

Extraction of UK catch data from historic EU catch data

Charlotte Wicker and Marc Owen

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), London, United Kingdom

1. Purpose of this paper

- a) To outline the rationale and process for extracting ‘metropolitan’ United Kingdom (UK) catch data from historic European Union (EU) catch data in the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) databases.
- b) To request that the Working Party on Data Collection and Statistics (WPDCS) agrees to the re-labelling of historic UK catch data in the IOTC databases.

2. Introduction

Following its exit from the EU on 1 January 2021, the UK is now represented by a single seat in the IOTC. This new situation implies the need to extract and re-label historical ‘EUGBR’ catches as ‘GBR’ catches in order that the UK can demonstrate and evidence its historical interest and participation in IOTC fisheries. This will ensure IOTC records of historic catches for both the UK and EU are accurate, and that any processes relying on historic catch data are transparent and robust.

For example, catch data form the basis of IOTC fee calculations, so in order to calculate the correct fees for both the UK and EU, UK data will need to be extracted and re-labelled.

This data extraction exercise will not impact or change the historic catch data of any other IOTC members and will not result in any change to IOTC’s total historical catch values.

3. Process

Historically labelled ‘EUGBR’ data would be amended as a new entry in the IOTC databases and labelled as ‘GBR’ data. This process would be undertaken by the Secretariat and apply to the following datasets¹: nominal catch, catch-and-effort, and size-frequency. An example of how this might look is provided in Table 1.

This extraction and re-labelling exercise will apply only to species fished by the UK in IOTC waters (FAO areas 51 and 57). Table 2 provides an example of historic UK nominal catch data which are currently labelled ‘EUGBR’ and would be re-labelled ‘GBR’.

The WPDCS is requested to acknowledge the rationale and outputs of this re-labelling request and agree on updating the official nominal catches, catch-and-effort, and size-frequency data held by the IOTC Secretariat accordingly.

¹ <https://iotc.org/data/datasets>

Table 1: YFT catches in 2016, by IOTC Member, before and after re-labelling EUGBR data to GBR data. Changes shown in yellow. Data source: IOTC best scientific estimates of nominal catch data (last updated 14/10/2021)².

| <i>Before re-labelling</i> | | <i>After re-labelling</i> | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Fleet Code | Catch/capture (t) | Fleet Code | Catch/capture (t) |
| AUS | 66.71 | AUS | 66.71 |
| BHR | 1.04 | BHR | 1.04 |
| CHN | 1,812.17 | CHN | 1,812.17 |
| COM | 5,583.75 | COM | 5,583.75 |
| DJI | 55.40 | DJI | 55.40 |
| EGY | 15.00 | EGY | 15.00 |
| EUESP | 51,659.76 | EUESP | 51,659.76 |
| EUFRA | 33,718.82 | EUFRA | 33,718.82 |
| EUGBR | 41.85 | EUITA | 1,867.63 |
| EUITA | 1,867.63 | EUMYT | 88.50 |
| EUMYT | 88.50 | EUPRT | 116.22 |
| EUPRT | 116.22 | EUREU | 797.92 |
| EUREU | 797.92 | GBR | 41.85 |
| GBRT | 2.07 | GBRT | 2.07 |
| IDN | 22,635.64 | IDN | 22,635.64 |
| IND | 19,244.24 | IND | 19,244.24 |
| IRN | 45,110.48 | IRN | 45,110.48 |
| JOR | 25.80 | JOR | 25.80 |
| JPN | 3,389.00 | JPN | 3,389.00 |
| KEN | 108.41 | KEN | 108.41 |
| KOR | 11,721.14 | KOR | 11,721.14 |
| LKA | 33,734.61 | LKA | 33,734.61 |
| MDG | 735.93 | MDG | 735.93 |
| MDV | 53,705.45 | MDV | 53,705.45 |
| MOZ | 173.65 | MOZ | 173.65 |
| MUS | 7,585.12 | MUS | 7,585.12 |
| MYS | 155.80 | MYS | 155.80 |
| NEICE | 417.97 | NEICE | 417.97 |
| NEIFR | 692.54 | NEIFR | 692.54 |
| OMN | 20,983.16 | OMN | 20,983.16 |
| PAK | 25,560.43 | PAK | 25,560.43 |
| QAT | 140.69 | QAT | 140.69 |
| SYC | 43,261.03 | SYC | 43,261.03 |
| TMP | 3.58 | TMP | 3.58 |
| TWN | 16,957.83 | TWN | 16,957.83 |
| TZA | 4,012.94 | TZA | 4,012.94 |
| YEM | 21,253.48 | YEM | 21,253.48 |
| ZAF | 183.46 | ZAF | 183.46 |
| Total | 427,619.22 | Total | 427,619.22 |

² <https://iotc.org/data/datasets/latest/NC-SCI>

Table 2: EUGBR nominal catches from 2004-2020 by species code. Data source: IOTC best scientific estimates of nominal catch data (last updated 14/10/2021)³.

| Year | EUGBR catch/capture(t) by species code | | | | | | | | | |
|------|--|-------|-------|-------|------|--------|-------|------|---------|--------|
| | ALB | BET | BLM | BUM | MLS | SBF | SFA | SKJ | SWO | YFT |
| 2004 | - | - | - | - | - | 22.15 | 13.89 | - | 351.62 | - |
| 2005 | 2.27 | 18.02 | 0.09 | 0.22 | 1.52 | - | 3.59 | 0.45 | 569.73 | - |
| 2006 | 7.13 | 0.11 | - | 20.70 | - | - | 19.49 | - | 1117.58 | 4.94 |
| 2007 | 18.43 | - | - | 22.86 | - | - | 13.95 | - | 1046.64 | - |
| 2008 | 10.73 | - | - | 34.54 | - | 163.52 | 14.54 | - | 940.56 | - |
| 2009 | 8.73 | - | - | 1.71 | - | - | 20.84 | - | 882.14 | 120.36 |
| 2010 | 4.52 | 2.25 | - | 9.89 | - | - | 16.28 | - | 581.14 | 46.11 |
| 2011 | 3.91 | 3.09 | - | 11.34 | - | - | 4.37 | - | 662.39 | 42.11 |
| 2012 | 6.57 | 3.27 | - | 21.15 | - | - | 7.99 | - | 676.99 | 55.76 |
| 2013 | 6.98 | - | - | 16.02 | - | - | 5.65 | - | 555.72 | 53.62 |
| 2014 | 7.97 | - | - | 11.71 | - | - | 2.76 | - | 527.23 | 85.86 |
| 2015 | 8.52 | - | - | 7.89 | - | - | 1.18 | - | 365.03 | 85.37 |
| 2016 | 2.05 | - | - | 3.49 | - | - | 1.68 | - | 203.66 | 41.85 |
| 2017 | 3.06 | 2.49 | 1.23 | 6.26 | - | - | 1.89 | - | 272.07 | 20.61 |
| 2018 | 1.03 | 2.13 | 14.98 | - | - | - | 8.10 | - | 485.40 | 8.57 |
| 2019 | 1.28 | 1.86 | 12.93 | - | - | - | 3.67 | - | 383.24 | 14.24 |
| 2020 | - | - | 4.31 | - | - | - | 1.40 | - | 202.45 | 6.20 |

³ <https://iotc.org/data/datasets/latest/NC-SCI>