



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-fourth Session

Rome, Italy, 05-08 February 2013

Report of ad-hoc Group on CWP Gear Classification – 2010 (Rome, Italy, 19-21 October 2010)

Report

1. CWP-23 (para 39-40) reviewed the preparation of revised text for the CWP Handbook and ICES/FAO agreed to coordinate on the sections related to vessels/gear that include the section of fishery fleet, fishing gear classification and fishing efforts . It was agreed that the progress inter alia would be reviewed at the intersessional fishery group meeting now planned for December 2011.
2. CWP-23 recommended establishing an Ad hoc group for developing the draft revision of CWP gear classification (the International Standard Statistical Classifications for Fishing Gear (ISSCFG)). Terms of reference are found in Annex II. The meeting took place at FAO HQ 19-21 October 2010. The list of participants is found in Annex I. The agenda is given in Annex III.
3. Sachiko Tsuji (FAO) opened the meeting and Hans Lassen (ICES) was elected chair. FAO agreed to act as rapporteur. The Chair made a tour-de-table at which the participants presented themselves.
5. The noted that the document this meeting is starting to prepare will be a part of the CWP Handbook and Fisheries Statistics Standards.
4. The ICES/FAO Working group on Fish Technology and Fish Behaviour (WGFTFB) had presented a proposal (November 2009) for a revised classification and was invited to present this proposal. This was done by Richard Ferro as one of the authors.
5. 9. The WGFTFB proposal is based on two main considerations: 1. The physical characteristics of the gear, 2. The operational aspects, the way the gear is set, as part of the characteristics of that gear.
5. Richard Ferro indicated that in the eyes of WGFTFB for the work requested by CWP at least 3 main constraints had to be considered,

- a. The classification was to be organized in a 2 level system letting the other levels be up to the countries and/or organizations to decide upon.
 - b. No gears were to be associated with target species.
 - c. There was the need to keep the structure of the classification the most similar to the current one, which meant keeping existing gear categories as much as possible.
6. The meeting thanked WGFTFB for this valuable input and agreed to use this proposal as reference to orient the discussion. The meeting agreed that the classification should define the standard at a global, international level, and leaving the finer details to national scales. This implied an overarching level and just 2 levels seemed appropriate. While this leaves the rest of the levels to regional/national needs and decisions at the same time, many regional organizations and/or countries would like to share a common coding system as well. There is therefore a fine balance to be struck.
7. Bundit Chokesanguan presented a set of Gear pictures (work still in progress) that helped to clarify doubts about set gillnets and fix gillnets, as well as set longlines and vertical-set lines.
8. The meeting had at its disposal the gear code lists used by the regional fisheries organisations. The meeting made numerous references to these code lists during the discussions. The meeting agreed that whatever information regions or countries have should be translatable to ISSCFG.
9. The meeting had input through two phone conferences
- a. with Mr Carlos Palma and Mr Mauricio Ortiz, ICCAT Secretariat. Some issues already discussed by the group were raised and notes were taken about those concerns. The conference also provided some clarifications on ICCAT use of categories.
 - b. with Mr Ricardo Federizon, NAFO Secretariat, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada. Some issues already discussed by the group were raised and notes were taken about those concerns. The conference also provided some clarifications on NAFO categories.
10. There was disagreement among the meeting participants to the concrete WGFTFB proposal. It was argued that the proposal was biased towards gear technology usage while the use for statistical purposes was not fully appreciated. Issues dealt with, for instance, problems arising from combining gears in order to maintain time series, but later needing to split the capture by guessing proportion caught by each. The need of independently consider the gear, without regard to target species, was also questioned although recognising that in some cases, as arctic shrimp gear, in fact this reference can be omitted without loss of information as that gear is used to capture only shrimp.
11. The meeting made an in-depth analysis of the proposed classification. Questions considered included
- a. What distinguishes a gear category from another? and what is establishing what and/or how a new category of gear comes about: Characteristics of use?, or of operation?, target species?
 - b. Should we be considering the operation as one way to define different gears?
 - c. The gear technology is focusing on the capture process while ecosystem based assessment include the habitat and other ecosystem impacts as well. It is therefore a consideration if the classification should take such concerns into account.
 - d. A suggestion was made about eliminating common names already incorporated. For instance, to delete 'lampara' for the Mediterranean, because the name does not relate to the gear itself but to the way it is used, and therefore rather indicates a fishing method. That is why it should be remove so it would not create confusion (Matthew).
 - e. A particular discussion issue was how to include auxiliary devices (excluders, selective, mitigating) used with gears. EU legislation considers them as important and specifies those types of gears, and modifications, as they are legal devices. They change every year

and there would be no way to include them in this standard list. There could be an additional column in which modifications could be indicated.

A quick list of ancillary elements that may operate along with given gears was put together as a way to incorporate this issue into further developments. They were further grouped roughly under two main headings.

A. Those aimed at enhancing capture: Fish Attractants such as FADs (palm leaves), acoustics, lights, light sticks, bait (chum); Observational enhancers such as air spotting (helicopters, planes); acoustic devices (sonars, echo-sounders, bird radars); Satellite data

B. Those aimed at mitigating unwanted impacts: Avoiding devices such as TEDs, bird / mammals avoiding devices, line shooters, tori-poles; Special hooks (circle, fast dissolving); Deterrents such as pingers; Escape hatches; Selectivity windows; Grates

Codes and Naming

12. The meeting agreed on the need for both a numerical as well as a three alpha identifier. Many countries have expressed their wish to avoid dealing with numeric codes, and it is suggested to CWP to emphasize the alpha coding as the one recommended.

13. There is a need for a common name for each category. As CWP operates under English as main language such common names would be in English. However, the CWP standard may well give names also in other languages. The global list would go beyond CWP, but it might be the FAO the one to put it in as many different languages as possible.

14. Common names that would be meaningful to users are to be preferred, but noting the existing standard that has defined language usage to a large extent.

15. The meeting considered if common local names should be incorporated in a manner similar to the ASFA species list, so different people from different places would understand what they refer to? The main use of the classification is for exchange of data between administrations and for publishing statistics and the need for usage of local name for this purpose was not considered too great.

16. The numeric coding should be revised thoroughly; FAO and ICES will review the system and make a proposal for the intersessional meeting. Attention should be paid to who is using the numeric coding and for what purposes. GFCM uses those codes, the main ones 01.0.0; 02.0.0, etc. to indicate the major types of gears. So there would be no problem in changing lower level coding.

Presentation of the gear classification

17. The meeting distinguished two presentations. One would be the Table and Introduction in the Handbook of Fisheries Statistics Standards and the other is the update of the Fisheries Technical paper¹ relevant to ISSCFG.

18. The document this meeting is starting to prepare will be a part of the CWP Handbook.

19. The FAO Document (Technical Guidelines) and the gear section of the Handbook should be coordinated.

20. The FAO Document should include as many levels as the authors deem necessary to cover the subject, but they should not be bound by the CWP international classification. For instance although the CWP Classification may drop the two purse seine categories PS1 and PS2, the FAO document may not need to do that. The FAO task will be to update the old publication already in 3 languages with the state of the art of the gear standardization.

¹ Claude Nédélec and J. Prado 1990. Definition and classification of fishing gear categories FAO FISHERIES TECHNICAL PAPER No. 222/Rev 1

21. The introduction to the section in the Handbook need to include some of the history, why was it necessary to review and update the existing classification. The list in the Handbook should be available at least in 3 languages, English, Spanish, French. It might be tricky to use some names in some languages (e.g. lampara, boliches) and not in other languages.

22. The meeting reviewed the presentation of the gear classification in the FAO Fisheries Technical Paper 222 and the thoughts presented for how best to update this document. The text prepared by FAO was produced for different purposes, people could have very different knowledge and understanding of the subject, but it will need to be amended to incorporate the changes brought about by the CWP.

23. The suggestion was made that that for CWP there should be a similar document to the one from FAO, where definitions of the categories could be detailed, and definitions of the alpha and numeric codes should be provided if applicable. Examples pertinent to different languages should be provided when translated to other than English. However, in the original general document in English there should be references to the different names given to the gear in different parts of the world. The document emanating from CWP should have an introduction indicating why and how this standardization should be useful. It should make references at how to handle gear modifications. Including indications how national classification (coding) systems could be constructed and organized in relation with the global classification. However, after consideration it was considered that several of these points could better be included in the Handbook Introduction and that there would be significant overlap with the Fisheries Technical Paper.

Draft Proposal

24. The meeting developed a draft proposal based on WGFTFB proposal and the 1980 ISSCFG. This proposal was discussed and amended. The final proposal is presented in Annex IV.

25. Hans Lassen, working as FAO consultant, will develop an the Introduction for the section in the Handbook to this proposal for presentation and discussion at the intersessional 2011 CWP meeting.

Conclusions

26. The meeting concluded that the ISSCFG should be a two level classification for international (Global) purposes, while beyond the two levels the subdivisions may respond to national / regional needs and characteristics. ISSCFG would include a prescription for extension of the code for national or regional use.

27. The meeting decided to remove 'Recreational fishing' as a Gear Category since most gears used could also be considered within the classes already included.

28. It would be preferably to have just one level, PS, for the global level and leave PS1 and PS2 for national levels. So there will a distinction between the two levels and their contents.

29. The meeting agreed to a proposal for a gear classification (Annex IV). This was forwarded to FAO/ICES as leads for this topic to develop this further for discussion at the intersessional CWP meeting in 2011.

30. Alpha and Numeric coding of new gear categories would both be developed. It was agreed to maintain old gear codes as long as possible especially for alpha-codes. It is suggested to CWP to emphasize the alpha coding as the one recommended.

31. The numeric coding should be revised thoroughly; FAO and ICES will review the system and make a proposal for the intersessional meeting. Attention should be paid to who is using

32. The classification proposal does not include sorting and other auxiliary devices addressing that issue would require a whole new document. However, where such codes are required e.g. for legal purposes these can be defined at the national or regional level.

AOB

33. A mock presentation of the vessel data management (work in progress at FIPS, FAO) was made Fabio Fiorellato. Matching procedures were demonstrated and the main characteristics of the approach taken were explained. Potential additional uses were suggested for the integration of data within the Tuna Organizations, and especial interest was also indicated by GFCM.

Closing

34. The meeting was closed at noon on 21 October 2011.

Annex I: List of Participants**A. PRESENT AT THE MEETING**

Name	Organization / Position	Address
Mr Francis Chopin	FAO	Francis.Chopin@fao.org
Mr Richard S.T. Ferro	FAO	theferrofamilly@lineone.net
Mr Fernando Jara	FAO	Fernando.Jara@fao.org
Ms Alicia Mosteiro	FAO	Alicia.MosteiroCabanelas@fao.org
Mr Matthew Camilleri	GFCM	Matthew.Camilleri@fao.org
Mr Michael Hinton	IATTC	mhinton@iattc.org
Ms Mette Bertelsen	ICES	mette@ices.dk
Mr Hans Lassen	ICES	hans@ices.dk
Mr Bundit Chokesanguan	SEAFDEC	bundit@seafdec.org
Ms Sachiko Tsuji	FAO/CWP Secretary	Sachiko.Tsuji@fao.org

B. PARTICIPANTS WHO WERE LINKED VIA TELE-CONFERENCE

Name	Organization / Position	Address
Mr Carlos Palma or Mr Mauricio Ortiz	ICCAT 34-91 416 5600 (prefered), or 34-91 510 3713	Mauricio.Ortiz@iccat.int skype: cpalmamadrid or / Mauricioortizp
Mr Ricardo Federizon	NAFO Secretariat 902- 4683978, in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada	rfederizon@nafo.int

Annex II. Terms of Reference: Ad hoc group for developing the draft revision of CWP gear classification

The twenty-third CWP Session, recognizing the Intersessional Work Plan to Update the CWP Handbook, established the Working Group to Revise the CWP Standard Gear Classifications (ISSCFG), the basis of which were provided by FAO Technical Paper 222/Rev.1 (1990).

1. OBJECTIVE: The Group should develop a draft proposal for revision of ISSCFG for both alphabetic and numeric codes.

2. CONSIDERATIONS:

i. Any revision should provide a clear, unambiguous mapping between current and proposed classifications

ii. It is suggested that a critical review of the substantial efforts of the CWP to revise the standards in 2001 and 2005 will be of importance to the working group.

iii. There is a significant demand for standardized gear classifications.

a. Current utilization of the ISSCFG includes vessel registries, fishing vessel licensing, vessel reporting requirements, and for catch and quota management.

b. The recent agreement on a legally-binding instrument on port state measures to prevent, deter and eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated fishing legally binds reporting standards to standard ISSCFG alphabetic codes.

iv. It is not pragmatic to assume that the CWP standard gear classifications will be a standard containing classifications for all possible details for the plethora of gear configurations. Yet, there are continuing demands at national levels for a standard gear classification capable of identifying details of gear configurations. Introducing a standard with a world common component and a user defined component (e.g. WCO HS codes) should be considered.

v. There was general preference at the twenty-third Session of CWP that classifications should not mix attributes based on harvesting mechanics with those based on other factors, such as targeting by fishermen, or definitions of fisheries created by management or reporting authorities.

vi. The twenty-third Session of CWP was advised of an ICES/FAO Working Group on Fishing Technology and Fish Behaviour (WGFTFB) that has been working to update the technical content of FAO Technical Paper 222/Rev.1 (1990). It is expected that the CWP working group would benefit by critical review of the work of the WGFTFB, particularly those related to identification of harvesting mechanisms. Close communication and collaboration with the WGFTFB, especially with the core members from ICES, FAO, and SEAFDEC, may be particularly helpful for the CWP working group, keeping in mind that the WGFTFB considered the update of technical contents based on their knowledge as gear specialists, which may not be necessarily relevant for classification needs for statistical purposes.

3. COMPOSITION

i. Participation in the Working Group to Revise the CWP Standard Gear Classifications shall be open to all CWP participating organizations. Each participating organization shall notify the CWP Secretary of its intention to participate in a group, including its nomination of expert(s). Notification should be delivered to the CWP Secretary by 31 March 2010.

ii. It is expected and requested that FAO, ICES and SEAFDEC nominate at least one expert to participate, since they are participating in the WGFTFB.

iii. The Working Group in consultation should select a Group coordinator by 15 April 2010, and inform the CWP Secretary. The CWP Secretary will deliver the name of the Coordinator and composition of the Group to participating organizations as the earliest possible after 15 April 2010.

4. OTHER MATTERS

vii. Communications and reports on progress of the work should be shared among participating organizations as much as possible, including information and reports available from the WGFTFB as and when available. In this context, FAO should establish a specialized wiki site to facilitate communication and reporting as promptly as possible.

viii. The final draft of proposed standards should be delivered to the CWP Secretary upon completion, but no later than two weeks prior to the twenty-fourth session of CWP. A draft should be presented at the Intersessional Fishery Group meeting.

ix. Operational procedures on voting, expenses, and working languages, should follow the principles of the CWP Rules of Procedure. When a question arises concerning a procedure or course of action, a request for guidance or clarification should be delivered to the CWP Secretary, which if necessary will seek guidance from the participating organizations.

Annex III Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Election of chair and rapporteur
3. Tour-de-table for presentation of the participants
4. Presentation of the WGFBFT proposal for revised gear codes
5. Discussion of the WGFTFB proposal
6. Review of gear codes in use by regional fisheries organisations
7. Discussion of draft proposal
8. AOB
9. Closing

Annex IV Draft proposal for a revised ISSCFG**International Standard Classification of Fishing Gears (ISSCFG)**

(Rev 4 21 October 2010)

(Numerical codes to be reviewed)

Gear Categories	Standard abbreviations	ISSCFG code	
		(new)	(current)
SURROUNDING NETS		01	01.0.0
Purse seines	PS	01.1	01.1.0
Surrounding nets without purse lines	LA	01.2	01.2.0
Surrounding nets (nei)	SUX	01.9	
SEINE NETS		02	02.0.0
Beach seines	SB	02.1	02.1.0
Boat seines	SV	02.2	02.2.0
Seine nets nei	SX	02.9	02.9.0
TRAWLS		03	03.0.0
Beam trawls	TBB	03.11	03.1.1
Single boat bottom otter trawls	OTB	03.12	03.1.2
Twin bottom otter trawls	OTT	03.13	03.3.0
Multiple bottom otter trawls	OTP	03.14	
Bottom pair trawls	PTB	03.15	03.1.3
Bottom trawls (nei)	TB	03.19	03.1.9
Single boat midwater otter trawls	OTM	03.21	03.2.1
Midwater pair trawls	PTM	03.22	03.2.2
Midwater trawls (nei)	TM	03.29	03.2.9
Semipelagic trawls	TSP	03.3	
Trawls (nei)	TX	03.9	03.9.0
DREDGES		04	04.0.0
Towed dredges	DRB	04.1	04.1.0
Hand dredges	DRH	04.2	04.2.0
Mechanized dredges	DRM	04.3	
Dredges (nei)	DRX	04.9	
LIFT NETS		05	05.0.0
Portable lift nets	LNP	05.1	05.1.0

Gear Categories	Standard abbreviations	ISSCFG code	
		(new)	(current)
Boat-operated lift nets	LNB	05.2	05.2.0
Shore-operated stationary lift nets	LNS	05.3	05.3.0
Lift nets (nei)	LN	05.9	05.9.0
FALLING GEAR		06	06.0.0
Cast nets	FCN	06.1	06.1.0
Cover pots/Lantern nets	FCO	06.2	06.2.0
Falling gear (nei)	FG	06.9	06.9.0
GILLNETS AND ENTANGLING NETS		07	07.0.0
Set (find better term) gillnets (anchored)	GNS	07.1	07.1.0
Drift gillnets	GND	07.2	07.2.0
Encircling gillnets	GNC	07.3	07.3.0
Fixed (find better term) gillnets (on stakes)	GNF	07.4	07.4.0
Trammel nets	GTR	07.5	07.5.0
Combined gillnets-trammel nets	GTN	07.6	07.6.0
Gillnets and entangling nets (nei)	GEN	07.9	07.9.0
TRAPS		08	08.0.0
Stationary uncovered pound nets	FPN	08.1	08.1.0
Pots	FPO	08.2	08.2.0
Fyke nets	FYK	08.3	08.3.0
Stow nets	FSN	08.4	08.4.0
Barriers, fences, weirs, etc.	FWR	08.5	08.5.0
Aerial traps	FAR	08.6	08.6.0
Traps (nei)	FIX	08.9	08.9.0
HOOKS AND LINES		09	09.0.0
Handlines and hand-operated pole-and-lines	LHP	09.1	09.1.0
Mechanized lines and pole-and-lines	LHM	09.2	09.2.0
Set longlines	LLS	09.31	
Drifting longlines	LLD	09.32	
Longlines (nei)	LL	09.39	
Vertical lines	LVT	09.4	09.4.0
Trolling lines	LTL	09.5	09.5.0

Gear Categories	Standard abbreviations	ISSCFG code	
		(new)	(current)
Hooks and lines (nei)	LX	09.9	09.9.0
MISCELLANEOUS Gears		10	10.0.0
Harpoons	HAR	10.1	10.1.0
Hand implements (Wrenching gear, Clamps, Tongs, Kes, Spears)	MHI	10.2	10.2.0
Pumps	MPM	10.3	10.3.0
Electric fishing	MEL	10.4	10.4.0
Pushnets	MPN	10.5	10.5.0
Scoopnets	MSP	10.6	10.6.0
Drive-in nets	MDR	10.7	10.7.0
Diving	MDV	10.8	10.8.0
Gear nei	MIS	10.9	10.9.0
GEAR NOT KNOWN		99	
Gear not known	NK	99.9	99.9.0