

Export invoice data available in Bali, Indonesia

S. Tsuji, H. Kurota
National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries
and
Y. Nishimoto
Fishery Agency of Japan

Summary : Information obtained through quick examination of raw invoice sheets was summarized. 'Fresh tunas' and 'Frozen tunas' components in DINAS statistics included processed products such as steak/loin/fillet and non-tuna species such as marlins. Though detailed packing lists carried useful information on species and size composition of exported products, there was a possibility of mis-identification. Bali exports estimates and import records from Indonesia in Japanese Import Statistics were compared.

要約 : インボイスの生データをざっと検討して得られた情報をまとめた。DINAS の統計における '生まぐろ類'、'冷凍まぐろ類' の中には、ステーキ/ロイン/フィレといった加工品やかじき類などまぐろ類以外の種が含まれている。詳細なパッキングリストには輸出品の種組成、サイズ組成の有用な情報が含まれているが、種の表示が間違っている可能性もある。Bali からの輸出推定量と日本の輸入統計にあるインドネシアからの輸入記録の比較を行った。

Introduction:

During the visit to the Provincial Fisheries Service, Laboratory Quality Control and Fish Inspection Division (DINAS) in Denpasar, Indonesia, in January 2003, we had an opportunity to look through raw invoice sheets and other trading papers stored at the DINAS. With an approval from the DINAS, we entered some key information in a electric form for later analyses in Japan. Since our stay at DINAS was limited to only three days, invoice data during January to March 2001 was mainly entered.

This is a brief note on what we found from this exercise. Because of time constraint and works with rush, the objective was to identify the type of information to be used for future work as well as for a correction of historical data. Data entry was not systematically organized other than list of information to be sought and individuals who did data entry judged which data to be obtained. Authors of this document and Mr. Miura of Japan Tuna Federation participated to this data entry. Entered data might still carry some errors, though some error checking was done afterward. We would like to ask to treat data shown here with an adequate care.

We would like express our greatest appreciation to the DINAS who kindly allowed us to examine raw trading papers at their office and gave a further approval to utilize data obtained there for preparation of this document and for analyses at the CCSBT Indonesian Catch Monitoring Workshop.

Information available from trading papers and data obtained during this exercise:

Several types of documents including packing list explained later were stapled for each export unit. Here, we understand one export unit as a set of packages exported from a certain company to a certain consignee on a certain day. Although we did not have a clear understandings on the role of several documents, the following information could be generally obtained from those documents: name and address of exporter, date of export, classification of exported product (cf. fresh whole tunas, frozen tuna loin etc) and total amount, air cargo or ship cargo, destination, and name and address of consignee. Some documents carried more detailed information including a series of flight number until final destination and name of processing company.

Detailed packing lists were usually stapled with the other document. The level of details about exported products in packing list substantially varied depending on mainly exporters and on type of products in lesser extent. The most detailed packing list carried species, weight and grade of each piece separated by packing boxes with prices. The least detailed list only carried total exported amount and values under species-aggregated product name, which was more common for exporters specialized in processed products such as loin and steak.

Generally, each stapled documents carried two sets of packing list, original one and photocopied one with sum of exported amounts by species written with a pencil. DINAS explained that the detailed data in packing list was entered and summarized at the Gondol Laboratory (Gondol Research Institute for Mariculture). We understand that those data were sent to the CSIRO and used as a basis to raise monitored information. Also, we understand that the species disaggregated export information had summarized from 2001 export data and expected that the results of those data would be presented at the Workshop by the CSIRO.

Table 1. Proportion of data obtained from this exercise to the total export of 'tunas' from Bali.

	Month	Exported data obtained	Exports from Bali	% of coverage
Fresh	Dec. 00	3,504	920,652	0.4
	Jan. 01	208,695	1,344,320	15.5
	Feb. 01	397,618	1,294,801	30.7
	Mar. 01	620,639	636,092	97.6
	Apr. 01	290,742	462,361	62.9
	May 01	12,633	557,035	2.3
	Nov. 01	82,721	946,346	8.7
	Dec. 01	35,739	1,351,596	2.6
Frozen	Jan. 01	200,742	288,273	69.6
	Feb. 01	146,307	313,838	46.6
	Mar. 0	54,803	272,764	20.1
	Dec. 01	32,939	576,265	5.7

Table 1 showed the total amount of exported data we obtained during this exercise comparing with the total exported amount from Bali reported by DINAS. The

proportion of data collected varied substantially reflecting the situation to initiate data entry before completely sorting a pile of sheets. Still, we could have reasonable coverage for four months from January to April of 2001.

Points noted:

This section summarized what we noted and considered as important for reviewing the CSIRO/RIMF catch monitoring system.

Species and products involved in 'Tunas' category:

DINAS used two categories of 'Fresh Tunas' and 'Frozen Tunas' for summary statistics of exports from Bali. Both categories contained whole fish and processed products such as loin/steak/fillet, though the frozen fish were almost exclusively composed with processed products.

When species name available, processed products generally composed with yellowfin tuna, and small amount of swordfish and marlins. Occurrences of bigeye tunas were quite rare. However, many exporters for processed products used species name as 'TUNA'.

Species names commonly observed in the packing list of the 'Fresh Whole Tunas' were 'YF' (yellowfin), 'BE' (bigeye), 'BF'/'SBF' (both assumed to be southern bluefin tuna), 'TR' (corresponding to 'toro', belly meat), and 'TUNA'. 'SWO' (swordfish) and 'ML'/'MK'/'BM' (marlins) were also occasionally observed and their total amount was about half of southern bluefin tuna, though exported portion of marlins were excluded when estimating species composition of exported tunas in the CSIRO/RIMF scheme. It should also be noted that belly meat was handled under the whole fish category.

Although packing list of 'Fresh Whole Tuna' generally contained species name, there were some questionable identification judging from their size. Majority of yellowfin and bigeye tuna exported from Bali was in the range of 20-60 kg and main component of southern bluefin tuna was higher than 70 kg. Some exporters with no records of SBT exports frequently exported bigeye of 90 kg above. There were several records of large quantity of SBT of 20-30kg range exported. We also suspected that majority of YF and BE less than 20 kg could be processed to belly meat or fillet.

Table 2 showed reported species composition by exporters. There were substantial differences in species composition among exporters. Average occurrence of SBT was 1.3%, lower than estimated from the CSIRO/RIMF scheme.

Table 2. Species composition of exported tunas by exporters.

Fresh/Fro	Exporter	YF	BE	TUNA	SBF	TR	總計	YF	BE	TUNA	SBF	TR	總計
Fresh	A	622,557	334,044	2,624	14,157	2,811	976,193	63.8%	34.2%	0.3%	1.5%	0.3%	100.0%
	B	97,236	96,050		1,076	238	194,600	50.0%	49.4%		0.6%	0.1%	100.0%
	C	93,641	45,869	3,620	459	177	143,766	65.1%	31.9%	2.5%	0.3%	0.1%	100.0%
	D	46,987	30,655	173	2,273	174	80,262	58.5%	38.2%	0.2%	2.8%	0.2%	100.0%
	E	27,272	24,033		1,520	49	52,874	51.6%	45.5%		2.9%	0.1%	100.0%
	F	5,096	37,716	1,218	109		44,139	11.5%	85.4%	2.8%	0.2%		100.0%
	G	31,278	789	6,714			38,781	80.7%	2.0%	17.3%			100.0%
	H	8,564	7,605	11,404	289	140	28,002	30.6%	27.2%	40.7%	1.0%	0.5%	100.0%
	I	13,656	11,918	1,417	211	31	27,233	50.1%	43.8%	5.2%	0.8%	0.1%	100.0%
	J	5,025	6,863	1,944			13,832	36.3%	49.6%	14.1%			100.0%
	K	3,007	3,280		158	6	6,451	46.6%	50.8%		2.4%	0.1%	100.0%
	L	5,193			201		5,394	96.3%			3.7%		100.0%
	M	2,044	2,283		195		4,522	45.2%	50.5%		4.3%		100.0%
	N	769	2,279				3,048	25.2%	74.8%				100.0%
	O	57	1,240				1,297	4.4%	95.6%				100.0%
P	81	771				852	9.5%	90.5%				100.0%	
Fresh 合計		962,463	605,395	29,114	20,648	3,626	1,621,247	59.4%	37.3%	1.8%	1.3%	0.2%	100.0%
Frozen	Q	126,827					126,827	100.0%					100.0%
	R	84,269		13,486			97,755	86.2%		13.8%			100.0%
	S	65,633		13,870			79,503	82.6%		17.4%			100.0%
	T	12,880		2,850			15,730	81.9%		18.1%			100.0%
	U	15,430					15,430	100.0%					100.0%
	F	270					270	100.0%					100.0%
	V			1			1			100.0%			100.0%
Frozen 合計		305,308	30,207				335,515	91.0%		9.0%			100.0%
總計		1,267,771	605,395	59,321	20,648	3,626	1,956,762	64.8%	30.9%	3.0%	1.1%	0.2%	100.0%

Exporters/Consignee/Destination/Processing:

DINAS reported monthly exports by categories by exporters. Distribution of exported amounts among exporters calculated from the data obtained through this exercise did not match completely with those from the DINAS. Especially, several significant exporters could not be identified through our examination. Also the total amount calculated from our data from some exporters exceeded the reported amount by DINAS for March with the highest data coverage. Mistyping could be one of the causes.

There were several places showing the consignee or importer of products within the trading documents. Different names of consignee were found occasionally within a set of documents. We also found the cases where different places were noted as final destination and destination of flight. There were several other cases puzzled us.

Part of documents contained information of processing company. However, only few processing companies were observed in documents. At least those companies seemed to have a close link with a specific exporters.

Comparison of Bali exported data and Japan Import Statistics:

Since the data obtained this time contained destination and species identification together with amount, value and type of products, species composition of exports from Bali was estimated using the coverage shown in Table 1 as a raising factor. Table 3 showed the results comparing with the imported amounts from Indonesia derived from the Japanese Import Statistics. Japanese Import Statistics included imports from Indonesian ports other than Bali. Although there were some general consistency, two tables did not show a good match. Somehow, SBT in Japanese Import Statistics always substantially lower than those exported from Bali. Both statistics were based on invoice

information and this indicated some discrepancies existed in treatment of invoices between two nations. Further investigation will be needed if those trading information will be used for catch estimation of SBT.

Table 3. Comparison of export estimates from Bali and import records from Indonesia in the Japan's Import Statistics.

Estimated Exports from Bali to Japan

	Month	YF	BE	TUNA	SBF	TR	総計
Fresh	2001.01	728,581	552,209	29,901	27,170	1,643	1,339,504
	2001.02	720,002	540,688	14,143	14,481	4,158	1,293,472
	2001.03	344,451	254,700	14,492	8,929	1,817	624,390
	2001.04	344,729	106,676	5,736	4,147	336	461,624
Frozen	2001.01	193,303	0	21,450	0	0	214,754
	2001.02	217,197	0	3,003	0	0	220,200
	2001.03	181,694	0	69,033	0	0	250,728

Import from Indonesia to Japan

	Month	YF	BE	TUNA	SBF	TR	総計
Fresh	2001.01	869,645	531,177	0	10,847	0	1,411,669
	2001.02	424,350	279,741	0	2,980	0	707,071
	2001.03	682,774	361,130	0	5,992	0	1,049,896
	2001.04	847,819	350,986	0	1,177	0	1,199,982
Frozen	2001.01	282,532	370,218	0	0	45,056	697,806
	2001.02	101,411	295,460	0	0	81,449	478,320
	2001.03	269,211	538,863	0	0	65,339	873,413