
Secretary, APFIC  
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the  
Pacific (RAP)  
Maliwan Mansion  
39 Phra Atit Road  
Bangkok 10200, Thailand  
Tel. 00662 2817844  
Fax. 00662 2800445  
Email: [Veravat.Hongskul@fao.org](mailto:Veravat.Hongskul@fao.org)

**COMMISSION FOR THE  
CONSERVATION OF ANTARCTIC  
MARINE LIVING RESOURCES**

E. DE SALAS  
Executive Secretary  
CCAMLR  
PO Box 213  
137 Harrington Street  
North Hobart, 7000  
Tasmania, Australia  
Tel. 0061 3 62310366  
Fax. 0061 3 62349965  
Email: [ccamlr@ccamlr.org](mailto:ccamlr@ccamlr.org)

**COMMISSION FOR THE  
CONSERVATION OF SOUTHERN  
BLUEFIN TUNA**

C. McGREGOR  
Executive Secretary  
CCSBT  
1/19 Napier Close  
Deakin  
PO Box 37  
Deakin West ACT 2600  
Australia  
Tel. 0061 2 62828396  
Fax. 0061 2 62828407  
Email: [cmcgregor@ccsbt.org.au](mailto:cmcgregor@ccsbt.org.au)

**COMMITTEE FOR INLAND  
FISHERIES OF AFRICA**

W.Q.B. WEST  
Senior Regional Fishery Officer  
Secretary of CIFA  
FAO Regional Office for Africa  
PO Box 1628  
Accra, Ghana  
Tel: +233 21 7010930/675051-60  
Fax: +233 21 7010943  
Email: [wariboko.west@fao.org](mailto:wariboko.west@fao.org)

**CIFA - SUB-COMMITTEE FOR THE  
DEVELOPMENT AND  
MANAGEMENT OF FISHERIES IN  
LAKE TANGANYIKA**

G. SSENTONGO  
Secretary, CIFA Sub-Committee for the  
Development and Management of  
Fisheries in Lake Tanganyika  
FAO Subregional Office for Southern  
and East Africa (SAFR)  
P.O. Box 3730, Harare, Zimbabwe  
Tel. 00263 4 791407  
Fax. 00263 4 703497  
Email: [George.Ssentongo@fao.org](mailto:George.Ssentongo@fao.org)

**SECRETARIAT OF THE  
CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL  
TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES  
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA**

G. VAN VLIET  
CITES Secretariat  
15 Ch. des Anemones  
Geneva, Switzerland  
Tel: +4122 9178139/40  
Fax: +4122 7973417  
Email: [cites@unep.ch](mailto:cites@unep.ch)

**COORDINATING WORKING PARTY  
ON FISHERY STATISTICS**

R. GRAINGER  
Chief  
Fishery Information, Data and Statistics Unit  
Secretary, CWP  
FAO  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00100 Rome, Italy  
Tel. 0039 06 57054828  
Fax. 0039 06 57052657  
Email: Richard.Grainger@fao.org

**EUROPEAN INLAND FISHERIES  
ADVISORY COMMISSION**

H. NAEVE  
Senior Fishery Resources Officer  
Secretary, EIFAC  
FAO  
Fishery Resources Division  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00100 Rome, Italy  
Tel. 0039 0657056244  
Fax. 00390657053020  
Email: Heiner.Naeve@fao.org

**FISHERY COMMITTEE FOR THE  
EASTERN CENTRAL ATLANTIC**

W.Q.B. WEST  
Senior Fisheries Officer  
Secretary of CECAF  
FAO Regional Office for Africa  
PO Box 1628  
Accra, Ghana  
Tel: +233 21 7010930/675051-60  
Fax: +233 21 7010943  
Email: [wariboko.west@fao.org](mailto:wariboko.west@fao.org)

**CECAF – SCIENTIFIC SUB-  
COMMITTEE**

A. JALLOW  
Regional Fishery Officer  
Secretary of SSC  
FAO Regional Office for Africa  
P.O. Box 1628  
Accra, Ghana  
Tel. 00233 21 666851  
Fax. 00233 21 668427  
Email: [Alhaji.jallow@fao.org](mailto:Alhaji.jallow@fao.org)

**GENERAL FISHERIES COMMISSION  
FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN**

H. BEN ALAYA  
Senior Fishery Liaison Officer  
Secretary, GFCM  
FAO  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00100 Rome, Italy  
Tel. 0039 06 57056435  
Fax. 0039 06 57056500  
Email: [Habib.Benalaya@fao.org](mailto:Habib.Benalaya@fao.org)

**INDIAN OCEAN TUNA COMMISSION**

D. Ardill  
Secretary of IOTC  
P.O. Box 1011  
Victoria  
Seychelles  
Tel. 00248 225494  
Fax. 00248 224364  
Email: [iotcsecr@seychelles.net](mailto:iotcsecr@seychelles.net)

**INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA  
COMMISSION**

R. ALLEN  
Director IATTC  
8604 La Jolla Shores Drive  
La Jolla  
California 92037  
USA  
Tel: +1 858 5467100  
Fax: +1 858 5467133  
Email: [rallen@iattc.ucsd.edu](mailto:rallen@iattc.ucsd.edu)



## **INTERNATIONAL BALTIC SEA FISHERY COMMISSION**

L. VAARJA  
Chairman IBSFC  
Ul. Hoza 20  
00528 Warsaw, Poland

W. RANKE  
Secretary of IBSFC  
Ul. Hoza 20  
00528 Warsaw  
Poland  
Tel: +48 22 6268 86 47  
Fax: +48 22 625 33 72  
Email: [ibsfc@polbox.pl](mailto:ibsfc@polbox.pl)

## **INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE EXPLORATION OF THE SEA**

H. SPARHOLT  
Fisheries Assessment Scientist  
ICES  
Palaegade 2-4  
1261 Kbh. K  
Denmark  
Tel: +45 33154225  
Fax: +45 33934215  
Email: [henriks@ices.dk](mailto:henriks@ices.dk)

## **INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF ATLANTIC TUNAS**

V. RESTREPO  
ICCAT  
C . Corazon de Maria, 8 - 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
28002 Madrid  
Spain  
Tel: 0034 91 4165600  
Fax. 0034 91 4152612  
Email: [info@iccat.es](mailto:info@iccat.es)

## **MEKONG RIVER COMMISSION**

J. G. JENSEN  
Programme Manager  
MRC Fisheries Programme  
MRC Secretariat  
P.O. Box 1112  
Phnom Penh  
Cambodia  
Tel: +855 23 720979  
Fax: +855 23 720972

K. VATTANATHAM  
Programme Officer  
MRC Fisheries Programme  
MRC Secretariat  
P.O. Box 1112  
Phnom Penh  
Cambodia  
Tel: +855 23 720979  
Fax: +855 23 720972

## **NORTHEAST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION**

K. HOYDAL  
Secretary  
NEAFC  
22 Berners Street  
London W1T 3DY  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 20 76310016  
Fax: +44 20 7636 9225  
Email: [kjartan@neafc.org](mailto:kjartan@neafc.org)

## **NORTH ATLANTIC MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION**

G. HOVELSRUD-BRODA  
General Secretary of NAMMCO  
(Sondre Tollbodgate 9 visiting address)  
University of Tromso  
Tromso 9037, Norway  
Tel: +47 77645908  
Fax: +4777 645905  
Email: [nammco-sec@nammco.no](mailto:nammco-sec@nammco.no)

## **NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION**

T. AMARATUNGA  
Assistant Executive Secretary  
NAFO  
PO Box 638  
2 Morris Drive  
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia B2Y 3Y9  
Canada  
Tel: +1 902 468 5590  
Fax: +1 902 468 5538  
Email: [nafo@fox.nstn.ca](mailto:nafo@fox.nstn.ca)

## **NORTH PACIFIC ANADROMOUS FISH COMMISSION**

V. FEDORENKO  
Executive Director  
NPAFC  
Suite 502, 889 West Pender Street  
Vancouver, B.C.  
Canada V6C 3B2  
Tel: +1 604 775 5550  
Fax: +1 604 775 5577  
Email: [vladf@npafc.org](mailto:vladf@npafc.org)

## **LATIN AMERICAN ORGANIZATION FOR FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT (OLDEPESCA)**

C. MAZAL  
Executive Director  
OLDEPESCA  
Las Palomas 422  
Lima 34  
Peru  
Email: [oldepesc@bellnet.com.pe](mailto:oldepesc@bellnet.com.pe)

## **REGIONAL COMMISSION FOR FISHERIES**

A. SAIF  
Secretary, RECOFI  
FAO Regional Office for the Near East  
PO Box 2223  
Cairo, Egypt  
Tel. 0020 2 3372229  
Fax. 0020 2 3495981  
E-mail: [Mohammad.Saif@fao.org](mailto:Mohammad.Saif@fao.org)

## **SOUTHEAST ASIAN FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT CENTER**

Y. KATO  
Special Adviser  
SEAFDEC Secretariat  
PO Box 1046  
Fastsat PO Bangkok  
10903 Thailand  
Tel: 662 940 6335  
Fax: 662 940 6336  
Email: [kato@seafdec.org](mailto:kato@seafdec.org)

## **SECRETARIAT OF THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY**

T. ADAMS  
Director  
Marine Resources Division  
SPC  
PO Box D5  
98848 Noumea Cédex  
New Caledonia  
Tel. 00687 260149  
Fax: 00687 263818  
Email: [tima@spc.int](mailto:tima@spc.int)

## **SOUTH PACIFIC FORUM FISHERIES AGENCY**

F. P. TEO  
Director FFA  
P.O. Box 629  
Honiara  
Solomon Islands  
Tel: +677 21124  
Fax: +677 23995  
Email: [info@ffa.int](mailto:info@ffa.int)

## **SOUTHWEST INDIAN OCEAN FISHERY COMMISSION**

A. HARRIS  
Secretary, SWIOFC  
Subregional Office for Southern  
and East Africa (SAFR)  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor Old Mutual Centre  
Cnr. J. Moyo/Third Avenue  
P.O. Box 3730,  
Harare, Zimbabwe  
Tel. 00263 4 791407  
Fax. 00263 4 703497  
Email: [Aubrey.Harris@fao.org](mailto:Aubrey.Harris@fao.org)

## **UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME**

J.E. ILLUECA  
Assistant Executive Director  
UNEP  
United Nations Avenue  
Giriri  
Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel:+254 2 623494  
Fax:+254 2 624300  
Email: [jorge.illueca@unep.org](mailto:jorge.illueca@unep.org)

S. KECKES  
Consultant  
UNEP  
21 L. Brunetti 21  
Rovinj, Croatia  
Tel/Fax: +385 52 811 543  
Email: [skeckes@compuserve.com](mailto:skeckes@compuserve.com)

## **WESTERN CENTRAL ATLANTIC FISHERY COMMISSION**

B. CHAKALALL  
Secretary of WECAFC  
FAO Sub-Regional Representation  
for the Caribbean  
P.O. Box 631-C  
Bridgetown  
Tel. 00854 4267110  
Fax. 00854 4276075  
E-mail: Bisessar.Chakalall@fao.org

## **FAO SECRETARIAT**

B.P. Satia  
Secretary of RFBs  
Chief, International Institutions  
and Liaison Service, FIPL  
E-mail: Benedict.Satia@fao.org

D. Menasveta  
Consultant

J.C. Webb  
Meetings Officer

A.M. Defendi  
Secretary

## **FAO, FISHERIES DEPARTMENT**

Ichiro Nomura  
Assistant Director-General

Z.S. Karnicki  
Director  
Fishery Policy and Planning Division, FIP

S. Garcia  
Director, Fishery Resources Division, FIR

G. Valdimarsson  
Director, Fishery Industries Division, FII

J. Csirke  
Chief, Marine Resources Service, FIRM

D. Doulman  
Senior Fishery Liaison Officer  
International Institutions and  
Liaison Service, FIPL

A. Bonzon  
Fishery Planning Officer  
Development Planning Service, FIPP

G. Bryden  
Fishery Liaison Officer  
International Institutions and  
Liaison Service, FIPL

K. Cochrane  
Fishery Resources Officer  
Marine Resources Service, FIRM

L. Garibaldi  
Fishery Statistician  
Fishery Statistics Group, FIDI

N. Hishamunda  
Fishery Planning Analyst  
Development Planning Service, FIPP

R. Shotton  
Fishery Resources Officer  
Marine Resources Service, FIRM



**APPENDIX C****LIST OF DOCUMENTS**

RFB/II/2001/1	Agenda and Timetable
RFB/II/2001/2	Some external factors influencing the work of regional fishery bodies and fisheries management
RFB/II/2001/3	Indicators to assess the performance of regional fishery bodies
RFB/II/2001/4	Proposal for improved status and trends reporting on fisheries
RFB/II/2001/5	Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing: proposal for a draft international plan of action
RFB/II/2001/6	Review of the CITES listing criteria for species exploited by fisheries in marine and large freshwater bodies
RFB/II/2001/7	Ecosystem-based management of fisheries: opportunities and challenges for coordination between marine regional fishery bodies and regional seas conventions
RFB/II/2001/Inf.1	List of Documents
RFB/II/2001/Inf.2	List of Participants
RFB/II/2001/Inf.3	Statement by the Assistant Director-General, FAO Fisheries Department
RFB/II/2001/Inf.4	Report of the (First) Meeting of FAO and Non-FAO Regional Fishery Bodies or Arrangements, Rome, Italy, 11-12 February 1999
RFB/II/2001/Inf.5	Regional Fishery Bodies and Governance: Issues, Actions and Future Directions. FAO Fisheries Circular N <sup>o</sup> 959 (FIPL/C959)
RFB/II/2001/Inf.6	Proceedings of the FAO E-Mail Conference on Fish Trade and Food Security Executive Summary
RFB/II/2001/Inf.7	The Development of Indicators of Sustainable Development (ISD) in Fisheries



**APPENDIX D****OPENING STATEMENT BY MR ICHIRO NOMURA  
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR-GENERAL, FISHERIES DEPARTMENT**

Ladies and Gentlemen, Colleagues,

I appreciate very much this opportunity to be with you today at the Second Meeting of FAO and Non-FAO Regional Fishery Bodies or Arrangements. It is a great pleasure for me, as the Assistant Director-General of the Fisheries Department, to extend to you the warm welcome of the Fisheries Department. It is also so delightful for me, as an individual, to be able to see many of my old friends today.

You will recall that your first meeting of Regional Fishery Bodies was held in February 1999 and that representatives from 20 bodies participated. The meeting reached a number of conclusions meriting the attention of regional fishery bodies, governments and FAO. In particular, the meeting stressed the importance of the precautionary approach for fisheries management and governance and of involving all stakeholders in developing and implementing management measures. In addition, the meeting urged the continued adaptation of mandates, structures and policies for improved responses to the challenges facing world fisheries.

At that meeting, Ladies and Gentlemen, you also expressed concern over the problems arising from over-capacity in fisheries and the lack of sufficient progress in improving the monitoring and enforcement of management measures.

It is important to note that the outcome of the first meeting was well received by the Twenty-third Session of the Committee on Fisheries (COFI), which was held in Rome a few days later. COFI endorsed the recommendation of the first meeting that such meetings be held on a regular basis, preferably prior to regular sessions of the Committee. So, here we are today to review what actions we have taken either individually or collectively, to foster the implementation of the recommendations of the first meeting and also to share experiences and views on often common problems and seek solutions to such problems as appropriate.

A glance at your agenda is sufficient to indicate the range of issues before you. You have not only a heavy task but a great responsibility. The substantive issues for considerations at this meeting are:

- external factors that may impact upon the work of regional fishery bodies and the management of fisheries;
- indicators to assess the performance of regional fishery bodies;

- a review of some emerging issues in fisheries of relevance to regional fishery bodies, in particular illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, cooperation in global trends and status reporting in fisheries, recent developments on criteria for listing commercially exploited fisheries in marine and large freshwater bodies in CITES; and
- the opportunities and challenges for coordination between marine regional fishery bodies and regional seas conventions.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Colleagues,

These are important issues, which deserve our attention. Through concerted action, I strongly believe that regional fishery bodies can improve their own performance, contribute to world food security and enhance international cooperation in the conservation and management of fisheries.

In this connection, I note with satisfaction the establishment of the Regional Commission for Fisheries (RECOFI) to cover the Gulfs region in the North West Indian Ocean, the opening for signature and ratification of the Convention on the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific, the conclusion of negotiations for the establishment of the Southeast Atlantic Fisheries Organization (SEAFO) and ongoing negotiations for the establishment of the Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC). These efforts are to be encouraged as fewer unregulated areas will be left on the high seas.

I wish to take this opportunity to express the appreciation of the Fisheries Department for the assistance and cooperation that the Department has received from your Bodies. Your contributions have been very useful not only for the elaboration of the documents to be presented at this session, but also in the production of several other reports and documents by the Department. We are indeed grateful and look forward to your continued collaboration.

Finally, I hope that your meeting will be marked with success and that you will begin making plans for the next meeting in two years time. In this connection I strongly believe that the agenda of future meetings should be elaborated in close collaboration with you, in particular with the Chairman you are going to elect, who should remain in office till the next meeting. These are YOUR meetings and FAO wishes to facilitate them in the best possible way.

Thank you very much for your attention.