KINGDOM OF CAMBODIA

**National​ Religion King**

**3**

​Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries

Fisheries Administration

**3**

**Cambodia Programme for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth**

**in the Fisheries Sector: Capture Component**

**Monthly Statistical Report**

**Scientific Catch Assessment of Inland Fisheries in Cambodia**

**July 2021**

**By Inland Fisheries Research and Development Institute**

Funded by European Union

ACA/2018/041-466 and ACA/2019/041-594

1. **Introduction**

IFReDI, with technical assistance from FAO CAPFISH project under EU budget support, is currently piloting scientific catch assessment using a monthly household recall survey for 900 households, covering all provinces in Cambodia. The aim is to obtain better information on catch and effort by small-scale household fisheries in Cambodia, and to develop a sustainable catch monitoring methodology for implementation by provincial fisheries administrations, supported by IFReDI. The randomly selected household coverage of survey is gradually expanding since the start of catch assessment survey in June 2021. The current statistical report provides preliminary analysis based on the available data and focuses on the main indicators that are covered by the catch assessment survey. Therefore, the results do not represent final estimates and may be changed in future updates.

A description of the methodology can be found in:

Fisheries Administration (FiA). 2021. Manual for Scientific Catch Assessment by Recall survey of Inland Fisheries in Cambodia. Inland Fisheries Research and Development Institute of the Fisheries Administration, Phnom Penh, Cambodia. 47 pages.

1. **Methodology of data collection and analysis**

The total estimated catch in this report is calculated using the proportion of fishing households found by the random household selection under the Household Selection Interview survey. This is taken to be representative for the proportion of fishing households for each fishing area and this is combined with the total number of rural households by fishing area from the NIS 2019 population census to estimate the total number of fishing households. The Fishing Activity Coefficient is estimated from proportion of households reporting fishing activities in the Household Catch Interview.

Estimates for CPUE, the average (mean) daily household catch and the mean monthly household catch used for extrapolating the total catch, come with a value for the standard error (ε). This is used to indicate the accuracy of the estimate for the mean catch. To better evaluate the accuracy of the mean value, the *relative* standard error is included, calculated by dividing the standard error by the mean catch. If this is higher than 30% this indicates a high inaccuracy[[1]](#footnote-1), due to high variation or low sample size and the resulting total estimate should be used with extreme caution.

In tables with the proportion of reported catch obtained by habitat and fishing gear, the average daily catch by habitat or gear (CPUE) isn’t included. This is a basic characteristic of Cambodian inland fisheries; the available data displays too much variation and the accuracy is too low for it to be statistically accurate and representative for the real CPUE.

1. **Statistical tables and results**

The coverage for data collection during July 2021 is included in Table 1, overall, 24.4% of the target household sample was covered in July.

**Table 1.** Number of random selected households covered by the survey and proportion of target household by fishing area for July 2021.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fishing Area** | **Villages** | **Household** | | |
| **Count** | **Target** | **Proportion** |
| Coastal | - | - | 60 | 0.0% |
| Floodplain | 4 | 58 | 315 | 18.4% |
| Mountainous | - |  | 105 | 0.0% |
| Plateau | 3 | 24 | 105 | 22.9% |
| Tonle Sap | 8 | 138 | 315 | 43.8% |
| **Total** | **15** | **220** | **900** | **24.4%** |

**Table 2.** Mean **daily** household catch (CPUE), with standard deviation, confidence limits, relative standard error.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fishing Area** | **Active HH** | **Daily HH catch (Kg)** | **SD** | **CL** | ε% |
| Coastal |  |  |  |  |  |
| Floodplain | 16 | 2.96 | 4.34 | 1.98 | 36.7% |
| Mountainous |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plateau | 16 | 1.31 | 1.22 | 0.58 | 24.1% |
| Tonle Sap | 56 | 5.00 | 9.07 | 2.05 | 24.3% |

Mean daily catch calculated based on the reported 5-day catch and fishing days, with SD is Standard Deviation; CL is Confidence Limits; ε% is relative Standard Error

**Table 3.** Mean **monthly** household catch with standard deviation, confidence limits, relative standard error and total estimated catch by fishing area.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fishing Area** | **Active HH** | **Monthly HH catch (Kg)** | **SD** | **CL** | ε% | **Total (MT)** |
| Coastal |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Floodplain | 16 | 69.83 | 131.38 | 59.75 | 47.0% | **11,858.02** |
| Mountainous |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plateau | 16 | 27.65 | 21.03 | 9.56 | 19.0% | **1,797.74** |
| Tonle Sap | 56 | 180.61 | 551.50 | 124.45 | 40.8% | **27,503.28** |
| **Total estimated catch (MT)** | | | | | | **41,159.04** |

SD is Standard Deviation; CL is Confidence Limits; ε% is relative Standard Error

**Table 4.** Proportion of fishing days on which male and female adults and children are reporting fishing activities.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fishing Area** | Adult | | Child | |
| Female | Male | Female | Male |
| Coastal |  |  |  |  |
| Floodplain | 40.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% |
| Mountainous |  |  |  |  |
| Plateau | 0.0% | 84.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% |
| Tonle Sap | 23.8% | 71.4% | 0.0% | 14.3% |
| **Total** | **19.4%** | **78.9%** | **0.0%** | **16.7%** |

The maximum involvement of each gender and age group is 100% for each fishing area, if they are fishing on all reported fishing days.

**Table 5.** Reported catch (Kg) with proportion caught by main boat type by fishing area.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fishing Area** | **Catch (Kg)** | **No boat** | **Motorised** | **Non-motorised** |
| Coastal | 0 |  |  |  |
| Floodplain | 180.2 | 15.0% | 64.5% | 20.5% |
| Mountainous | 0 |  |  |  |
| Plateau | 66.6 | 6.4% | 77.2% | 16.4% |
| Tonle Sap | 967.9 | 47.9% | 41.5% | 10.6% |
| **Overall** | 1214.7 | 35.0% | 51.1% | 13.9% |


Overall proportion based on weighted average catch by main boat type over fishing areas, not reported total catch[[2]](#footnote-2)

**Figure 1.** Overall contribution of the main boat types to total reported catch.

**Table 6.** Reported catch by habitat for single habitat catches by fishing area.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fishing habitats** | **Floodplain** | **Plateau** | **Tonle Sap** | **Overall** |
| Floodplain: rice fields (rain) | - | - | 33.2% | 26.3% |
| Floodplain: lakes and ponds | 28.2% | 0.5% | 19.5% | 19.8% |
| Mekong Mainstream | 70.1% | 82.5% | - | 15.1% |
| Tributaries to Tonle Sap | - | - | 17.6% | 13.9% |
| Stream | - | - | 11.0% | 8.7% |
| Floodplain: rice fields (flooded) | - | - | 2.7% | 2.2% |
| Irrigation canals | - | - | 1.5% | 1.2% |
| Sub-Stream | - | 17.0% | - | 0.9% |
| Major Tributaries | 0.5% | - | - | 0.1% |
| Others | 1.2% | - | 14.6% | 11.8% |
| **Total catch for single habitat days** | **180.2** | **64.0** | **939.4** | **1183.6** |

Only catch for fishing days that report fishing in a single habitat is included



**Figure 2.** Overall contribution of the habitats to total reported catch, with proportion of catch for floodplain habitats.

**Table 7.** Reported catch by gear for single gear days, by fishing area.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fishing gears** | **Floodplain** | **Plateau** | **Tonle Sap** | **Overall** |
| Horizontal cylinder trap | 0.9% | - | 51.6% | 39.6% |
| Drifting gillnet | 61.8% | - | 5.2% | 15.0% |
| Stationary gillnet | 14.9% | 92.2% | 7.6% | 13.8% |
| Lift nets | - | - | 5.2% | 4.0% |
| Hook and line | 7.5% | - | 3.4% | 4.0% |
| Cast net | 0.7% | 7.7% | 2.7% | 2.7% |
| Hook long line | 1.7% | - | 1.2% | 1.2% |
| Giant lift nets | - | - | 1.1% | 0.9% |
| Vertical hanging vase trap | 2.2% | - | - | 0.4% |
| Others gears | 10.4% | 0.1% | 21.9% | 18.6% |
| **Total catch for single gear days** | 781.3 | 252.0 | 3338.9 | 4372.2 |

Only catch for fishing days that report fishing with a single gear is included

**Figure 3.** Overall contribution of the gears to total reported catch.

**Table 8.** Reported disposal by fishing area in weight and proportion.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fishing Area** | **Sold** | | **Consumed** | | **Other** | |
| Kg | % | Kg | % | Kg | % |
| Floodplain | 129.2 | 71.7% | 51.0 | 28.3% | - | - |
| Plateau | 5.1 | 7.6% | 51.4 | 77.2% | 10.1 | 15.2% |
| Tonle Sap | 801.6 | 82.8% | 140.1 | 14.5% | 26.1 | 2.7% |
| **Overall** | **935.9** | **77.1%** | **242.5** | **20.0%** | **36.2** | **3.0%** |

**Figure 4.** Catch contribution compared between fish and other aquatic animals.

**Table 9.** Top 10 reported species and species groups **by weight** in reported household catch, with reported weight and proportion of catch by individual species and species groups.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Scientific name** | **catch (kg)** | **Catch contribution** | |
| **Proportion** | **Cumulative** |
| 1 | *Clarias batrachus* | 216.5 | 17.8% | 17.8% |
| 2 | *Labiobarbus siamensis* | 103.1 | 8.5% | 26.3% |
| 3 | *Oxyeleotris marmorata* | 100.4 | 8.3% | 34.6% |
| 4 | Other fish nei | 90.6 | 7.5% | 42.0% |
| 5 | *Puntioplites proctozysron* | 89.2 | 7.3% | 49.4% |
| 6 | *Anabas testudineus* | 67.5 | 5.6% | 54.9% |
| 7 | *Channa striata* | 44.5 | 3.7% | 58.6% |
| 8 | *Henicorhynchus lobatus* | 39.7 | 3.3% | 61.9% |
| 9 | *Boesemania microlepis* | 35.0 | 2.9% | 64.7% |
| 10 | Other species | 428.2 | 35.3% | 100.0% |
|  | **Total reported catch** | **1214.7** |  |  |

**Table 10.** Top 10 reported species **by value** (1000 Riel) in reported catch, with reported value, proportion of value by individual species and species groups.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Scientific name** | **Value**  **(1000 Riel)** | **Value Contribution** | |
| **Proportion** | **Cumulative** |
| 1 | *Clarias batrachus* | 1190.8 | 13.0% | 13.0% |
| 2 | Other fish nei | 946.8 | 10.3% | 23.4% |
| 3 | *Labiobarbus siamensis* | 721.8 | 7.9% | 31.2% |
| 4 | *Puntioplites proctozysron* | 561.4 | 6.1% | 37.4% |
| 5 | *Channa striata* | 458.7 | 5.0% | 42.4% |
| 6 | *Anabas testudineus* | 438.8 | 4.8% | 47.2% |
| 7 | *Oxyeleotris marmorata* | 435.2 | 4.8% | 51.9% |
| 8 | *Cyclocheilichthys enoplos* | 340.0 | 3.7% | 55.6% |
| 9 | *Hemibagrus spilopterus* | 280.0 | 3.1% | 58.7% |
| 10 | Other species | 3780.0 | 41.3% | 100% |
|  | **Total reported value** | **9153.5** |  |  |

1. For national statistical reports a rule of thumb exists that if the *relative* standard error is higher than 30%, the average should not be reported. The current report includes all estimated values to indicate the availability of data, with the accuracy indicated by the relative standard error. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. This is the standard way to calculate, but isn’t done for habitat and gear catch, as this is complicated by fishing days where the reported catch is from multiple habitats or caught by multiple gears [↑](#footnote-ref-2)