



FIRMS Technical Working Group Meeting
First Session
Rome, Italy, 05-08 December, 2005
FINAL REPORT
Author: FSC Secretariat

OPENING OF SESSION AND THE WELCOME ADDRESS

1. The First Session of the FIRMS Technical Working Group (TWG) meeting was opened by Dr. Richard Grainger, Chief, FIDI at 9.30 hrs on Monday 05 December, 2005. He welcomed the FIRMS Technical Working Group representatives of the following agencies: IATTC, ICES, ICCAT, EUROSTAT, SEAFDEC, CCSBT, CCAMLR, IWC and NAFO.
2. Participants were introduced. The list of participants is at Annex 1.

ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSONS

3. Mr Robert Kennedy and Dr. Michael G. Hinton were nominated and chosen by consensus as co-chairmen for the meeting, with Mr. Kennedy Chair for items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7, and Dr. Hinton Chair for items 6, 8, 9, 10 and 11 (see Agenda, Annex 2).

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

4. The Chairs presented the draft agenda. A revised version was adopted (Annex 2).
5. Rapporteurs from the participants were appointed for each session, and they were assisted by the FIRMS Secretariat in recording the proceedings.

REVIEW OF THE FIRMS WEBSITE, WITH FOCUS ON UNRESOLVED COMMENTS FROM E-MAIL DISCUSSIONS, CASE STUDIES. POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6. The FIRMS Secretariat outlined the mandate of the Technical Working Group (TWG) as described at FSC1. Mr Taconet highlighted additional objectives for the TWG:
 - Sharing common understanding of concepts, terms and processes used in FIRMS.
 - Addressing outstanding points of past review rounds.

- Obtaining contributions from participants on the interface for data maintenance and construction of the fisheries module.
7. Mr Taconet presented Information Document 1 which compiled the outstanding points from email discussions held within the group throughout the last 3 review rounds. Discussion focused on the outstanding points in this compilation.
 8. An overview of the structure of the FIRMS web site was presented by Mr Taconet. Following the overview, the TWG noted that:
 - The words “fact sheets” in the FIRMS Data Quality Assurance page should be altered to “reports”. Furthermore, throughout the FIRMS web site, the term “fact sheets” should be changed to more intuitive terminology which is yet to be determined.
 - The Quality Assurance sheets were prepared from Annex 2 to the Partnership Agreements. They should be homogeneous as far as possible, and Partners should fill in gaps.
 - The icons “Stock Status Summaries” and “Fact Sheets Search” displayed in the FIRMS home page do not adequately describe the function of those links. It was agreed that “Stock Status Summaries” should be changed to “Status and Trend Summaries (extracted from reports)” and that “Fact Sheets Search” should be changed to “Search for Resource and Fishery Reports”. Furthermore, as the stock status and trend summaries are a subset of reports, it was decided that the icon for summaries should be moved to the right, and the icon for full reports moved to the left.
 9. Mr Taconet presented the FIRMS Organisation summary sheets. The TWG commented that:
 - The words “see fact sheet” should be replaced by “see Partner Institution’s summary description”.
 - At present FAO’s Policy and Liaison Service (FIPL) is responsible for editing and updating the organization content of the web site, in close relationship with the concerned institutions, making sure that the wordings of institutions are reflected in these summary descriptions. In the future it is intended that Partners will be able to directly edit the content of their institution’s summary description as editors or data owners of these pages.
 - Most elements of organizational summary sheets were considered to be relatively static. However, Partners memberships are not static and for some Partners, membership may change several times in a year (e.g. IWC). It was noted that some mechanisms currently exist for Partners to tailor their membership page to manage changing memberships and that Partners should take advantage of these mechanisms. These comprised:
 - Partners checking and updating their membership information on an annual basis. To aid this process, it was agreed that the FIRMS Secretariat would create a “check list” page on the private area of the FIRMS website that listed all the FIRMS information that should be checked and/or updated by Partners on a regular basis or when submitting.
 - A Partner can add a sentence to their membership page alerting users that the list of members may not be fully up-to-date and a link to the Partner’s own website can be provided so that users have access to the latest list;
 - It was agreed that the date of last updating date of Partner’s organization information (which appears at the bottom of the front page) should be displayed in a larger font size.
 10. Mr Bensch presented the components and layout of a “fact sheet” (see TWG1/2005/5a, page 5), geo-referencing standards (TWG1/2005/4d), citations (TWG1/2005/4b) and the body content of a “fact sheet”. In relation to these items, the TWG commented or recommended that:

-
- 10a. The question mark next to the data owner be replaced by [more] or [more info]. It was also agreed that all “question marks” within FIRMS that serve the purpose of displaying more information be similarly replaced.
- 10b. In relation to maps showing the location of the Marine resource it was agreed that:
- The light blue shading which represented adjacent FAO areas should be removed from the maps.
 - The map label “Area” should be replaced by the text “Distribution of [*name of marine resource*]”.
 - Maps should be initially displayed at a zoom level appropriate to the extent of the stock distribution as determined by owner, and users should then be able to zoom out to a global level by clicking a “-” button. The global view should include options for polar projection and a Pacific-centered projection. It was further agreed that this enhancement should not delay public release of FIRMS and that other options could be considered as a short term solution. For example, a global level map could be the default, but methods (such as an arrow pointing to the location of a resource) could be used to better display those resources which are difficult to see on a global level map.
 - Latitude and longitude coordinates should be added to maps.
- 10c. The geo-referencing standards seemed to meet TWG’s needs and expectations, with the required level of flexibility.
- 10d. The proposed revisions to citation guidelines agreed upon by FSC2 were supported by the TWG.
- 10e. In relation to the body content of the “fact sheets”:
- There was considerable discussion on “direct” and “indirect” assessment methods to determine whether these classifiers were required and if so whether some form of “combined” classifier was also required. It was agreed that there was value in retaining both classifiers and that if the “direct” or “indirect” classifier was not set, then the associated sub structure could still be available for use as determined by the Owner and that FIRMS should only display the header “Assessment Methods” without any reference to direct or indirect. It was noted that Partners may report at a higher level of FIRMS standard topic if they did not wish to use the sub structure that existed within the direct/indirect assessment level topics.
 - The descriptor “Considered as a stock” should be changed to “Considered a single stock” to remove issues of confusion.
 - In the data submitted by IOTC as part of the FIRMS driven efforts to report to the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), the IOTC noted that all its tuna stocks have an “Uncertain” stock structure. IOTC was not present at the TWG and discussion by the TWG did not reach agreement on including an “Uncertain” category for the descriptor “Considered a single stock”. Some Partners considered it important to explicitly identify stocks with uncertain stock structure by including an “Uncertain” category. However, it was also recognized that in producing an assessment there is usually a decision (either explicitly stated or implicitly assumed and not stated) regarding how to consider the stock status of the resource being assessed and it is this decision that should be reflected in the “Considered a single stock” descriptor for a resource/stock assessment report within FIRMS. While this is not considered to be a major issue, the TWG felt that this should be discussed further at the next FSC meeting, but preferably with input from the IOTC so that the IOTC’s situation is adequately accommodated.
 - The descriptor “Management unit” should be changed to “Considered a management unit”.
 - For the descriptor “Spatial scale”, provide a mouse-over pop-up feature to display definitions associated with the spatial scale. It was noted that this type of feature would also be welcomed for other controlled terms.

- In addition to the very specific terms in the “Jurisdictional distribution” list of terms, there should be broader terms in order to run more general queries.

11. The TWG discussed ICCAT’s alternative proposal (Information Document 4) to the current FIRMS list of reference terms for State of exploitation. ICCAT’s proposal uses both fishing mortality and biomass levels in describing the state of a stock, which together enables a more accurate judgment of the actual status of a stock than is provided by the single reference term proposed by FIRMS.

The FIRMS list of 12 terms described by ICCAT’s information document is not the FAO reference list, which actually comprises 7 terms (the definitions of which were supplied to the group). The FIRMS Secretariat advised that upon ICCAT’s initiative, a detailed review of the current use of the 12 terms resulted in (i) dropping those unused terms (“exhausted”, a synonym for “depleted”, and “under extreme stress”), (ii) renaming “in recuperation” (unused until now) into “Recovering”; (iii) no decision could be taken on dropping “condition of equilibrium” and “no-specific assessment” which are respectively used by ICES and ICCAT. The 7 terms left are those used by FAO.

In the context of the precautionary approach to fisheries management, the TWG generally felt that the ICCAT proposal made sense, while different views were expressed as whether ICCAT’s option 1 (use of qualitative terms) or option 2 (use of reference levels) would be the best choice. There was varied opinion on the value of reference levels to the resources managed by some Partners, with some Partners (e.g. IWC, SEAFDEC) doubting the value of reference levels to their situation and others (e.g. IATTC) considering reference levels to be particularly valuable. In relation to option 1, it was felt that if this option were to be considered, the term “High fishing mortality” should be changed to “Fishing mortality too high” and that the term “Low abundance” should be changed to “Abundance too low”.

It was recognized that various FIRMS Partners have different constraints and information management policies with respect to handling reference terms for state of marine resources, and that FIRMS should, as far as possible, accommodate the various situations. From the information management view point, the FIRMS Secretariat advised that different lists may be available according to Partners needs (eg an FAO list, and two ICCAT lists). Consideration could also be given to finding ways to provide a meaningful mapping of the ICCAT pairs of terms in ICCAT’s proposal to the single FAO terms.

In conclusion, the TWG gave general support to ICCAT’s proposal, but did not feel competent to provide firm recommendations. The TWG considers that the selection of an appropriate set of descriptors to describe stock status is highly important. Therefore, the TWG requests that this matter be considered at the next FIRMS Steering Committee which should decide whether this kind of discussion and decision making falls under its remit, or within the remit of the CWP.

12. Mr Bensch presented the Marine resource browser in which Marine resources are presented in a tree structure organized by Marine regions or species; this tree reflects the way data is compiled in the inventories. Particular emphasis was made on how to display resources such as Southern Bluefin tuna that are distributed over several areas. After some discussion on that issue, the group agreed on the following strategy:
 - As default, a marine resource should be placed according to the hierarchy defined in the source inventory.
 - On a Partner’s specific request, a marine resource could be presented under different parents in the tree.

13. Another thread of discussion addressed the presentation within the FIRMS inventory browser, of marine resources inventories implemented outside of FIRMS Partners (under the Strategy-STF initiative). It was specified that the outputs of these inventories are controlled by Fisheries Department or Partners such as SEAFDEC both from the subject view point and data consistency view point. Possible options are:

- These marine resources or fisheries objects will not appear at all in the tree;
- These marine resources or fisheries objects may appear making use of different colours or fonts in order to distinguish them from the FIRMS list; they may then be linked or not to the reference observations (that is the species and areas definition of the objects).
- logically, status and trends reports should not exist so the question of the linkage to the full report should not be an issue; in practice, there may be some status and trends supporting information supplied together with the inventories, and decision should be made as to whether to link to that information (contained in the fact sheet) or not.

Since this issue is not a pressing one and it is an issue that relates to the scope of FIRMS, the group agreed that this discussion should be brought to the FSC for further discussion and decision.

14. It was noted that each Partner decides on keeping or removing old fact sheets.

15. Mr Gentile presented the search and search results pages. Participants made the following recommendations:

- The help text for specific search fields needs to be more completely defined. For example, the help text for the species field should indicate that the 3-alpha species codes can be used in the species search.
- Some work should be conducted to provide assistance for species searches so that users do not need to know precise species names/codes, etc. This could include a tool that displays a selection of possible species based on a user's partial entry. It was decided that it is not practical to provide a pop-up list of all species due to the large list of species involved.
- The word "by" should be removed from all labels on the advanced search page.
- Some Partners believed it would be valuable to add "Exploitation status" as a further criterion for searching, but it was noted that this should not be considered further until progress is made relating to the descriptors of exploitation status. It was also noted that a previous FIRMS meeting had decided that exploitation status should not be searchable.
- The default value for all fields used to specify a search, and in particular for "Considered a single stock" and "Considered a management unit" fields, should be "all", not "yes".
- In the results page, the terms "Stock structure" and "Management unit" should be replaced with "Considered a single stock" and "Considered a management unit" respectively and should use the standard values for these terms. In addition, in this page the level of relevance for secondary observations should be removed because secondary observations are displayed on the basis of linkages to the primary observation, not their relevance to the search.
- It was agreed that the geographic search tool has potential but that further development and consultation was needed.

16. Mr Taconet presented the ability of FIRMS to dynamically embed statistics. It was noted there were three options for the use and placement of statistics graphs/tables generated automatically from statistic data given by Partners and maintained by FAO:

- Place these graphs/tables somewhere directly inside the fact sheet (statistics section).

- Clearly identify the generated graphs/tables as being additional to the Partners report by placing the graphs/tables after the end of the report or by placing a link in the report to the graphs/tables with a label such as “additional information”.
- Insert explanation text in the fact sheet with a link to the statistics section of the Partner’s website.

It was agreed to allow each Partner to choose the option it prefers. An automatic tool which automatically retrieves and elaborates data on the specific resource is already used inside the FIGIS system. Within the next two months a scenario with the possible options will be presented to Partners for a decision.

17. Comments from Robin Allen in relation to stock status summary were presented to the TWG. Participants made the following recommendations:

- The use of a specific tool to provide stock status summaries within FIRMS means that the Biological State and Trend section of the fact sheets are particularly important and that Partners should be encouraged to complete this section. This point should be added to the checklist that the FIRMS Secretariat has been asked to prepare.
- The results section should only show the source reference and not the full bibliographic references list which is already included in the source report.
- The descriptor for Exploitation status should be included in the results wherever it is recorded in the associated fact sheet.
- The label “Stock Status Summary” should be changed to “Stock Status and Trend Summary”. The word “stock” will probably be removed if/when this search tool is expanded to include fishery reports.

PUBLISHING WORKFLOW: PRESENTATION, REVIEW, TRAINING ON THE TOOLS AVAILABLE/ UNDER DEVELOPMENT FOR THE FIRMS WEB-BASED MODULE

18. A series of presentations were provided to the TWG:

- Mr Bensch described the main concepts, definitions and requirements related to FIRMS reporting on marine resources, including; reference objects, fact sheets, secondary observations, data collections, ownership, user rights (editors, reviewer and approver) and the cover page (TWG1/2005/5a).
- The workflow for report creation, edition and publication, including the possibility to import XML formatted reports or to use on-line editing facilities was described by Mr Calderini (TWG1/2005/5a, page 10). Each step from edition to publication is controlled through attribution of different types of rights to users. These security mechanisms ensure that information is validated by data owners before publication. The TWG noted that each Partner will have to submit to FIRMS Secretariat a list of user names and associated rights.
- Mr Jaques presented a progress report (see Information document 6) on the development of the FIRMS data management module. A full operational version will be available for the next FIRMS Steering Committee (February 2006). Four participants were invited to participate in user testing of the user interface mock-ups. Results of these testing sessions are included later in this report.
- Mr Caillot described conversion tools that have been developed for use in converting Excel inventories to XML (Information Document 2) and MS Word Status reports to XML (Information Document 3). The tool for the conversion of MS Word documents has been tested on ICES stock summaries reports and will soon be adapted to NAFO reports. The conversion process requires a standardization of the reports. It includes the use of a commercial package (UPCAST). Use of other software solutions were also considered

but would require more investigation. The use of these tools could be extended to other Partners, providing that they use structured templates for their MS Word sources.

19. Mr Caillot presented the data management interface highlighting the aspects of: Uploading an observation; Editing an observation; and Managing the status of an observation. The presentation was conducted using scenarios based on the live application. The procedure for uploading XML files was demonstrated together with editing tools such as inserting new topics with images and tables. The TWG commented or recommended that:
- They were highly encouraged by the developments with the data management interface.
 - A stable version of the On Line Editor tool is required before making it accessible to FIRMS Partners.
 - The XML schema has to be stable and any changes must be introduced with careful consideration given to the implications of any change on Partners.
 - Further feedback from Partners will need to be provided once Partners have had the opportunity to further evaluate the interface.
 - Clear descriptions should be provided in order to better understand the functionality of the different screens.
20. Mr Jaques reported on the results of the users' testing held on the 6th of December and he indicated that most of the issues reported were in relation to Observation Management while the editor tool appeared quite satisfactory. In relation to these items, the TWG recommended that:
- A more consistent use of labels, icons and pull down menus was required.
 - A better design of the observation management workflow interface should be provided.
 - Better explanation should be provided of the multi step process required in loading and validating an XML file.
21. Mr Gentile presented an additional workflow mockup showing alternative scenarios that could replace the current interface of the Observation Management. The TWG recommended that:
- The data collection list should be sorted in a consistent order, e.g. alphabetical order.
 - The possibility of displaying text below icons in addition to the "ALT" (mouse over) function be considered and implemented in selected menus.
 - A legend of icons and color schemes could be displayed at the top and/or at the bottom of each page.
 - The tracking eventual bugs by copying the error and sending by mail to the webmaster be implemented for the Partners.
 - An additional first level view organizing observations by reporting year [as opposed to by marine resource or fishery object] should be developed.
 - There be ensured consistent use of terminology and that it be common for the language in documentation (e.g. 'publish' instead of "set visible on the internet").

FIRMS FISHERIES MODULE: SEEKING GUIDANCE FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT

Fisheries naming conventions (doc. TWG1/2005/4c2)

22. Mr. Taconet presented a revision of the Fisheries naming conventions (doc. TWG1/2005/4c2). Fishery names should be based on three fundamental keys: (1) the "geo-reporting standpoint", (2) the "fishery title", and (3) the "parent fishery title"; these keys

should be displayed together when presenting a fishery with the understanding that the “parent fishery title” may not be available from the inventory if the considered fishery is a top level item of the inventory. Additionally, the “thematic approach” was introduced as a necessary classifier of fisheries for a sound inventory.

The geo-reporting standpoint is key information for the identification of a fishery and provides the geographical scope for the identification of fisheries.

The thematic approach: the identification of fisheries in an inventory is often the result of successive segmentations driven by different thematic reporting approaches: Resources (primarily for biologists), Métier (primarily for biologists, technologists and socio-economists), Fishing technique (primarily for technologists), Production system (primarily for socio-economists), management system (primarily for managers).

Fishery Title is established using keywords representative of the criteria which make a fishery unique within the geo-reporting perspective. Considering the convention to limit the fishery title to a maximum of three keywords, it is proposed, when available, to complement the fishery title with its parent fishery title. The fishery title should as far as possible harmoniously complement the parent fishery title, while remaining consistent with “brother” fishery titles.

The term “fishery” is normally added at the end of the fishery title, but might be replaced by other terms (e.g. “Management unit”, “Operational unit”).

Principles presented on the different thematic reporting perspectives have no implication of at which level or perspective FIRMS Partners have to report within FIRMS.

23. In order to illustrate the application of the convention for fisheries titles and naming of fishery references, a mock-up list of search result on fisheries was presented. Each fishery is referenced in the list by its title, its geo-reporting standpoint, and when available the title of its parent fishery. Additionally, scale, thematic approach and “considered a Management unit” are presented. For each fishery reference, a pop-up window is available to visualize where the fishery is located within the fisheries hierarchies established in the source inventory.
24. The TWG endorsed the general approach outlined in TWG1/2005/4c2, and agreed that each Partner may:
 - Define its own set of thematic elements used to classify fisheries; and
 - Choose the appropriate spatial scale at which to define and report on its fisheries.
25. The TWG recognized that this procedure would follow a learning curve, and that Partners may amend their definitions as they gain experience with FIRMS. However, FIRMS would be able to track these changes, and Partners may amend, update or delete documents to reflect their current definitions.
26. The TWG also recognized that statistical comparisons of fisheries listed in FIRMS would require the development of a method to map each Partner’s set of fishery definitions to an agreed, standard classification.
27. The TWG agreed that some fisheries, or some fishery elements, may be wholly defined from research results, e.g. characteristics of a small-scale artisanal fishery, quantification by-catch.
28. The TWG recalled that the overall objective of FIRMS is to provide information on the status and trend of capture fisheries including estuarine and inland fisheries, excluding aquaculture. However, the TWG noted that agreement has been reached that FIRMS was not ready to support a large number of Partners at this early stage of development. An orderly, progressive

development was required, and this necessitates an initial focus on marine fisheries. The TWG considered that contributions from Partners involved in estuarine and inland fisheries will be added in incremental steps.

Fishery fact sheet template

29. Mr. Gentile presented the logic underlying the proposed design for the fishery module based on the links available from the FIRMS working site (fishery template, data structure/fishery/fishery schema). He showed how the fields of the fisheries inventory in the excel template are mapped to fact sheet topics, how topics would be grouped within “artificial” headers with both headers and groups changing depending on the thematic approach, how the thematic approach could be driven by the choice of a template, and how the fishery template would look, with a particular focus on the Identity block.
30. Participants then explored the five available fishery case studies, and made preliminary comments.
31. The TWG endorsed the proposed approach, recognizing that many of the concepts and structures remain in early stages of development, as Partners test the system and submit information.

Feedback on the template for the presentation of Fishery Fact Sheets [FS]

32. Mr. Taconet presented the five fishery case studies in more detail, starting with the three developed from a Resource Perspective, then one from a Fishing Technique Perspective, and one from a Production System Perspective.

Perspective

33. The TWG noted that reporting perspective for Fishery, FS would depend on individual characteristics of information, and would result in different views of presentation. The approaches that are generally reported by biologists are “Resource” and “Métier”; while the reports of a management organization may include those which provide information how the fishery or systems are managed and describe regulatory activities and responsibilities [i.e. a “Management System” approach; e.g. NAFO Fisheries – describing management of NAFO Regulatory Area, with links made to relevant Stock/Marine Resource FS].

Area/Map – aims to define geo-reference location of fishery

34. With regards to the Area and Geographical Map, the TWG commented that:

In order to avoid confusion to readers, the geographical map should focus on the area where fisheries are conducted. The “area for fishery activity” should therefore be the most prominent colour, compared to other areas.

It was also noted that one fishery could be composed of more than one fishing area (e.g. sub-areas A, B, C ...). If no map of these sub-areas can be dynamically generated, then this information could be supplied using static maps, or text.

A map should to be available on a global perspective, with arrow pointed to the focus area, which could be zoomed in.

For dynamically generated maps, Partners should be able to choose default zooming level between local or global map. At a data collection level, a Partner may indicate default projection for all marine resources included under this data collection (e.g. polar view, Pacific Ocean basin centered view, etc.).

A legend is required for each shading/colour scheme. In default view, this legend could be displayed in the Fishery area section just below. In the zoom view, this legend should be part of the opening window).

The TWG also noted that the approach for displaying area for Fishery FS should be consistent with the approach for Marine Resource FS (e.g. removing FAO area).

Species

35. The TWG took note that the Species appearing in the Fact Sheets (FS) are currently linked to information in “FAO-FIGIS Species FS”, which is not under FIRMS. To ensure that the Species FS contain the most up-to-date information available, Partners may send available information on Species to FAO Species Identification and Data Programme (SIDP - Mr. Gentile) in order to properly update the “FAO-FIGIS Species FS”.

Additional description (if any) in text format could be added to further describe the species from the marine resource perspective.

As an example, in the case study “Shark Fisheries of Thailand” provided by SEAFDEC, it was noted that sharks are not target species for fisheries, but a focus of the information reported in the FS. The TWG suggested that:

- There could be a new keyword for Title (e.g. “shark catch” instead of “shark fishery”) to avoid misinterpretation of the Fact Sheet.
- Species should not be defined only as target, associated, incidental or discard, but also as “captured” species (Partner’s choice).
- Rule should be set e.g. associated species could not appear by itself, but appear together with target species; captured species may appear by itself.
- An introduction could be used to draw readers to the focus of the report (e.g. scope and perspective of the Fact Sheet).

Fishery Component

36. This describes the structure of fishery, with possible link to other relevant fishery fact sheet dynamically retrieved as sons from this inventory.

Links to other related fisheries should be enabled in a topic called “Related fisheries”.

Fishing Gear

37. Gears generally refer to the set of gears in the database (which can link to FAO-FIGIS Fishing Gear FS).

Local name of gear could also be used, with link to gear in the database – Additional description of the gear can be put as text.

[The main difference between fishery component and fishing gear is that Fishery Component is to describe the particular structure and character and their component (here son fisheries) of Fisheries activity, while Gear is generally linked to standard gear database].

Vessel

38. The TWG took note that Flag State would be displayed by the official name of the State or fishing entity (instead of code).

Hyper links to FAO reference material:

39. Comment was made that if information comes from other sources (e.g. from FAO-FIGIS Species FS), this should be made clear in the FS that this is not information provided by Partners. (e.g. put the word “additional information from Name of Source”).

The TWG agreed that Partners may choose whether or not to include hyperlinks to general reference materials such as FAO-FIGIS species fact sheets, vessel types or gear type fact sheets, etc. with the understanding that the default would be set to “links established”. As well, there should be an option available to the Partner to show/hide the image generated from this link to reference material.

Fishery indicator

40. The TWG took note that as the statistical database relevant to fisheries FS is already available in FIGIS system and this facility could be used in the future to more systematically handle indicators.

The TWG expressed concern that there should be a standardized way of presenting catch indicator (e.g. use same unit in tons, etc.). However, it was clarified that this element should provide flexibility for various characteristics of information provided by Partners.

Management

41. The TWG discussed and agreed that as most of the Partners are RFBs, with management reports already available, and choices/possible solutions for reporting management information include:

- Under the Fishery FS, in the Management Topic
- Separated FS (reporting Management perspective) with link to relevant Fishery FS
- Hyperlink to specific homepage of RFBs (e.g. the commission resolution) and put source of information in the FS.

The TWG also agreed that as there are cases that fisheries management are under both regional (RFB) regulation and national law, options should be available for Partners to use Management “Authority” or Management “Body”.

To describe management in a more detailed, additional fields under “Management System” can be used (although not compulsory), such as Jurisdiction area, “Management competence” (or “Role”). Other topics could be added if necessary.

To assist FIRMS to finalize the appropriate structure of information to describe “Management”, NAFO and other Partners with available information could provide case study of Fisheries FS using management system approach.

Socio-economic data

42. The TWG took noted that at the current state, only high-level topics for socio-economic data have been created for the FS, without detailed classification. In order to assist FIRMS to finalize the appropriate structure of this, Partners with available socio-economic data (e.g. Eurostat, or small-scale fisheries of SEAFDEC) could start providing case-study information.

43. According to the FIRM-FIGIS Partnership Agreement between Eurostat (in collaboration with the Directorate-General for Fisheries DG FISH) Eurostat provides information on socio-economic indicators of EU and associated fisheries. Commission Regulation N° 1639/2201 will be the most likely source of information. Each member State is required to meet a Minimum Programme of data collection and establish national data-bases containing, inter alias, economic data by segment of the EU fleet. The collection of socio-economic data is a

relatively new sector of interest. While the Regulation lists the socio-economic parameters to be included in the national data-bases, it does not define these parameters.

Several meetings of fishery economists have been held to review the parameters and develop the concepts and definitions to be applied to these parameters to ensure that the resulting data are comparable at Community level. At the present time and until these discussions have been completed Eurostat will not have socio-economic information to contribute to FIRMS-FIGIS.

Once agreement on the parameters, the concepts and definitions has been reached, the Commission (Eurostat and DG-FISH) will have to obtain the agreement of the member States to provide information extracted from the national data-bases to FIRMS-FIGIS. However it must be stressed that this information submitted to FIRMS-FIGIS may differ significantly from this.

List of the parameters under consideration:

- Income
- Production costs
- Fixed costs
- Financial production
- Investment
- Prices/species
- Employment
- Fleet
- Effort

These indicators should be available for each segment of the fleet (Please, see Information document 5). Eurostat produces yearly 6 "Statistics in Focus" reports which analyse various aspects of EU fisheries. The last one is on EU15 fishing vessels between 2000 and 2004. They are available on Eurostat web-site. Eurostat would welcome the views of the Technical Working Group and the Steering Committee on their suitability for FIRMS.

Additional information has been provided on the situation of Employment in EU Fisheries. The analysis of a questionnaire sent to the Member States will be one of the items on the agenda of the next Working Group on Fishery Statistics scheduled for May 2006.

44. It was suggested that the secretariat contact the NOAA USA economists for input at this stage, before there is extensive development of economic modules.

General Conclusion

45. Taking into consideration the comments made during the discussion, the TWG in principle agreed with the Fisheries Template presented by FIRMS, and requested FIRMS to proceed in obtaining more case studies in order to consolidate the structure/schema, and start developing template and live application on each reporting perspective starting with Resource and Métier.
46. It was suggested that the FIRMS Secretariat further consult with the members of the TWG for necessary clarification and confirmation of issues as agreed at this Meeting to be further proposed for consideration by the FSC Meeting.

MULTILINGUAL FIRMS WEBSITE: REVIEW OF MINIMALIST SOLUTION FOR ADDRESSING MULTILINGUAL CONTENT

47. Mr. Ramm explained the CCAMLR policy of publishing in its four official languages (English, French, Spanish and Russian) and asked about the possibility to implement a multilingual version of FIRMS. The TWG noted that this policy was shared by other Partners with several official languages and also noted that FIRMS recognized the Partners information policy.
48. The FIRMS Secretariat explained that there were no technical constraints in implementing a multilingual version for languages using western alphabet. In this case, the only constraint would be the cost of translation of labels and reference terms. In the case of languages using other characters (e.g. Chinese, Arabic, Russian or Japanese) not only would the on-going move to a new data base be a prerequisite, but also more experience by the development team on the handling of such characters in the FIRMS application.
49. The TWG noted that the accurate definition of terms, titles and references used in FIRMS should be the first priority in the short term. However, taking into account that different Partners shared languages other than English and considering that regular translation of terms used in FIRMS already exist in these languages, the TWG recommended working simultaneously in the translation of defined terms.
50. Regarding other languages the TWG agreed that it would be useful if the Partners provided the translation of terms. Mr. Ramm mentioned that CCAMLR would investigate the feasibility of translating the basic FIRMS menus and buttons into Russian.
51. The TWG agreed that the priority of this process would be defined by the FSC.

NEXT STEPS

52. The TWG agreed that FIRMS should aim at releasing the FIRMS website to the public as soon as possible, but that this should be a decision of the next FSC meeting (13-15 February 2006). The foreseen date for release can be reasonably envisaged for March 2006. There was agreement that the site should contain a consistent database, with up-to-date contributions from Partners. As a minimum, contributions already made for UNGA should be available.
53. The technical steps toward this goal are the following:
 - During December 2005, FIRMS Secretariat will ensure consolidation of the application while loading data already submitted in the intranet server.
 - As soon as the application is considered stable enough for extending testing to members of the TWG, FIRMS Secretariat will contact volunteers from this group to start loading and publishing reports on the intranet application. While preparing their data for final release to the public, volunteers will further contribute to testing of the application, and this activity will be implemented in close interaction with the Secretariat. This activity will likely take place by early January 2006, and should be completed on 10th February 2006.
 - The steering Committee members will then meet in Madrid for FSC3 with a full awareness from TWG members of the actual status of implementation towards release of FIRMS to the public.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

54. No other business was requested for discussion.
55. On behalf of both chairs, the chairman then thanked warm fully the FIRMS Secretariat team members involved in the FIRMS development for the results achieved to date.
56. The meeting was closed at 4.40 pm on Thursday 08 December.

ANNEX 1

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

Dr Michael G. HINTON
IATTC
8604 La Jolla Shores Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037-1508
U.S.A.
Phone: +1 (858) 546 7033
Fax: +1 (858) 546 7133
Email: mhinton@iattc.org

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF ATLANTIC TUNAS

Ms Pilar Pallares
ICCAT
C/ Corazón de María, 8, 6th Fl.
28002 Madrid
Spain
Phone: +34 91 416 5600
Fax: +34 91 4152612
Email: pilar.pallares@iccat.int

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE EXPLORATION OF THE SEA

Ms Bodil CHEMNITZ
ICES
H.C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46
Copenhagen 1261, V
Denmark
Phone: +45 (45) 33154225
Fax: +45 (45) 33934215
Email: bodil@ices.dk

COMMISSION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF SOUTHERN BLUEFIN TUNA

Mr Robert KENNEDY
CCSBT
P.O. Box 37, Deakin West
ACT 2600,
Australia
Phone: +61 (2) 62828396
Fax: +61 (2) 62828407
Email: rkennedy@ccsbt.org

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

Mr David RAMM
CCAMLR
P.O. Box 213
North Hobart
Tasmania 7002
Australia
Phone: +61 3 62310556
Fax: +61 3 62349965
Email: david@ccamlr.org

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

Ms Cherry ALLISON
IWC
The Red House
135 Station Road
Impington, Cambridge, CB4 9NP
United Kingdom
Phone: +44 1223 233971
Fax: +44 1223 232876
Email: cherry.allison@iwcoffice.org

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

Ms Barbara MARSHALL
NAFO
2 Morris Drive, P.O. Box 638
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
Canada B2Y 3Y9
Phone: +1 902 468 8598
Fax: +1 902 468 5538
Email: bmarshall@nafo.int

STATISTICAL OFFICE OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Mr Franco ZAMPOGNA
EUROSTAT
Directorate for Agriculture, Environment and Energy Statistics
Batiment Jean Monnet
BP 1907
Luxembourg, Grand Duchy
Luxembourg
Phone: +352 430 137268
Fax: +352 430 137318
Email: Franco.Zampogna@cec.eu.int

SOUTHEAST ASIAN FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT CENTRE

Ms Nualanong TONGDEE
SEAFDEC Secretariat
P.O. Box 1046 Kasetsart Post Office
Bangkok 10903, Thailand
Phone: +662 940 6326 to 29
Fax: +662 940 6336
Email: nual@seafdec.org

Ms Jarumon TALAWAT
SEAFDEC Secretariat
P.O. Box 1046 Kasetsart Post Office
Bangkok 10903, Thailand
Phone: +662 940 6326 to 29
Fax: +662 940 6336
Email: jarumon@seafdec.org

FAO FISHERIES DEPARTMENT

Chief, FIDI
Senior Fishery Statistician
Fishery Information Officer (FIGIS)
Senior Fishery Resources Officer, FIRM
Deputy Executive Secretary of GFCM
Information Systems Officer, FIDI
Information Officer, FIDI
Associate Professional Officer (FIGIS)
Consultant

Mr Richard Grainger
Ms Sachiko Tsuji
Mr Marc Taconet
Mr Jordi Leonart
Mr Abdellah Srour
Mr Alexis Bensch
Mr Aureliano Gentile
Mr Sylvain Caillot
Ms Elena Balestri

ANNEX 2

ANNOTATED AGENDA AND TIMETABLE

Monday, 5 December, 2005

Morning: 09:30 hours

1. *Opening of session and Welcome address*
2. *Election of chairperson and rapporteurs*
3. *Adoption of Agenda*
4. *Review of the FIRMS web site, with focus on un-resolved comments from e-mail discussions, case studies. Looking for possible solutions and recommendations (doc.TWG1/2005/1)*
 - *Organizations summary sheets*
 - *Components and layout of a fact sheet:*
 - *citation, ownership; (doc. TWG1/2005/4c1)*
 - *identity, including map for geo-location; (doc. TWG1/2005/4a and 4b)*
 - *body content: standard and local topics, Metadata semantic, controlled term (doc. TWG1/2005/4a and 4e)*

Afternoon: 14:00 hours

4. *Review of the FIRMS web site (continued)*
 - *Marine resource tree browser*
 - *Search page / search results page (layout, ranking)*
 - *Dynamic embedding of statistics*

Tuesday, 6 December, 2005

Morning: 09:30 hours

- 5a. *Publishing workflow: Presentation of/Review of/Training on the tools available/under development for the FIRMS web-based module (doc. TWG1/2005/5a)*
 - *Metadata concepts and their use*
 - *Cover page, collection, organization, reference Object;*
 - *User rights;*
 - *Reference observation, fact sheet, other observations;*
 - *Diagramme of possible workflow;*

-
- *Upstream processes: tools converting word source files into XML files (tools: schema, XMLSpy, Upcast and XSL); (doc. TWG1/2005/2 and 3)*
 - *Status of FIRMS applications. user testing of mock-ups*

Afternoon: 14:00 hours

6. *FIRMS Fisheries module: seeking guidance for further development*

- *The inventory of fisheries: status and issues;*
- *How to ensure its consistency: naming conventions; (doc. TWG1/2005/4c2)*

-*Side track testing sessions with 4 volunteers: on-line editing, evaluation of the target interface.*

Wednesday, 7 December, 2005

Morning: 09:30 hours

6. *FIRMS Fisheries module (continued)*

- *Feedback on the template for the presentation of fishery fact sheets;*
- *Handling of resource related data;*
- *Handling of fishing techniques related data;*
- *Handling of socio-economic data;*
- *Handling of management related data*

- *Side track testing sessions with 4 volunteer: on-line editing: evaluation of the target interface.*

Afternoon: 14:00 hours

5b. *Publishing workflow Presentation of/Review of/Training on the tools available/under development for the FIRMS web-based module (continued) (doc. TWG1/2005/5a)*

- *User login*
- *Fact sheet upload: evaluation of the interface;*
- *On line editing: demo of the live interface;*
- *Workflow management: demo of the live interface;*
- *Working protocols between Secretariat and Partners: testing, versioning, communications;*
- *Tests by users of the on-line editing and workflow management.*

Thursday, 8 December, 2005

Morning: 09:30 hours

5c. *Publishing workflow (continued)*

- Tests by users of the on-line editing and workflow management*

7. *Adoption of the Report as Agenda: items 1,2,3,4, 5a, 5b*

Afternoon: 14:00 hours

8. ***Multilingual FIRMS web site: review of minimalist solution for addressing multilingual content***
9. ***Any other business***
10. ***Finalization and adoption of the Final Report (including agenda items: 6,7,8,9)***
This report should include:
 - *solutions suggested;*
 - *recommendations;*
 - *issues for decision-making by FSC3.*

Closure of the meeting at 16.40 on Thursday, 8 December, 2005