

Information Paper 9

Original: English

Progressing regional reporting on ‘Future of Fisheries Roadmap’ and ‘New Song’

Connie Donato-Hunt, FAME MEL Unit



Pacific
Community
Communauté
du Pacifique

11th SPC Heads of fisheries Meeting, 11–15 March 2019, Noumea, New Caledonia
11^e Conférence des Directeurs des pêches de la CPS, 11–15 mars 2019, Nouméa, Nouvelle-Calédonie



Key points for HOF11:

In this session members and partners are invited to:

1. Note key points and issues raised in this paper
2. Provide feedback through breakout groups on:
 - a. How SPC can better collaborate with members and partners to improve data quality, coverage and validity of information for the Report Card (see paragraphs 28 and 30)
 - b. How useful any improvements to the Report Card would be at the national/partner level, and national/partner level commitment to this process, as this would assist SPC in understanding the level of further resources to invest in this annual reporting (see paragraph 13).

Introduction

3. In 2015, 2016, and 2017 significant commitments were made for reporting on progress towards achieving regional goals and outcomes for Pacific fisheries. These included the *Future of Fisheries Regional Roadmap for Sustainable Fisheries*; *A New Song for Coastal Fisheries – Pathways to Change*; and, the Sustainable Development Goals, particularly Goal 14 on Life Below Water.
4. SPC FAME is responsible for producing the Coastal Fisheries Report Card, and jointly producing the Tuna Fisheries Report Card with FFA where SPC provides information for Goal 1 Sustainability. All Report Cards are available online <https://fame1.spc.int/publications/roadmap-a-report-cards>
5. The 2018 Report Cards were the fourth Report Cards under the Regional Roadmap. The 2018 Coastal Fisheries Report Card was second time the Report Card has been used for harmonised regional reporting to report on both the Regional Roadmap and A New Song strategies, after a regional set of indicators for Coastal Fisheries was endorsed by the 10th SPC Heads of Fisheries and FFC102 (see [HOF10 IP5](#)). The table of indicators are included as Annex 1.
6. The Coastal Fisheries Report Card has been received well by member countries and territories at the FFC Officials and Ministerial level, as well as the PIF Leaders where it is presented each year.
7. The Report Card has also received positive international recognition as one of the few, perhaps only, annual regional level reporting on coastal fisheries management. An FAO background paper on monitoring implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries (SSF Guidelines) noted that “the Coastal Fisheries Report Card provides a strong example of a monitoring framework tailored to the needs of the fisheries sector” and “can serve as a useful example of how to develop indicators relevant to small-scale fisheries”.

Data improvements for the 2018 Report Card

8. SPC has continued to work on improving data gaps in the Coastal Fisheries Report Card, with the following data added for 2018:
 - **Economic** value added to GDP of coastal catch (Gillett, 2016)
 - **HIES** related information included for 10 PICTs compared to 7 PICTs in 2017
 - **First time progress reporting in three outcomes:** *Strong and up-to-date management policy, legislation ...; effective collaboration and coordination between stakeholders ...; and, keep harvests within sustainable limits and ... do not damage fish habitats.*

Improving data sources, gaps and quality

Data sources

9. Despite these improvements and strengths, data gaps and opportunities to improve data quality remain. The 2018 Report Card with the additional improvements made is effectively as far as SPC alone can progress the Report Card using current resourcing and processes.
10. In developing the indicators and corresponding data sources for the Report Card, the intention of New Song partners was that reporting on progress reflect the partnership approach underpinning the New Song itself. As such, data for the Report Card is designed to come from multiple sources:
 - National fisheries agencies sought/provided directly from countries
 - Census and HIES data for population level change over time
 - NGOs, CSOs and other community-based partners
 - SPC and other regional agencies (e.g. PIFS in relation to 'Oceans' work).
11. To date, there have been limited resources to enable this to occur effectively, with data reported being limited to indicators where the data sources are SPC, available HIES data, and data sought from national fisheries agencies by SPC. Within this data availability also varies across PICTs.
12. To date, investment into new methods required to report on complex outcomes such as *Informed and empowered coastal communities with clearly defined user-rights* has not been possible.
13. **Future direction:** *The decision on how much time and resources to invest in the Coastal Fisheries Report Card depends on how useful improved information would be to members and partners, or whether it is felt the current level of reporting satisfies regional and stakeholder needs. SPC will seek input from HOF11 to understand the cost-benefit of doing so as improvements require greater input and cooperation from all partners, so mutual interest, utility and investment is crucial.*

Review of indicators

14. It is also timely to take a step back and review the indicators that were agreed in 2017 for their utility and effectiveness in monitoring progress to the regional outcomes, particularly as many of the outcomes have multiple elements making measurement challenging. For example, Regional Roadmap/New Song outcome: *Re-focused fisheries agencies that are transparent, accountable, and adequately resourced, supporting coastal fisheries management and sustainable development, underpinned by CEAFM* is a complex statement including at least six different concepts. The outcome is focussed transparency and accountability, however, the answers provided by current indicators reveal very little on these issues.
15. The Coastal Fisheries Working Group - Law & Policy Taskforce are also reviewing those indicators relating to New Song outcome 1 on user-rights and outcome 5 on policy and legislation.
16. **Future direction:** *The Coastal Fisheries Working Group have tasked a voluntary sub-group to review the indicators in detail by end 2019. Members are invited to participate in this sub-group and nominate a suitable individual.*

Country level reporting for the Coastal Fisheries Report Card

17. For the 2017 and 2018 Report Cards reporting has been undertaken at a regionally aggregated level. This approach was taken to both provide a regional view of progress of implementation, as well as address the data and quality gaps in these earlier Report Cards.

18. For some indicators aggregating figures across PICTs into a regional result creates an additional layer of uncertainty and lack of clarity over what these regional level figures mean in terms of progress when the unit is by PICT.
19. For many of the regionally agreed indicators the unit of measure is the “number of PICTs”. This means that as data coverage improves this will enable reporting by PICT for those relevant indicators. This also responds to the request made at FFC Ministerial for country level reporting, and enables the information contained in the Coastal Fisheries Report Card to be more useful at the national level. Similarly, the Coastal Fisheries Working Group in November 2018 noted the value of improved country level reporting.
20. **Future direction:** *For the 2019 Report Card SPC will report on results by country for those indicators where country-level information is available and of sufficient quality. This further raises the importance for improved data coverage, quality and validation processes.*

Improving collaboration for monitoring progress

Cooperation with countries and territories

21. When preparing the Report Card in 2017 and 2018 SPC circulated a questionnaire asking members for information on indicators where national fisheries agencies were identified as the data source, namely those relating to staff numbers and budget allocation.
22. Despite country commitment it has proven difficult to obtain this information. In 2017 10 PICTs returned questionnaires to SPC, some incomplete, and in 2018 eight PICTs returned this information. The 2018 version of the questionnaire is attached as Annex 2.
23. Differences in response rates across years have meant that as yet these figures are not directly comparable between report cards, cannot be reported at PICT level if it is not provided and change over time is not able to be measured at PICT level.
24. In this correspondence, and at FFCMIN15, SPC also asked for members to nominate a contact person to be SPC’s focal point for the Coastal Report Card. No contact person was nominated.
25. There appear to be a number of reasons for the response rate including:
 - a. Request may not always get priority or lack of staff capacity / resources to complete
 - b. Request does not go to the right person
 - c. Request may go to the right person but they do not feel authorised to respond
 - d. The questionnaire is not always clear on what information is required or there is a mismatch between what is asked and how the institution keeps its records.
26. There are several approaches to potentially improving this process, including:
 - In response to a, b and c above, SPC suggests that members identify a focal point for annual Regional Roadmap / New Song reporting, including setting aside staff time to collaborate on this piece of work and authorising them to provide this information on behalf of their agency (or work with SPC to work through any issues in providing this information)
 - In response to d above, SPC can look at further simplification of the questionnaire, and providing guidance notes on how to answer the various questions.
27. There are also some other ways of going about the data collection, including:

- Using SPC staff, when in-country on other work, to complete the questionnaire while sitting alongside government staff. This has been attempted for each Report Card, however, is challenging given the time and resources of SPC staff fitting it around other work and the time of year.
- Using a contracted consultant, possibly at national level for each country or a person/team to travel to each country to obtain the data. The former option would require significant regional coordination (e.g. training on methods), while the latter would involve additional costs.

28. **Future direction:** SPC will seek guidance from HOF11 and the Coastal Fisheries Report Card Indicators Working Group on options provided under paragraphs 26 and 27 above.

Cooperation with NGOs, CSOs and other New Song partners

29. The Coastal Fisheries Working Group in November 2018 had a preliminary discussion on how to gather information at local levels to feed into the Report Card, along with standardisation of data gathering methodology. It was discussed that perception information on coastal fishery status could also be gathered across the region, and how to setup a better system of data collection, particularly from the community, CSO and NGO levels. The discussion was preliminary and the subject requires further attention.

30. **Future direction:** The Coastal Fisheries Report Card Indicators Working Group will explore options for gathering information from multiple data sources to feed into the Report Card. SPC will seek feedback from NGO, CSO and community-based partners at HOF11 on this also.

Cooperation with other regional and international reporting mechanisms

31. In the 2018 Pacific Sustainable Development Report it was reported that the Pacific only had data available for one of the SDG indicators under Goal 14 - 14.5.1 on coverage of protected areas.

32. In fact, through the Tuna and Coastal Fisheries Report Cards regional level data is available for five of the nine indicators under Goal 14 (either partially or wholly), with many of these being classified as Tier III by the UN, meaning that globally there is no methodology to measure or data available.

33. **Future direction:** SPC FAME is working closely with the SPC Statistics for Development Division to further utilise opportunities to showcase the efforts of the Pacific to measure SDG14 related indicators as this is an area where the Pacific appears to be leading internationally.

Acknowledgements

SPC FAME would like to acknowledge the following contributors to the Coastal Report Card:

- All countries and territories who have contributed information for the Report Cards to date
- Bruce Chapman, who has assisted in data collection and analysis for the 2017 and 2018 Report Cards, and whose feedback as helped to inform this paper
- SPC Statistics for Development Division, particularly Michael Sharp, who have provided the aggregated analysis of HIES data utilised in the Report Card in 2017 and 2018
- Hampus Eriksson and Hugh Govan who have provided input throughout the process of developing and refining indicators and the utility of the Report Card information
- Representatives at HOF10 and FFC102, along with additional staff from SPC, OPOC, WorldFish, University of Wollongong and LMMA, who have provided feedback on the initial set of indicators drafted in 2017, and since.

Annex 1 - Regional coastal fisheries indicators for the Coastal Fisheries Report Card

Table 1: Indicators for Regional Roadmap result areas

Coastal fisheries outcomes	Relevance to other policies/instruments ¹	Indicators	Potential data source/s	Report card status ²
GOAL 1 – EMPOWERMENT				
Informed, empowered coastal communities with clearly defined user rights <i>Roadmap - Result area 1.1</i> <i>New Song - Outcome 1</i>	SSF Guidelines 5a FPO AICHI Target 1 SDG Indicator 14.b.1	1.1 Number of PICTs where user rights for coastal communities are formally recognised	Published legislation, SPC, national fisheries offices	1. Data included in 2018
		1.2 Ability of rights-holders to claim / control the use of their rights	Multiple, all partners	3. Data deficient. Method TBC
		1.3 Level of community awareness of the status of their resources	Multiple, all partners	3. Data deficient. Method TBC
		1.4 Level of community action to manage declining resources	Multiple, all partners	3. Data deficient. Method TBC
Adequate and relevant information to inform management and policy <i>Roadmap - Result area 1.2</i> <i>New Song - Outcome 2</i>	FPO SAMOA Pathway 58.a MSG Roadmap Objective 2 Aichi Biodiversity Target 19	2.1 Number and % of coastal fisheries management measures informed by evidence	Published measures, SPC, all partners	3. Data deficient. Method TBC
		2.2 Number of fisheries extension officers (as a ratio to total number of households participating in fisheries and aquaculture)	National fisheries offices Census/HIES for household data	1. Data included in 2018
		2.3 Coastal communities receiving information relevant to coastal fisheries management (i.e. coverage)	Multiple, all partners	3. Data deficient. Method TBC
		2.4 Accessibility and appropriateness of information available to inform community-based coastal fisheries management	Multiple, all partners	3. Data deficient. Method TBC
Recognition of, and strong political commitment and support for, coastal fisheries management at a national and sub-national scale <i>Roadmap - Result area 1.3</i> <i>New Song - Outcome 3</i>	FPO Indicator 7	3.1 National recurring budgets allocated to coastal fisheries (% of total budget)	National fisheries offices	1. Data included in 2018
		3.2 Proportion of fisheries budgets allocated to coastal fisheries		
		3.3 Number of staff allocated to coastal fisheries, both national and sub-national (as a ratio to total number of households participating in fisheries and aquaculture) - disaggregated by professional/support staff, gender	National fisheries offices	1. Data included in 2018
Re-focused fisheries agencies that are transparent, accountable, and adequately resourced, supporting coastal fisheries	FPO MSG Roadmap Objective 1.3 Aichi Biodiversity Target 2 & Target 20	4.1 Number of PICTs with published annual financial statements for their national fisheries offices - (these would normally be included in annual reports)	Published financial statements	1. Data included in 2018
		4.2 National recurring budgets allocated to coastal fisheries as ratio to total number of households living in coastal areas	Published financial statements, National fisheries offices	1. Data included in 2018

Coastal fisheries outcomes	Relevance to other policies/instruments ¹	Indicators	Potential data source/s	Report card status ²
management and sustainable development, underpinned by CEAFM <i>Roadmap - Result area 1.4</i> <i>New Song - Outcome 4</i>		4.3 National coastal fisheries management roadmap or strategy in place (current dates)	Published strategies/roadmaps	1. Data included in 2018
GOAL 2 – RESILIENCE				
Strong and up-to-date management policy, legislation and planning <i>Roadmap - Result area 2.1</i> <i>New Song - Outcome 5</i>	FPO SAMOA Pathway 58.a & 58.g SDG Target 14.4 MSG Roadmap Objective 3.1 SSF Guidelines 10 Aichi Biodiversity Target 17	5.1 Number of PICTs with current coastal fisheries management policies	Published legislation, SPC	1. Data included in 2018
		5.2 Number of PICTs with new coastal fisheries management legislation	Published legislation, SPC	1. Data included in 2018
		5.3 Evidence of coastal fisheries monitoring, control, surveillance and enforcement (e.g. number of recorded violations, fines, inspections)	National fisheries offices SPC database (future)	2. Data deficient
Effective collaboration and coordination between stakeholders and key sectors of influence <i>Roadmap - Result area 2.2</i> <i>New Song - Outcome 6</i>	FPO Indicators 12 & 14 MSG Roadmap Objective 1.4	6.1 Coastal fisheries management related projects or activities integrating more than one government agency	National fisheries offices, all partners	3. Data deficient. Method TBC
		6.2 Coastal fisheries management related projects or activities including multiple non-government stakeholders	Multiple, all partners	3. Data deficient. Method TBC
		6.3 Level of effectiveness of partnerships, collaboration and coordination	Multiple, all partners	3. Data deficient. Method TBC
		6.4 Fisheries statistics incorporated into the National Strategy of the Development of Statistics (NSDS)	National Statistics Offices	2. Data deficient
More equitable access to benefits and decision making within communities, including women, youth and marginalised groups <i>Roadmap - Result area 2.3</i> <i>New Song - Outcome 7</i>	FPO SSF Guidelines 8	7.1 Labour force participation rate in fisheries (disaggregated by age, gender, occupation and education attainment)	Census, HIES, Labour Force Survey	1. Data included for 10 PICs in 2018
		7.2 Household participation in fisheries and aquaculture (disaggregated by urban / rural)	Census, HIES	1. Data included for 10 PICs in 2018
		7.3 Number and % of women in senior fisheries positions	National fisheries offices	2. Data deficient
		7.4 Number of women and men graduating in the areas of fisheries management and sciences	Education institutions	3. Data deficient. Method TBC
		7.5 Number and % of people attending meetings where coastal fisheries management decisions are made that are women and young people	Multiple, all partners	3. Data deficient. Method TBC
GOAL 3 – LIVELIHOODS & FOOD SECURITY				
Keep harvests within sustainable limits and ensure coastal developments do not damage fish habitats <i>Roadmap - Result area 3.1</i> <i>New Song - Overarching 2³</i>	SSF Guidelines 5b Aichi Biodiversity Targets 4 & 11 SDG Indicators 14.2.1 & 14.5.1, 14.4.1 SAMOA Pathway 58.e & 58.o FPO Micronesia Challenge	8.1 Coastal ecosystem and fisheries monitoring and assessments undertaken (i.e. data collection)	Multiple, all partners	3. Data deficient. Method TBC
		8.2 Stock status of key indicative coastal fisheries species	SPC, partners	1. Data included in 2018
		8.3 Percentage of PICT coastal areas under management or protection	SPREP, FPO report	1. Data included in 2017

Coastal fisheries outcomes	Relevance to other policies/instruments ¹	Indicators	Potential data source/s	Report card status ²
Enhanced food security from sustainable fisheries, including the supply of tuna for domestic consumption <i>Roadmap - Result areas 3.2 & 3.4</i> <i>New Song - Overarching 1³</i>	FPO SDG Targets 2.1 & 3.4	9.1 Proportion of daily per capita calorie consumption from fisheries (disaggregated by fish type: fresh reef, pelagic or invertebrate; or canned)	HIES	2. Data deficient
		9.2 Reported incidences of fish poisoning	National Health Information Systems	2. Data deficient
Diversify the supply of fish, primarily through nearshore fish aggregating devices (FADs) and sustainable aquaculture <i>Roadmap - Result area 3.3 & 3.5</i> <i>New Song - Outcome 8³</i>	SDG Target 14.7 SAMOA Pathway 58.b & 58.h SSF Guidelines 6 & 7 MSG Roadmap Objective 3.2 FPO	10.1.1 Household income from fisheries & aquaculture (income includes cash and subsistence, disaggregated by capture & aquaculture; cash & subsistence; and urban & rural)	HIES	1. Data included for 10 PICs in 2018
		10.1.2 Proportion of households who sell fish (disaggregated as above)		
		10.2.1 Proportion of total household consumption expenditure on fisheries (disaggregated by fish type: fresh - reef, pelagic or invertebrate; or canned)	HIES	1. Data included for 10 PICs in 2018
		10.2.2 Proportion of households who consume fish (disaggregated as above)		
		10.3 Location and fishing methods used by households fishing (location disaggregated by freshwater, inshore, nearshore, offshore, FAD; Gear disaggregated by net, spear, harpoon, hook & line, gleaning, traps)	HIES, Agricultural Census	1. Data included for 10 PICs in 2018
<i>New Song - Overarching 1³</i>		10.4 Volume & income generated from nearshore FAD fishing	FAD monitoring programs	2. Data deficient
		10.5 Proportion of households that participate in fisheries that are below the national poverty line	HIES	3. Data deficient. Method TBC
[Added on request of FFC106]	SDG Indicator 14.7.1	11.1 Economic contribution of coastal fisheries (value added to GDP)	Benefish study (Gillett, 2016) National accounts	1. Data included in 2018

Table notes:

1. FPO=Framework for a Pacific Oceanscape; MSG Roadmap=Melanesian Spearhead Group roadmap for inshore fisheries management and sustainable development; SAMOA Pathway= Small Island Developing States Accelerated Modalities of Action Pathway; SDG=Sustainable Development Goals; SSF Guidelines=Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries

2. The status of data available reporting in the Coastal Fisheries Report Card has been categorised as follows:

1. Data is available and was included in the 2018 Report Card, although data may not be available for all PICTs

2. The indicator is defined for reporting, however, data is not available for reporting.

3. Work is required to further define the indicator into something that is measurable, data is not available for reporting.

3. For Goals 1 and 2 wording of the Regional Roadmap result areas is the same as A New Song Outcomes. Wording differences occur for result areas under Goals 3 and 4, however, the Regional Roadmap and A New Song still align in these areas with shared indicators.

Annex 2: 2018 Questionnaire

Coastal Fisheries Report Card – data collection 2018

Please email completed questionnaire to: Connie Donato-Hunt (connied@spc.int) by 30 June 2018

Country / Territory:		
Contact person	Name:	Email:

1. Financial statements

Annual financial statements	Answer
a) Are financial statements for fisheries ministries / departments published annually? (i.e. publicly available)	Yes / No
b) Name of document in which finances are published:	
c) Link to document if available online:	

2. Annual fisheries budgets

What is the total government budget in each of the following categories for the most recent financial year (Please state which year)? Note: 'Total government budget' is intended to include the national/federal budget plus any relevant sub-national (state/provincial or equivalent) budgets. This includes any funds that appear in government budgets, regardless of the funding source.

Annual budget	Budget amount (\$)	Year / period	Currency	Source of information / comments
a) Total government budget for all government expenditure:				
National / federal budget				
Sub-national budget (sum of state or provincial governments)				
<i>Total government budget</i>				
b) Total government budget for fisheries (including offshore and coastal fisheries):				
National / federal fisheries budget				
Sub-national fisheries budget (sum of state or provincial government budgets for fisheries)				
<i>Total government budget for fisheries</i>				
c) Total government budget for coastal fisheries:				
National / federal coastal fisheries budget				
Sub-national coastal fisheries budget (sum of state or provincial government budgets for coastal fisheries)				
<i>Total government budget for coastal fisheries</i>				
d) Further detail: Where available please attach further details on the coastal fisheries budget breakdowns				
Further details attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			

3. Fisheries staff

How many fisheries staff are there in mid-2018? Note: ‘nationally’ is intended to include the national/federal government staff plus sub-national (state/provincial or equivalent) staff:

Fisheries staff	Total	Female	Male
a) All fisheries staff (coastal and oceanic) nationally			
i. Total number of all fisheries staff:			
National / federal fisheries staff			
Sub-national fisheries staff			
<i>Total government staff for fisheries</i>			
ii. How many people hold senior positions? (i.e. Permanent Secretary, Head of Fisheries, and those reporting directly to the Head of Fisheries)			
iii. Number of extension officers:			
b) Coastal fisheries staff nationally			
i. Total number of coastal fisheries staff:			
National / federal coastal fisheries staff			
Sub-national coastal fisheries staff			
<i>Total government staff for coastal fisheries</i>			
c) Further detail: Where available please attach further details on the coastal fisheries staffing breakdowns			
Further details attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	

4. Policies and legislation

Policies and legislation		Comments – if yes, please provide details
a) Is there a current overall national coastal fisheries roadmap or strategy ?	Yes / No	
b) Are there any coastal fisheries management policies in need of drafting or revision?	Yes / No	
c) Is coastal fisheries management legislation in need of drafting or revision?	Yes / No	
d) Are there any coastal fisheries management regulations in need of drafting or revision?	Yes / No	
e) Is information collected on coastal fisheries monitoring, control, surveillance and enforcement ?	Yes / No	