



Report of the working group on the review of national reports on member states effort to achieve balance between fleet capacity and fishing opportunities (SGBRE 09-01) subgruop on balance between resources and exploitation (SGBRE) of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

Curtis, Hazel; Abella, Alvaro; Irondo, Ane; Brodie, Colin; Little, Alyson; Hadelers, Silvia; Velinova, Mihaela; Yankova, Maria; Thøgersen, Thomas Talund; Galrito, Helena; Miguez, Maria Amelia

Publication date:
2009

Document version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (APA):

Curtis, H., Abella, A., Irondo, A., Brodie, C., Little, A., Hadelers, S., ... Miguez, M. A. (2009). *Report of the working group on the review of national reports on member states effort to achieve balance between fleet capacity and fishing opportunities (SGBRE 09-01): subgruop on balance between resources and exploitation (SGBRE) of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)*. European Commission. JRC Scientific and technical reports



**Scientific, Technical and Economic
Committee for Fisheries (STECF)**

**Report of the Working Group on the review
of national reports on Member States
efforts to achieve balance between fleet
capacity and fishing opportunities
(SGBRE 09-01)**

**Subgroup on Balance between resources
and exploitation (SGBRE) of the Scientific,
Technical and Economic Committee for
Fisheries (STECF)**

7-11 SEPTEMBER, EDINBURGH

Edited by Hazel Curtis & John Anderson

EUR xxxxx EN -

The mission of the Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen (IPSC) is to provide research results and to support EU policy-makers in their effort towards global security and towards protection of European citizens from accidents, deliberate attacks, fraud and illegal actions against EU policies

European Commission
Joint Research Centre
Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Contact information

Address: TP 051, 21027 Ispra (VA), Italy
E-mail: stecf-secretariat@jrc.it
Tel.: 0039 0332 789343
Fax: 0039 0332 789658

<https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home>
<http://ipsc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>
<http://www.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>

Legal Notice

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of this publication. This report does not necessarily reflect the view of the European Commission and in no way anticipates the Commission's future policy in this area.

***Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers
to your questions about the European Union***

**Freephone number (*):
00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11**

(*). Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers or these calls may be billed.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet. It can be accessed through the Europa server <http://europa.eu/>

JRC [PUBSY request]

EUR XXXXX LL
ISBN X-XXXX-XXXX-X
ISSN 1018-5593
DOI XXXXX

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

© European Communities, 20YY

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

Printed in Country

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	5
2.	Terms of reference.....	6
3.	STECF Comments and Conclusions	7
4.	Introduction to working group report	9
4.1.	Terms of reference.....	9
4.2.	Participants	10
5.	ToR 1. Evaluate MS annual reports and Commission summaries	13
5.1.	Evaluation of MS annual reports for 2008	13
5.2.	Evaluation of Commission summary of MS annual reports.....	18
6.	ToR 2. Evaluate MS application of guidelines on balance indicators	25
6.1.	Evaluation of Quality of Technical Indicators	27
6.2.	Evaluation of Biological Indicators	31
6.3.	Evaluation of Economic Indicators	35
6.4.	Evaluation of Social Indicators	39
7.	ToR 3. Assess and summarise the problem of data availability	43
8.	ToR 4. Assess appropriateness of indicators for small scale fleets	48
9.	ToR 5. Improve the guidelines for balance indicators	50
10.	References.....	52
	Appendix A	53
	Appendix B	54

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

**REVIEW OF NATIONAL REPORTS ON MEMBER STATES EFFORTS TO
ACHIEVE BALANCE BETWEEN FLEET CAPACITY AND FISHING
OPPORTUNITIES (SGBRE 09-01)**

**SUBGROUP ON BALANCE BETWEEN RESOURCES AND EXPLOITATION
(SGBRE) OF THE SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR
FISHERIES (STECF)**

STECF OPINION EXPRESSED DURING THE PLENARY MEETING (PLEN-09-03)

9-13 NOVEMBER 2009, BRUSSELS

1. Introduction

STECF is requested to review the report of the SGBRE meeting of September 7-11, 2009 (Edinburgh), evaluate the findings and make any appropriate comments and recommendations.

2. Terms of reference

The working group was asked to:

1. Evaluate the Member States' reports on their efforts during 2008 to achieve a sustainable balance between fishing capacity and fishing opportunities and the Commission's summary made thereof. To what extent do the MS reports comply with Article 14 of Council Regulation No 2371/2002 and Article 12 of Commission Regulation no 1438/2003.
2. Evaluate Member States' application of the indicators proposed in the "Guidelines for an improved analysis of the balance between fleet capacity and fishing opportunities". Assess the extent of the application of the guidelines and the problems encountered by Member states.
3. To assess the problem of availability of data for the calculation of the proposed indicators. Particular attention should be paid to biological data. Further clarification required from DG MARE
4. To assess the appropriateness of the proposed indicators for small scale coastal fleets and fisheries, identify problems related to their use for this part of the fleet and consider possible alternatives.
5. Propose improvements to the Commission guidelines on the balance indicators.

3. STECF Comments and Conclusions

STECF Observations

ANNEX I

SGBRE-09-01: REVIEW OF NATIONAL REPORTS ON BALANCE BETWEEN FISHING CAPACITIES AND FISHING OPPORTUNITIES.

Edinburgh, 7-11th September 2009

This report is the opinion of the expert working group on Balance between capacity and exploitation (SGBRE-09-01) and not of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

This report does not necessarily reflect the view of the European Commission and in no way anticipates the Commission's future policy in this area

4. Introduction to working group report

4.1. Terms of reference

The working group was asked to:

1. Evaluate the Member States' reports on their efforts during 2008 to achieve a sustainable balance between fishing capacity and fishing opportunities and the Commission's summary made thereof. To what extent do the MS reports comply with Art. 14 of Council Regulation No 2371/2002 and Art. 12 of Commission Regulation no 1438/2003.
2. Evaluate Member States' application of the indicators proposed in the "Guidelines for an improved analysis of the balance between fleet capacity and fishing opportunities". Assess the extent of the application of the guidelines and the problems encountered by Member states.
3. To assess the problem of availability of data for the calculation of the proposed indicators. Particular attention should be paid to biological data. Further clarification required from DG MARE
4. To assess the appropriateness of the proposed indicators for small scale coastal fleets and fisheries, identify problems related to their use for this part of the fleet and consider possible alternatives.
5. Propose improvements to the Commission Guidelines on the balance indicators.

4.2. Participants

Name	Address	Telephone no.	<u>email</u>
STECF members			
Curtis, Hazel (chair)	Sea Fish Industry Authority 18 Logie Mill, Logie Green Road Edinburgh, EH7 4HS, UK	+44 131 524 8664	h_curtis@seafish.co.uk
Abella, Alvaro	Agenzia Regionale Protezione Ambiente della Toscan Via Marradi 114 57126, Livorno, Italy	+39 0586 263456	a.abella@arpat.toscana.it
External experts			
Iriondo, Ane	AZTI - Tecnalia / Unidad de Investigación Marina Txatxarramendi Ugarteia z/g 48395 Sukarrieta (Bizkaia), Spain	+34 946 029 400	airiondo@suk.azti.es
Brodie, Colin	Sea Fish Industry Authority 18 Logie Mill, Logie Green Road Edinburgh, EH7 4HS, UK	+44 131 524 8662	c_brodie@seafish.co.uk
Little, Alyson	CEFAS Pakefield Road Lowestoft NR33 0HT, United Kingdom	+44 1502 524501	alyson.little@cefasc.co.uk
Hadeler, Silvia	CEFAS Pakefield Road Lowestoft NR33 0HT, United Kingdom	+44 01502 524590	silvia.hadeler@cefasc.co.uk
Velinova, Mihaela	National agency of fisheries and aquaculture Hr. Botev 17 1606 Sofia, Bulgaria	+35 9280 51663	mihaela.velinova@nafa-bg.org
Yankova, Maria	Institute of Fishing Resources Blvd. Primorski 4 9000 Varna, Bulgaria	+35 9526 32066	maria_y@abv.bg
Thoegersen, Thomas	FOI Marstalsgade 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark	+35 286895	thth@foi.dk
Galrito, Helena	DGPA Av. Brasília 1449-030 Lisboa, Portugal	+35 12130 35804	galrito@dgpa.min-agricultura.pt
Miguez, Maria Amélia	DG Pescas e Agricultura Av. Brasília 1449-030 Lisboa, Portugal	+35 12130 35888	amiguez@dgpa.min-agricultura.pt

JRC experts			
Anderson, John	Joint Research Centre JRC	+39 0332 78 9256	john.anderson@jrc.it
European Commission			
Lopez-Benitez, Casto	DG MARE	+32 2 299 6077	casto.lopez-benitez@ec.europa.eu
Anderson, John	Joint Research Centre JRC, STECF secretariat	+39 0332 78 9256	john.anderson@ec.europa.eu

5. ToR 1. Evaluate MS annual reports and Commission summaries

Under Item 1 in the Terms of Reference, the working group was asked to evaluate:

- the MS reports on their efforts during 2008 to achieve a sustainable balance between fleet capacity and fishing opportunities; and
- the Commission's summary made of MS reports.

In particular, the working group was asked, to what extent do the MS reports comply with Article 14 of Council Regulation no. 2371/2002 and Articles 12 and 13 of Commission Regulation no. 1438/2003?

5.1. Evaluation of MS annual reports for 2008

The MS reports were evaluated against the requirements of Article 12 and 13 of Commission Regulation no. 1438/2003.

Overall there is significant variation in the completeness and quality of the Member State reports. A common strength amongst the Member State reports was the description provided of their fleets, changes of the fleet over the year and linkages with fisheries. However, there is a high degree of variation in the quality of the reports and the extent to which they provide the information stipulated in Article 13 of Commission Regulation no. 1438/2003:

- Two Member States failed to describe effort reduction schemes, whilst six countries did not refer to the impact of these schemes on fishing capacity. In general, the descriptions of effort reduction schemes are quite poor.
- Denmark, Germany, Italy and Spain did not state whether they complied with entry/exit schemes. All other countries did give some indication of compliance (although often not explicitly).
- Approximately half of the Member States summarised strengths and weaknesses of fleet management systems, although the quality of these statements was varied. Furthermore, only half of MS reports provided plans for improvements in fleet management systems.
- Only seven Member States gave information on the level of compliance surrounding general fleet policy instruments. A common failing was weaknesses in the quality of this information.
- Half of the Member States referred to changes in administrative procedures relevant to fleet management with varying degrees of quality.

The regulation stipulates that the Member State reports should not exceed 10 pages, 40% of countries failed to meet this requirement. Only a third of Member states gave an overall assessment of the balance between fishing capacity and opportunity.

The working group assessed compliance with Article 12 and 13 of Commission Regulation no. 1438/2003 by developing a scoring system. Table 5.1 shows the scoring system is based on the elements of Article 13 (1A to 2) and Article 12 (O), if the report provides an overall balance between capacity and opportunity. The scoring system was split between a score for providing the required information and a

separate score for the quality of the information. The quality score is a reflection of the completeness, robustness and relevance of the information provided and a weighting system was applied to reflect the importance of the elements included (present) in MS reports. It was not possible to assign a score for submitting the report by the required date.

The working group notes the similar work carried out by the Institute for European Environmental Policy¹ (IEEP). The IEEP report scored Member States on a scale of 10 for timeliness, completeness and readability. In comparison our report has a two score system; presence of required element and a quality indicator based on completeness, robustness, relevance. Unlike the IEEP report our assessment did not adopt a traffic light system to rank Member States.

Q	Element to be included	Max score available	
		Present	Quality
1A	i) Description of fleets	2	3
	ii) Link with fisheries	3	3
	iii) Development in fleets	3	3
1B	i) statement of effort reduction schemes	2	3
	ii) impact on fishing capacity of effort reduction schemes	3	3
1C	Statement of compliance with entry / exit scheme	2	3
1D	i) Summary of weaknesses & strengths of fleet management system	1	3
	ii) plan for improvements in fleet management system	2	3
	iii) information on general level of compliance with fleet policy instruments	1	3
1E	Information on changes of the admin. procedures relevant to fleet management	1	3
2	Report 10 pages or less?	1	
O	Overall: does report assess balance between capacity & opportunity?	3	3
Total possible scores:		24	33

Table 5.1 Scoring system for evaluation of MS annual reports

Table 5.2 shows the scores by country for the inclusion of required elements in the annual report (the present score). Overall MS scored quite highly on 1A (description of fleets, link with fisheries, fleet developments), 1B (effort reduction schemes) and 1C (compliance with entry/exit scheme). Member states scored less well on 1D (fleet management systems), 1E (administrative procedures), report length and an overall assessment of balance. Only 6 of the 22 member states gave an overall assessment of whether the capacity of their fishing fleet was in balance with the fishing opportunity.

Table 5.4 ranks the Member States by their 'present' score for inclusion of required elements. A maximum of 24 points was available. Latvia, Netherlands and Poland achieved 21 points, while Greece only scored 7 points.

¹ 'Overcapacity – What Overcapacity', An evaluation of Member States Reporting on Efforts to achieve a sustainable balance between capacity and fishing opportunities in 2007, Institute for European Environmental Policy, July 2009.

		Max scores	BELGIUM	BULGARIA	CYPRUS	DENMARK	ESTONIA	FINLAND	GERMANY	GREECE	IRELAND	ITALY	LATVIA	LITHUANIA	MALTA	NETHERLANDS	POLAND	PORTUGAL	ROMANIA	SLOVENIA	SPAIN	SWEDEN	UK
Q	Required element of report																						
1A	i) Description of fleets	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	ii) Link with fisheries	3	3	3	3	0	3	3	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	0
	iii) Development in fleets	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	3
1B	i) statement of effort reduction schemes	2	0	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	ii) impact on fishing capacity of effort reduction schemes	3	0	3	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	3	0	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	0	3
1C	Statement of compliance with entry / exit scheme	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2
1D	i) Summary of weaknesses & strengths of fleet management system	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
	ii) plan for improvements in fleet management system	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	2
	iii) information on general level of compliance with fleet policy instruments	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
1E	Information on changes of the administrative procedures relevant to fleet management	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
2	Report 10 pages or less?	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
O	Overall: does report assess balance between capacity & opportunity?	3	3	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Total scores:		24	16	18	19	14	11	19	20	7	17	10	21	12	17	21	21	17	17	15	14	15	16

Table 5.2 Scores by country for inclusion of required elements in annual reports

Q	Required element of report	Max scores	Belgium	Bulgaria	Cyprus	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	Germany	Greece	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Malta	Netherlands	Poland	Portugal	Romania	Slovenia	Spain	Sweden	UK
1A	i) Description of fleets	3	3	3	3	3	1	2	3	1	1	1	3	2	2	2	3	3	1	2	1	0	1
	ii) Link with fisheries	3	3	1	1	0	1	2	2	0	2	0	3	0	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	0	0
	iii) Development in fleets	3	3	2	1	3	1	1	2	0	2	0	2	1	0	3	3	3	1	1	2	0	2
1B	i) statement of effort reduction schemes	3	0	2	2	3	0	2	1	0	3	3	3	1	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
	ii) impact on fishing capacity of effort reduction schemes	3	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	2	3	2	2	0	3	0	2
1C	Statement of compliance with entry / exit scheme	3	2	1	3	2	3	3	1	2	2	0	2	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	0	2	3
1D	i) Summary of weaknesses & strengths of fleet management system	3	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	3	0	1	2	1	3	2	0	0	1	1
	ii) plan for improvements in fleet management system	3	2	2	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	1
	iii) information on general level of compliance with fleet policy instruments	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
1E	Information on changes of the administrative procedures relevant to fleet management	3	0	0	2	3	0	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	2
2	Report 10 pages or less?	n/a																					
O	Overall: does report assess balance between capacity & opportunity?	3	2	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Total scores:		33	15	13	15	20	6	15	16	6	12	9	26	9	10	19	22	20	14	12	10	11	14

Table 5.3 Scores by country for quality of required elements in annual reports

Scores for inclusion of required elements			
Member State	Score	Max Score	%
Latvia	21	24	88%
Netherlands	21	24	88%
Poland	21	24	88%
Germany	20	24	83%
Cyprus	19	24	79%
Finland	19	24	79%
Bulgaria	18	24	75%
Romania	17	24	71%
Portugal	17	24	71%
Ireland	17	24	71%
Malta	17	24	71%
UK	16	24	67%
Belgium	16	24	67%
Sweden	15	24	63%
Slovenia	15	24	63%
Spain	14	24	58%
Denmark	14	24	58%
Lithuania	12	24	50%
Estonia	11	24	46%
Italy	10	24	42%
Greece	7	24	29%

Table 5.4 Ranked results of scoring system for inclusion of required elements in MS reports

Table 5.5 shows the quality scores by MS for each of the required elements in the annual reports. There is a significant variation in the quality of the MS reports. Table 5.5 shows the MS ranked by quality of included elements. Latvia scored 26 out of 33 points (79%), whereas Estonia and Greece only scored 6 points (18%) for report quality.

Scores for quality of included elements			
Member State	Score	Max Score	%
Latvia	26	33	79%
Poland	22	33	67%
Portugal	20	33	61%
Denmark	20	33	61%
Netherlands	19	33	58%
Germany	17	33	52%
Finland	15	33	45%
Cyprus	15	33	45%
Belgium	15	33	45%
UK	14	33	42%
Romania	14	33	42%
Bulgaria	13	33	39%
Slovenia	12	33	36%
Ireland	12	33	36%
Sweden	11	33	33%
Spain	10	33	30%
Malta	10	33	30%
Lithuania	9	33	27%
Italy	9	33	27%
Greece	6	33	18%
Estonia	6	33	18%

Table 5.5 Ranked results of scoring system for quality of included elements in MS reports

5.2. Evaluation of Commission summary of MS annual reports

The Commission summaries of MS reports vary in quality and relevance. They vary in length, order of information and detail included. For instance, in many cases the first sentence of the summary states whether or not the balance indicator guidelines were followed in the MS report, but this is not true of all summaries.

It would be useful if all Commission summaries followed a template so that they would contain the same information in the same order, as long as it is included in the MS reports. This would also serve to highlight when MS reports failed to include some required information. Such a method of providing summaries would make it easier for members of the Council to compare the situation between various MS.

A summary template could possibly be supplied to the MS national correspondents, so that MS could complete their own report summary. This procedure might also help to improve the completeness of MS annual reports.

The regulation requires the MS reports to be less than 10 pages but this is a difficult target to achieve if the report is to include application of the guidelines regarding balance indicators.

A suggested summary template is given below and could potentially be completed in table form. Where the required information is not contained in the MS report, the

Commission summary could note the absence of the information. The Commission summary could also note whether the information supplied is comprehensive.

Suggested template for summary of MS annual reports

1. Conclusions about whether the fleet is in balance with the opportunity. Note whether the balance is improving, staying the same or getting worse.
2. Size of the fleet (no. of vessels, total GT, total kW)
3. List biggest fleet segments, with key species fished and total volumes landed
4. Additions to and removals from the fleet during the year, expressed in number of vessels, giving fleet segment or some indication of vessel capacity.
5. Change in state of stocks and/or in fishing opportunity during the year
6. Outline of effort reduction schemes, if any, during the year
7. Statement of compliance with entry / exit scheme during the year
8. Plans for improvements in fleet management system
9. Length of report (over / under 10 pages)
10. Application of the balance indicators (technical, biological, economic, social)

In the final paragraph of section 2 of the summary document, the Commission highlight that of the 11 MS reports which included application of the balance indicators, “a number” of them indicated “a great degree of overcapacity”. This comment is not helpful because it suggests many of the 11 MS indicated overcapacity, but does not say how many, which would have been more useful.

Comments on summary of the Belgium report

- The Commission's summary is relevant and a good reflection of what is written in the Belgian report.
- The summary omits to explicitly state that the Belgian report includes an evaluation of the current status as regards the likely balance between capacity and fishing opportunities.
- The summary is correct in stating that the guidelines were applied to the main Belgian fleet.

Comments on summary of the Bulgaria report

- The summary is relevant and makes reference to the main issues contained in the text of the Bulgarian report.
- The summary omits to explicitly state that the Bulgarian report does not include an evaluation of the current status as regards the likely balance between capacity and fishing opportunities.
- The summary is correct in stating that the guidelines were applied to the main Bulgarian fleet.
- The summary does not mention that (as stated in the report) the quality of data and results utilised for the definition of MSY and corresponding F rates in the biological indicators are highly uncertain.

Comments on summary of the Cyprus report

- The summary is correct but very brief, and several key points contained in the report are missing from the summary, such as the size of the fleet.
- The summary is correct in highlighting that the report contains no assessment of the balance between fleet capacity and fishing opportunities.
- The summary is correct in stating that the proposed guidelines on balance indicators were not applied.

Comments on summary of the Germany report

- The Commission's summary is correct but omits some important points.
- The summary omits to explicitly state that the German report does include an evaluation of the current status as regards the likely balance between capacity and fishing opportunities by segment.
- The summary is correct in stating that the proposed guidelines on balance indicators were not applied. The summary mentions that a qualitative version of the biological approach examined the balance between fishing capacity and fishing opportunities by fleet segment.
- More information in the link of vessels with fisheries could have been included in the MS report but this absence was not highlighted in the summary.
- Statement of effort reduction schemes and the impact on fishing capacity were not quantified in the report but this is not highlighted in the summary.

Comments on summary of the Denmark report

- The Commission's summary gives a good summary of the significant elements in the Danish report, but omits some important detail.
- The summary correctly states that the Danish report includes an assessment of the current status as regards the likely balance between capacity and fishing opportunities.

- The summary correctly states that the guidelines were applied in the Danish report but fails to mention the indicators use 2007 and not 2008 data.

Comments on summary of the Estonia report

- The Commission's summary report accurately summarises the key details contained in the MS report.
- The summary omits to explicitly state that the Estonian report does not include an evaluation of the current status as regards the likely balance between capacity and fishing opportunities.
- The summary is correct in stating that the guidelines were only partly applied in the Estonian report.
- The summary does not give details of the size of the fleet segments but does mention the number of vessels joining and leaving the fleet.
- The summary notes that there appears to be distinct over capacity in one segment, but fails to mention that there are only 6 vessels in total in that segment.

Comments on summary of the Finland report

- The summary accurately reflects the main points of the report.
- The summary correctly states that the Finnish report fails to make an evaluation of the current status as regards the likely balance between capacity and fishing opportunities.
- The summary is correct in stating that the guidelines were not applied in the Finnish report.
- It is unclear both in the summary and the report what fishing effort refers to (according to Table 2.3. in the report).

Comments on summary of the France report

- The report from France was not available in English, so it is not possible to make a fair assessment of the Commission summary of the French report.

Comments on summary of the Greece report

- The summary provides a short and accurate summary of the Greek report but omits some important information.
- The summary omits to explicitly state that the Greek report does not include evaluation of the current status as regards the likely balance between capacity and fishing opportunities.
- The summary correctly stated that the Greek report partially applied the guidelines but did not mention that the report failed to reflect on any biological and social indicators.

Comments on summary of the Ireland report

- The summary of the Irish report is a good reflection of the contents of the report.
- The summary correctly states that the Irish report gave no evaluation of the current status as regards the likely balance between capacity and fishing opportunities.
- The summary notes that the guidelines were not applied in the Irish report.

Comments on summary of the Italy report

- The summary of the Italian report is a good reflection of the contents of the Italian report.
- The summary omits to explicitly state that the Italy report does not include an evaluation of the current status as regards the likely balance between capacity and fishing opportunities.
- The summary notes that the guidelines proposed by the Commission were applied.

Comments on summary of the Latvia report

- The summary includes most important points contained in the Latvian report.
- The summary states that some assessment of balance between capacity and fishing opportunities was made for the high-sea segments. However the summary omits to explicitly state that the Latvian report does not include an overall evaluation of the current status as regards the likely balance between capacity and fishing opportunities in general.
- The summary correctly states that the Latvian report did not apply the guidelines.
- The summary states the number of vessels removed since May 2004. It would have been useful if the summary indicated what proportion of vessels had been removed.

Comments on summary of the Lithuania report

- The summary of the Lithuania report is a fair reflection of the contents of the Lithuania report.
- The summary correctly states that the Lithuanian report provides an evaluation of the current status as regards the likely balance between capacity and fishing opportunities.
- The summary correctly states that the Lithuanian report applies the guidelines.
- The summary missed information on general level of compliance with fleet policy instrument.

Comments on summary of the Malta report

- The summary reflects most of the main points in the Malta report.
- The summary correctly states that the guidelines were not fully adhered to in the Maltese report but fails to mention that no social indicator was reported.
- The summary accurately describes low fleet utilisation and that the fleet is proportionate with available resources and hence does not require reduction.
- The summary gives a brief but fair description of the Maltese fleet and correctly states that no fishing effort adjustment aid schemes were implemented in Malta.

Comments on summary of the Netherlands report

- The summary captures the main aspects of the Dutch report.
- The summary correctly states that the Dutch report gives an evaluation of the current status as regards the likely balance between capacity and fishing opportunities. The summary states the Dutch fleet is at a justifiable size given fish stocks.

- The summary accurately reports that the guidelines were applied in the Dutch report.
- The summary describes improvements in economic and social indicators; however a social indicator has not been reported. The summary report does not refer to the technical and biological indicators reported.
- The summary correctly describes substantial contraction in the Dutch cutter fleet and fishing effort.

Comments on summary of the Poland report

- Overall the Commission's statement accurately reflects the Polish report.
- The Commission's summary correctly states that the Polish report fails to directly assess the balance between fishing capacity and fishing opportunities.
- The Commission is also correct in stating that the guidelines were not applied.
- There is a summary of the Polish report, description of the Polish fleet and the year on year changes which appears to be accurate.

Comments on summary of the Portugal report

- Overall the Commission's statement accurately reflects the Portuguese report.
- The summary correctly states that the Portuguese report fails to directly assess the balance between fishing capacity and fishing opportunities.
- The summary correctly states that the guidelines were not applied in the Portuguese report. The summary acknowledges that the Portuguese report does make use of some socio-economic data.
- The summary provides a description of the Portuguese fleet management and effort reduction changes which appears to be accurate.

Comments on summary of the Romania report

- Overall, the summary provides an accurate description of the Romanian report but misses several key points in the report.
- The summary omits to explicitly state that the Romanian report does include an assessment of the current status as regards the likely balance between capacity and fishing opportunities. The summary does not mention the claim that the fleet is under capacity for the fishing opportunity, due to lack of fishing gear.
- The summary correctly states that the Guidelines (indicators of balance) are not applied in the Romania report.
- The summary mentions that the Romanian report claims that the fleet is operating in a sustainable manner, but the summary fails to say on what basis the Romanian report reaches this conclusion.
- The summary mentions that the Romanian report claims that fish species are sufficiently available, but fails to mention the basis for the claim.
- The Romanian report mentions that over half of the small scale vessels have no engine, but this is omitted from the Commission summary, as is the total number of small scale vessels (416 under 12m vessels).
- The summary does mention the additions (6) and removals (7) from the fleet in 2008 but does not mention the total size of the fleet.

Comments on the Summary of the Slovenia report

- The Commission's summary gives a fair review of the Slovenian report.
- The summary omits to explicitly state that the Slovenian report does not include an assessment of the current status as regards the likely balance between capacity and fishing opportunities.
- The summary correctly notes that Slovenia applied to the guidelines as technical, biological, economic and social indicators were reported.
- The summary highlights structural problems in the fleet and emphasizes that whilst no effort reduction schemes apply to the Slovenian fleet, scrapping schemes are envisaged under the 2007-2013 EFF programme.

Comments on the Summary of the Spain report

- Overall the summary gives a fair description of the Spanish fleet focussing on the vessel decommissioning programme and the Greenland halibut recovery plan.
- The Commission's summary correctly highlights that Spain did not comply with the indicator guidelines.

Comments on the Summary of the Sweden report

- The summary provides a fair reflection of the emphasis in the Sweden report.
- The summary omits to explicitly state that the Swedish report does include an assessment of the current status as regards the likely balance between capacity and fishing opportunities.
- The summary is correct in stating that the guidelines were applied in the Swedish report.
- The summary focuses on the balance indicators and on the plans adopted by Sweden to reduce the fishing effort. Sweden has made some administrative changes about special permits but the report does not mention it.

Comments on the Summary of the United Kingdom report

- The summary is a fair description of the UK's report.
- The summary correctly states the UK report makes no assessment of balance between fleet capacity and fishing opportunity.
- The summary correctly states the UK report did not apply the guidelines but does acknowledge that other technical, biological and socio-economic information was provided.
- The summary points out relevant results achieved by the UK government.

6. ToR 2. Evaluate MS application of guidelines on balance indicators

Item 2 in the Terms of Reference requested that the working group evaluate Member States' application of the guidelines indicators and highlight any problems encountered.

The balance indicators estimated in MS reports were reviewed and evaluated using the scoring system detailed below. The guidelines require completion of the technical indicator, one biological, one economic and one social indicator. There is a stated preference for the first indicator, with second or third indicators being regarded as less satisfactory but acceptable if data is not available for the preferred indicator. Therefore, 3 points are awarded for the first indicator in any category, 2 for the second and 1 point is awarded for a third biological indicator. The maximum score available for completing the minimum required indicators is 12 points. It is possible to exceed full required marks if more than the minimum required indicators are completed, for instance, Slovenia. Table 6.1 shows scores per MS for completing the indicators. Detailed scores are shown in subsequent tables for each type of indicator.

Member State	TECHNICAL	BIOLOGICAL 1	BIOLOGICAL 2	BIOLOGICAL 3	ECONOMIC 1	ECONOMIC 2	SOCIAL 1	SOCIAL 2	TOTAL	REQUIRED	% of full marks
Belgium	3	3			3		3		12	12	100%
Bulgaria	3			3	3	1	3	1	14	12	117%
Cyprus									0	12	0%
Denmark	3				3	1	3	1	11	12	92%
Estonia	3								3	12	25%
Finland									0	12	0%
Germany									0	12	0%
Greece	3			3					6	12	50%
Ireland									0	12	0%
Italy	3			3	3	1	3	1	14	12	117%
Latvia									0	12	0%
Lithuania		3			3	1	3	1	11	12	92%
Malta	3			3		3			9	12	75%
Netherlands	3	3			3				9	12	75%
Poland									0	12	0%
Portugal									0	12	0%
Romania									0	12	0%
Slovenia	3		3		3	1	3	1	14	12	117%
Spain									0	12	0%
Sweden	3	3			3	1		3	13	12	108%
UK									0	12	0%

Table 6.1 Scores per Member State for completion of balance indicators

Weighting and overall scores for completing the indicators are as shown in Table 6.1. Five member states (Belgium, Bulgaria, Italy, Slovenia and Sweden) all met or exceeded the minimum requirements for the balance indicators as specified in the guidelines. Some MS did not complete any balance indicators and some MS completed some of the indicators suggested. The Technical indicator was the most commonly completed indicator by MS and the Biological Indicators were the least. Bulgaria completed an alternative biological indicator.

Table 6.2 shows the quality scores for Member States for the guideline indicators. Bulgaria, Italy, Lithuania and Slovenia all scored highly in terms of the quality of indicators.

Member State	TECHNICAL	BIOLOGICAL 1	BIOLOGICAL 2	BIOLOGICAL 3	ECONOMIC 1	ECONOMIC 2	SOCIAL 1	SOCIAL 2	TOTAL SCORE	Full marks for quality of min. required indicators
BELGIUM	7	6			5		7		25	32
BULGARIA	7			3	7	7	6	6	36	32
CYPRUS									0	32
DENMARK	2				8	8	6	7	31	32
ESTONIA	6								6	32
FINLAND									0	32
GERMANY									0	32
GREECE	4			7					11	32
IRELAND									0	32
ITALY	4			3	7	7	6	7	34	32
LATVIA									0	32
LITHUANIA		5			8	7	7	7	34	32
MALTA	4			3		8			15	32
NETHERLANDS	1	1			1				3	32
POLAND									0	32
PORTUGAL									0	32
ROMANIA									0	32
SLOVENIA	7		1		4	7	7	7	33	32
SPAIN									0	32
SWEDEN	7	7			6	6		4	30	32
UK									0	32

Table 6.2 Summary of quality scores for indicators per Member State

In general, there is a lack of overview and comparison in the MS reports between the different indicators (biological, technical, social and economic) they have estimated for their own fisheries. Overall there is a lack of interpretation of findings from use of the indicators and a lack of conclusions about balance drawn from use of the indicators.

6.1. Evaluation of Quality of Technical Indicators

Technical Indicator Scoring System

The technical indicators included in MS reports were reviewed and evaluated against five criteria and given scores of 0, 1 or 2 for each of the five criteria. Table 6.3 shows how scores were awarded for quality of technical indicators.

Score	
	Completeness of indicator
0	Incomplete i.e. indicator not calculated
1	Partially complete – included one of days at sea per vessel, GT or KW. Not 2008.
2	Almost complete – as per guidelines. Included two of days at sea per vessel, GT or kW, was for 2008
	Interpretation / useful / conclusion
0	No interpretation, comment on ratio
1	Limited comment on meaning of ratio
2	Useful commentary on meaning of ration in relation to segment
	Accurate – correct computation
0	Not present
1	Only presented ratio and not underlying days. Calculation appeared accurate
2	Presented days at sea and ratio. Calculation appeared accurate
	Fleet coverage
0	No coverage of segments
1	0-74% of total fleet GT covered
2	75% or over of total fleet GT covered

Table 6.3 Scoring system used for technical indicators

Table 6.4 shows the scores awarded to each MS for their application of technical indicators. The technical indicators from each MS are then evaluated individually and a short summary and comment are presented.

Member State	Completeness	Accuracy	Fleet coverage	Conclusion	Total Score	Max Score
Belgium	1	2	2	2	7	8
Bulgaria	2	2	2	1	7	8
Cyprus	0	0	0	0	0	8
Denmark	1	1	0	0	2	8
Estonia	1	2	2	1	6	8
Finland	0	0	0	0	0	8
Germany	0	0	0	0	0	8
Greece	1	1	1	1	4	8
Ireland	0	0	0	0	0	8
Italy	1	1	1	1	4	8
Latvia	0	0	0	0	0	8
Lithuania	0	0	0	0	0	8
Malta	1	1	1	1	4	8
Netherlands	0	0	1	0	1	8
Poland	0	0	0	0	0	8
Portugal	0	0	0	0	0	8
Romania	0	0	0	0	0	8
Slovenia	2	2	2	1	7	8
Spain	0	0	0	0	0	8
Sweden	2	2	2	1	7	8
UK	0	0	0	0	0	8

Table 6.4 Scores per Member State for quality of technical indicators

Belgium

Belgium's report provided the Technical Indicator for 2008. The Technical Indicator was calculated accurately and some interpretation of the ratio was provided. The indicator was calculated for days at sea per vessel but not for KW days or GT days. Fleet coverage was good for the Technical Indicator as the majority of the fleet was covered. Overall we judged the information provided to be of good quality.

Bulgaria

Bulgaria's report provided the Technical Indicators for 2008. The Technical indicator was calculated for days at sea per vessel, KW days and GT days. Limited interpretation of the technical indicator was given. Overall we judged the information provided to be of good quality.

Cyprus

No Technical Indicator was provided.

Germany

No Technical Indicator was provided.

Denmark

Denmark's report provided the Technical Indicator for 2008. The ratio was calculated using an estimated maximum of days at sea rather than actual figures. No interpretation of indicator was given and it was difficult to assess fleet coverage. Overall we judged the information provided to be of low quality.

Estonia

Estonia's report provided the Technical Indicator for 2008. Estonia provided the days at sea per vessel only and not GT or KW days at sea. Technical Indicators were provided on a vessel by vessel basis and good coverage of fleet. Limited interpretation of the indicator was given. Overall we judged the information provided to be of good quality.

Greece

Greece's report provided the Technical Indicator for 2008. The days per vessel, GT and KW technical indicators are all calculated. Only the ratio is shown however, not the underlying days or vessels, which makes it difficult to assess coverage of fleet. Limited interpretation of the indicators was given in the text. Overall we judged the information provided to be of reasonable quality.

Finland

No Technical Indicator was provided.

Ireland

No Technical Indicator was provided.

Italy

Italy's report provided the Technical Indicator but for 2007 not 2008. The report provided the ratio for days at sea per vessel, KW and GT indicators only and not supporting information on days at sea. Given the information provided, it was difficult to assess the coverage of fleet. Overall we judged the information provided to be of reasonable quality.

Latvia

No Technical Indicator was provided.

Lithuania

No Technical Indicator was provided.

Malta

Malta's report provided the Technical Indicator but for 2007 not 2008. The report provided the ratio for days at sea per vessel, KW and GT indicators only and not supporting information on days at sea. Given the information provided, it was difficult to assess the coverage of fleet. Overall we judged the information provided to be of reasonable quality.

Netherlands

Netherlands's report provided the Technical Indicator for 2008. Only a single ratio for days at sea per vessel was provided for Netherlands main segment. No supporting information on days or interpretation was provided. Overall we judged the information provided to be of low quality.

Poland

No Technical Indicator was provided.

Portugal

No Technical Indicator was provided.

Romania

No Technical Indicator was provided.

Slovenia

Slovenia's report provided the Technical Indicator for 2008. The ratio was given for days at sea per vessel and GT. There was some interpretation of the indicator and fleet coverage was good. Overall we judged the information provided to be of high quality.

Spain

No Technical Indicator was provided.

Sweden

The Swedish report provided the Technical Indicator for 2008 using Days per vessel and KW days given for technical indicator. Both the ratios and underlying days were given in the report. Limited interpretation of the indicator was provided in the text. Fleet segments given and good coverage of segments. Overall we judged the information provided to be of high quality.

UK

No Technical Indicator was provided.

6.2. Evaluation of Biological Indicators

The biological indicators included in MS reports were reviewed and evaluated against five criteria and given scores of 0, 1 or 2 for each of the five criteria. Table 6.5 shows how scores were awarded for quality of technical indicators.

Score	
	Completeness of indicator by species
0	When none of the biological indicators were present/calculated
1	Partially complete – when at least one year is calculated (either 2007 or 2008) for at least the main species in terms of catch composition
2	When biological indicator was present for at least 5 years (as cited in the guidelines) for at least the main species in terms of catch composition
	Interpretation / useful / conclusion
0	No interpretation and comments on indicator
1	Limited comments on meaning of indicator, little interpretation or conclusion
2	Meaningful and coherent comments on fleet segment, possible draw conclusion
	Accurate – correct computation
0	Not present
1	Partially correct computation of indicators
2	Fully correct computation of indicators
	Fleet coverage
0	<10% of the total fleet in number of boats
1	11-70% of total fleet in number of boats
2	>70% of total fleet in number of boats

Table 6.5 Scoring system used for biological indicators

Table 6.6 shows the scores awarded to each MS for their application of biological indicators. The biological indicators from each MS are then evaluated individually and a short summary and comment are presented.

These are the three biological indicators evaluated:

- Biological indicator 1: Ratio between current and target fishing mortality. This indicator accommodates differences between species in terms of sustainable exploitation rates. The F/F_t ratio is dimensionless and facilitates comparisons or combinations across species.
- Biological indicator 2: Catch / Biomass Ratio. It can be interpreted as a proxy for the exploitation rate.
- Biological indicator 3: Catch per unit of effort (CPUE). It can be interpreted as a relative index of stock abundance.

No MS has presented more than one biological indicator. According to the data availability (DCR) all MS (or most of them) should have catch and effort data and

therefore, it would be desirable if they present at least CPUE trends together with one or all biological indicators.

Following commission guidelines, for biological indicator, it is desirable to have 5 years time series as it contributes to robust results. But if a member states can not provide 5 year time series because they are new members or because there has been no stocks assessment for one stock they should not be penalised for shorter time series of biological indicators.

Member State	Indicator	Completeness	Accuracy	Fleet coverage	Conclusion	Total score	Max Score
Belgium	B1	1	2	2	1	6	8
Bulgaria	B3	1	1	1	1	5	8
Cyprus	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Germany	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Denmark	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Estonia	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Greece	B3	2	2	2	1	7	8
Finland	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Ireland	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Italy	B3	1	2	0	0	3	8
Latvia	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Lithuania	B1	1	2	0	2	5	8
Malta	B3	1	0	2	0	3	8
Netherlands	B1	1	0	0	0	1	8
Poland	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Portugal	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Romania	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Spain	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Sweden	B1	1	2	2	2	7	8
Slovenia	B2	0	1	0	0	3	8
UK	-	0	0	0	0	0	8

Table 6.6 Scores per Member State for quality of biological indicators

Belgium

- The biological indicator 1 (Fest/Ftarget) is only calculated for 2008, guidelines suggest biological indicators should be presented for the last 5 years. There is a good application of guidelines, however the indicator is still not as detailed as is suggested in the guidelines. The biological indicator is not calculated for each fleet segment (i.e. beam trawl has 2 length ranges) as done for the technical indicator and therefore indicators were not comparable.
- The biological indicator was calculated for plaice and sole which represents 41% of the total catch.

Bulgaria

- The Bulgarian report presents biological indicator 3 (CPUE) for sprat and turbot for 2007 and 2008, for each fleet gear but not for vessel size range, therefore not detailed for each fleet segment. The 2 species covered are the main catch of different fleet gears, which were not stated. Extra information use survey data and therefore do not reflect fleet segments. Also there is no further details about how it was calculated which do not permit an assessment of its precision and robustness.

- Good use of the guidelines about CPUE. Unfortunately the time series is short and there is no further interpretation of this indicator with additional expert information.

Cyprus

- The biological indicators were not reported.

Germany

- The biological indicators are not reported.
- The member state explains in detail their disagreement about the usefulness of all three biological indicators. The report comments on their own bio-economical modelling work, which should provide more comprehensive analyses of the fishing capacity once it is completed.

Denmark

- The biological indicators are not reported.
- The member state explains that there are difficulties with data desegregation, i.e. to have detailed information of landing, per species per fleet segment, which can reflect on low level of results reliability.

Estonia

- The member state presents biological indicator 3 (CPUE). However, the indicator is only presented for 2008 and it is not aggregated for fleet segment, it is presented per vessel.
- The member state failed to follow the guidelines. The member state should seek help from their scientific community to calculate the biological indicators.

Greece

- The biological indicator 3 (CPUE) was calculated for 5 years, which fully complies with the guidelines. However, they do not make further comments on the trends of CPUE. There is no comment on the importance of each species in the total catch.
- Guidelines were applied.

Finland

- The biological indicators were not reported.

Ireland

- The biological indicators were not reported.

Italy

- CPUE indicator was provided. This indicator was done for the total landings and total fleet and was not by separated species and fleets as is explained in the guidelines

Lithuania

- Evaluate indicator: Estimation of F/F_{target} is provided and the guidelines were applied for this indicator. It is clearly presented but the indicator for the demersal trawlers should be divided into fleet segments.

Latvia

- The biological indicators were not reported.

Malta

- Evaluate indicator: CPUE is calculated by the assemblage of species (i.e. for the total catch composition) but not for single species. There is general information about catch composition but it is not very detailed. CPUE data is given by gear but not by fleet segment.
- Guideline application and problems: the guidelines were applied. However, the biological indicator was reported by assemblage of species instead of by individual target species.

Netherlands

- Evaluate indicator: there is no numerical value for the biological indicator. Although the fleet is divided into different segments (explained earlier) the indicator was only cited for beam trawl.
- Guideline application and problems: There is a statement in the Dutch annual report: “the indicators provided by the Commission are difficult to apply to the Dutch pelagic fleet which operates worldwide” but no more detailed information about this issue is provided, so it is difficult to evaluate how difficult it was and whether it might still be possible to estimate this indicator.

Poland

- The biological indicators were not reported.

Portugal

- The biological indicators were not reported.

Sweden

- Evaluate indicator: all information was very clear, easy to find and to interpret. The indicator was only estimated for one year however.
- Guideline application and problems: good application of the guidelines and extra useful information related to stock, quotas and fleet. There are some comments in the report about the biological indicators: “the indicator provides a rough overview of the ratio, and there may be a huge spread within each segment”.

Slovenia

- Evaluate indicator: only covers 3 boats and 1 fleet segment (3.2% of fleet). Good information about stock assessment but failed to show as indicator despite having catch and the stock biomass estimation.
- Guideline application and problems: none were noted in the report.

Spain

- The biological indicators were not reported.

UK

- The biological indicators were not reported.

6.3. Evaluation of Economic Indicators

The economic indicators included in MS reports were reviewed and evaluated against five criteria and given scores of 0, 1 or 2 for each of the five criteria. Table 6.7 shows how scores were awarded for quality of technical indicators.

Score	
	Completeness of indicator
0	Incomplete i.e. indicator not calculated
1	The indicator is only calculated for one year
2	The indicator is completely calculated for three years or more
	Interpretation / useful / conclusion
0	No comments or interpretation of indicator
1	Limited comments and interpretation of indicator
2	Useful comments and interpretation of indicator
	Accurate – correct computation
0	The indicator is not correctly calculated
1	There are uncertainty of the accuracy of the calculation
2	There are no indication of incorrectly computation
	Fleet coverage
0	No coverage of segments
1	0-74% of total fleet GT is covered in the calculation of the economic indicator
2	75% or over of total fleet GT is covered in the calculation of the economic indicator

Table 6.7 Scoring system used for economic indicators

Table 6.8 shows the scores awarded to each MS for their application of economic indicators. The economic indicators from each MS are then evaluated individually and a short summary and comment are presented.

Member State	Indicator	Completeness	Accuracy	Fleet coverage	Conclusion	Total score	Max Score
Belgium	E1	1	2	2	0	5	8
Bulgaria	E1	2	2	2	1	7	8
Bulgaria	E2	2	2	2	1	7	8
Cyprus	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Denmark	E1	2	2	2	2	8	8
Denmark	E2	2	2	2	2	8	8
Estonia	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Finland	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
France	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Germany	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Greece	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Ireland	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Italy	E1	1	2	2	2	7	8
Italy	E2	1	2	2	2	7	8
Latvia	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Lithuania	E1	2	2	2	2	8	8
Lithuania	E2	2	2	2	1	7	8
Malta	E2	2	2	2	2	8	8
Netherlands	E1	0	0	1	0	1	8
Poland	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Portugal	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Romania	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Slovenia	E1	1	0	2	1	4	8
Slovenia	E2	1	2	2	2	7	8
Spain	-	0	0	0	0	0	8
Sweden	E1	1	2	2	1	6	8
Sweden	E2	1	2	2	1	6	8
UK	-	0	0	0	0	0	8

Table 6.8 Scores per Member State for quality of economic indicators

Belgium

- The report shows ROI in a table, but the CR/BR is not calculated. The report could make more comments and interpretation.

Bulgaria

- The report presents ROI and CR/BR in a table. The report could make more comments and interpretation.

Cyprus

- No economic indicators reported.

Denmark

- The report presents ROI and CR/BR and makes comments and interpretation. An extra indicator is included, which is Return of Revenue (ROR). The indicator indicates, like CR/BR, the profitability of the segments and it can be discussed whether this measures the balance between fishing capacity and fishing opportunities rather than just being a profitability measure.

Estonia

- No economic indicators reported.

Finland

- No economic indicators reported.

France

- No economic indicators reported.

Germany

- No economic indicators reported.

Greece

- No economic indicators reported.

Ireland

- No economic indicators reported.

Italy

- The report presents the economic capacity indicators for 2007, but does not present figures for 2005 and 2006. There could have been more comments and interpretation of the figures

Lithuania

- The report presents the economic capacity indicators, but there could have been more interpretation of the figures.

Latvia

- No economic indicators reported.

Malta

- The report calculates CR/BR, but not ROI. The report makes good comments and interpretation of the figures for CR/BR.

The Netherlands

- The Netherlands report gives an indication that ROI is positive, but no exact values are calculated and no comments are made.

Poland

- No economic indicators reported.

Portugal

- No economic indicators reported.

Romania

- No economic indicators reported.

Slovenia

- Slovenia has calculated both ROI and CR/BR, but the figures for ROI appear unlikely. A possible explanation is a misinterpretation of the investment calculation. Also, there is missing information on investments, capital costs and repair costs, which makes it uncertain and difficult to calculate the balance

between fishing capacity and fishing opportunities. The report presents the economic capacity indicators for 2007, but does not present figures for 2005 and 2006.

Spain

- No economic indicators reported.

Sweden

- The report presents the economic capacity indicators for 2007, but do not present figures for 2005 and 2006. There could have been more comments and interpretation of the figures

UK

- No economic indicators reported.

6.4. Evaluation of Social Indicators

Social indicator scoring system

The social indicators included in MS reports were reviewed and evaluated against five criteria and given scores of 0, 1 or 2 for each of the five criteria. Table 6.9 shows how scores were awarded for quality of technical indicators.

Score	
	Completeness of indicator
0	Incomplete – year of indicator not referenced or incorrect year reported
1	At least one year (either 2005, 2006, 2007 or 2008)
2	Required time series of three years (2005-2007 or 2008 if possible)
	Useful / quality of presentation / interpretation or conclusion
0	No useful information or useful interpretation/conclusion of indicators
1	Limited usefulness of information, very little interpretation or conclusion
2	Good information and/or interpretation / conclusions drawn
	Accurate – correct computation
0	Complete inaccurate computation of indicators
1	Partially correct computation of indicators
2	Complete correct computation of indicators
	Fleet coverage
0	for <20% of total fleet GT coverage
1	for 21%-50% of total fleet GT coverage
2	for >50% of total fleet GT coverage

Table 6.9 Scoring system used for social indicators

Table 6.10 shows the scores awarded to each MS for their application of social indicators. The social indicators from each MS are then evaluated individually and a short summary and comment are presented.

Member State	Indicator	Completeness	Accuracy	Fleet coverage	Conclusion	Total score	Max Score
Belgium	S1	2	2	2	1	7	8
Bulgaria	S1	1	2	2	1	6	8
Bulgaria	S2	1	2	2	1	6	8
Cyprus		0	0	0	0	0	8
Denmark	S1	2	1	2	1	6	8
Denmark	S2	2	2	2	1	7	8
Estonia		0	0	0	0	0	8
Finland		0	0	0	0	0	8
Germany		0	0	0	0	0	8
Greece		0	0	0	0	0	8
Ireland		0	0	0	0	0	8
Italy	S1	0	2	2	2	6	8
Italy	S2	1	2	2	2	7	8
Latvia		0	0	0	0	0	8
Lithuania	S1	2	2	2	1	7	8
Lithuania	S2	2	2	2	1	7	8
Malta		0	0	0	0	0	8
Netherlands		0	0	0	0	0	8
Poland		0	0	0	0	0	8
Portugal		0	0	0	0	0	8
Romania		0	0	0	0	0	8
Slovenia	S1	1	2	2	2	7	8
Slovenia	S2	1	2	2	2	7	8
Spain		0	0	0	0	0	8
Sweden		1	1	1	1	4	8
UK		0	0	0	0	0	8

Table 6.10 Scores per Member State for quality of social indicators

Belgium

- Belgium calculates the average share per full-time equivalent for 2003-2007 for two fleet segments (12-24m and 24-40m). Belgium had a good time series for the social indicator (S1), they were estimated accurately for a very large proportion of the fleet (93% of vessels). Limited conclusions were drawn from the social indicator.

Bulgaria

- Bulgaria calculates both the social indicators for 2008 covering the whole fleet (five segments) Bulgaria reported complete social indicators for the whole Bulgarian fleet for 2008. Bulgaria also conclude using a traffic light system levels of the indicators, using the measure of the social indicator three segments of the fleet are performing well whilst two segments (vessels up to 12m) are not making a positive assessment.

Cyprus

- Cyprus did not report any social indicators

Germany

- Germany did not report any social indicators

- Germany explains that they are not able to report any social indicators because the data is unavailable until 12-15 months after the reporting period. Germany could report social indicators for the previous years for which data would be available (2007).

Denmark

- Denmark reported both social indicators for 2005-2007 and made estimates for 2008 and 2009 using the EIAA model. Denmark was unable to estimate the average crew per full-time equivalent according to the guidelines, but made an equivalent estimation for the Danish fleet. The social indicators cover all the active Danish fleet. No specific conclusions were made in relation to the social indicators, but that social indicators are related to the economic climate and must be analysed with caution.

Estonia

- Estonia did not report any social indicators.

Greece

- Greece did not report any social indicators.

Finland

- Finland did not report any social indicators.

Ireland

- Ireland did not report any social indicators.

Italy

- Italy reported a limited time series for both social indicators by fleet segment. Italy reported average crew share per FTA and GVA (weighted by fishery segment) for 2006 and 2007 respectively. Italy carried out additional analysis for crew share per FTE for 6 geographical sub-areas employing a traffic light system. GVA was not analysed further because a valid a reference point for this indicator was not found.

Latvia

- Latvia did not report any social indicators

Lithuania

- Lithuania reported a time series (2005-2007) of both social indicators for two fleet segments. The social indicators calculated covered over 90% of the active fleet, however Lithuania drew limited conclusions from the social indicators.

Malta

- Malta did not report any social indicators

Netherlands

- Netherlands did not report any social indicators. Netherlands described an improvement in the social indicator however it was not reported.

Poland

- Poland did not report any social indicators

Portugal

- Portugal did not report any social indicators.
- Portugal believed they were difficult to apply to the characteristics of the national fleet and also as a result of poor data reliability. Nevertheless Portugal did report yield, employment and days of effort for 2003-2007.

Romania

- Romania did not report any the social indicators.

Slovenia

- Slovenia reported both social indicators for all fleet segments in 2007. A time series of social indicators was not reported but Slovenia drew comprehensive conclusions for both social indicators.

Spain

- Spain did not report any social indicators.

Sweden

- Sweden only reported gross value added for the Swedish fleet. It is uncertain to which year the calculations of GVA relate. Whilst Sweden concluded that the fishing industry adds value to the economy, GVA is probably underestimated because labour costs are not fully incorporated.

United Kingdom

- The UK did not report any of the social indicators specified in the guidelines.
- The UK was unable to report GVA, instead GVA per capita employed was reported due to insufficient profitability data.

7. ToR 3. Assess and summarise the problem of data availability

Item 3 in the Terms of Reference required the working group to assess and summarise the problem of availability of data for the calculation of the proposed indicators in MS reports. Particular attention should be paid to biological data. If time allows, in addition, propose solutions to these problems.

Technical indicators

Member States are required to collect days at sea per vessel, GT and kW according to the DCR. Therefore availability of data should not be a problem. MS which have a large number of small vessels may find it problematic to report on the technical indicator for some of their fleet but this is discussed in Terms of Reference 4.

It is noted again that there are shortcomings in the technical indicator as applied to vessels using passive gear such as pots and traps. The days at sea of the vessel is not a good proxy for total effort when there is no discrimination or assessment of the amount of passive gear (e.g. number of pots) operated by the vessel during those days, because the gear is fishing every day it is deployed, even if the vessel is not at sea. This is an element which could be improved and MS should be encouraged to provide suitable alternative approaches for their passive or static gear fleet segments.

Providing up to date data in time for the publication deadline may be an issue for some MS. MS may have to revise their timetable for data collection in order to ensure the appropriate year is reported on for this indicator.

Biological indicators

For the new member states of the European Union it is not possible to provide a five years time series of biological indicators (F estimate/ F target, catch per unit effort by fleet segment and species and ratio between catch weight and stock biomass) because this information is not available.

For example, in the Black Sea, Sprat (*Sprattus sprattus*) and turbot (*Psetta maxima* L) has been included in the Data Collection Program of the European Commission since 2007. The surveys conducted were funded by the Data Collection Regulation of the European Commission. The reference year of the Data Collection Programme for Bulgaria is 2007, therefore National Agency of Fisheries and Aquaculture will have the biological data of the most important fish species (sprat, horse mackerel, anchovy and turbot in the Black Sea) and more accurate information after the programme is implemented. This is the situation with lack of available biological data essential for the most important stocks and for other new member states of the European Union.

As many stocks do not have assessment, there is no fishing mortality information for these stocks and therefore the member states that exploited these stocks can not yet provide the indicators requested.

Some countries share borders with non-EU countries and it might therefore be difficult to get information on the total catches or biomass, since the non-EU countries are not obliged to collect and share this.

For example, the horse mackerel (*Trachurus mediterraneus*) and anchovy (*Engraulis encrasicolus*), are two of the intensively exploited summer pelagic migration species off the Black Sea Coast. For these species, stock assessment is only possible when the whole area of distribution of the species is included into examination. Therefore, it would be necessary to collect samples in the waters of all Black Sea states to produce stock assessment and mortality data for these pelagic species. However, due to the lack of general agreement between the Black Sea states in fishery matters (no legal agreement to regulate) no such joint scientific research expeditions and scientific assessments take place. Some countries share borders with non-EU countries, for example Turkey, and it might therefore be difficult to get information on the total catches, and Turkey is not obliged to collect and share this data.

Belgium

No problem with data availability was detected or stated by the MS. In order to calculate fishing mortality ratio (F_{est}/F_t) the member state used 2007 values but that should not be considered an issue as data come from ICES working groups which have a time lag due to their estimation procedure.

Bulgaria

Data collection by this MS only started two years ago when the country joined the EU. Therefore their biological indicators could only be shown for this period. We suggest that the MS should endeavour to collect further data which will allow them to estimate the other biological indicators.

Cyprus

Data availability is an issue for this MS. They reported conflicting deadlines between DCR report submission and DCR data submission. For this reason it was not possible to estimate the indicators. We suggest that Cyprus try to adjust to the deadlines and attempt to produce a complete report.

Germany

Data availability does not seem to be an issue for this MS. Germany has improved its methodology of analysing and reach conclusions about fleet capacity and fishing opportunities, which is good. However, it would be best if they would comply with the guidelines calculating and analysing the indicators, at least as a comparison ground with all the other MS.

Denmark

Data availability seems to be an issue for this MS. It is mentioned that detailed data for fleet segment and species is not accessible. The member state should seek help from their scientific community to extract the information from their databases and attempt to produce the report.

Estonia

Data availability is not mentioned in the report. The member state should attempt to follow the guidelines and present the indicators calculated for fleet segments and species, as suggested in the guidelines.

Greece

Data availability to calculate biological indicator 3 does not seem to be an issue for this MS. We would like to encourage Greece to attempt to estimate other indicators.

Finland

Data availability does not seem to be an issue for Finland. We encourage Finland to follow the guidelines, estimate the indicators and draw some conclusions about the balance between their fleet capacity and fishing opportunities.

Ireland

Data availability does not seem to be an issue for Ireland. We encourage Ireland to follow the guidelines, estimate the indicators and draw some conclusions about the balance between their fleet capacity and fishing opportunities.

Italy

Biological data are updated to 2007 because 2008 data are not available. There is information about fleet coverage. Biological indicators 1 and 2 were not calculated because of the particular characteristics of the Mediterranean management system where stock assessment is not provided for many species. Assessments including estimates of fishing mortality and biomass are available for a very limited number of species.

Lithuania

Data availability is not mentioned as an issue for Lithuania. The Lithuanian report mentions the quota for herring, sprat, cod and salmon. However, only biological indicator 1 is calculated for cod and there is no mention about cod importance in terms of landings. It is not clear what fleet segments were included as acronyms in text and graphs are different.

Latvia

Data availability is not reported as an issue for Latvia.

Malta

Data availability to calculate the biological indicator 3 does not seem to be an issue for Malta apart from the fact that only 3 years were presented. We encourage Malta to attempt to calculate other indicators and have a longer time series of biological indicator 3. Malta should also draw from their analysis some conclusions about the balance between fleet capacity and fishing opportunity

Netherlands

Data availability does not seem to be an issue for the Netherlands. We encourage the Netherlands to follow the guidelines and to draw conclusions about the balance of their fleet capacity and fishing opportunity.

Poland

There is no information about data availability. However there is no estimation of biological indicators. We encourage Poland to be transparent about its data collection and availability, follow the guidelines, and to draw some conclusions about the balance between their fleet capacity and their fishing opportunity.

Portugal

There is no information about data availability. However there is no estimation of biological indicators. We encourage Portugal to be transparent about its data collection and availability, follow the guidelines, and to draw some conclusions about the balance between their fleet capacity and their fishing opportunity.

Sweden

Data availability does not seem to be an issue for Sweden.

Slovenia

Data availability seems to be an issue for Slovenia as their main catch species (Sardine (*Sardina pilchardus*) and Anchovy (*Engraulis encrasicolus*)) are migratory species which are also targeted by Italian and Croatian fleets. Only Slovenian fleets were considered in this analysis. We would like to encourage Slovenia to promote joint studies with the neighbouring countries to improve the accuracy of its estimations and usefulness of its results

Spain

There is no mention about data availability and no estimation of biological indicators. We would like to encourage the member state to be transparent about data collection and availability and to endeavour to follow the guidelines and present at least one biological indicator.

UK

There is no mention about data availability and no estimation of biological indicators. We would like to encourage the UK to be transparent about data collection and availability and to endeavour to follow the guidelines and present at least one biological indicator.

Economic indicators

- **Return on investment for each fleet segment**
Over a third (38%) of MS delivered information on Return on Investment (ROI). However it is doubtful whether these countries have calculated ROI accurately or in a standard manner. This doubt is because the guidelines do not explicitly explain what “investment” means. The MS might therefore misinterpret it as “the annual investment” instead of the total capital investment less depreciation. It is likely that most countries do not have information about long-term investments and this increases the uncertainty of the calculations of ROI. Furthermore, some MS do not have data on depreciation and interest, even though this is required in both the DCR and DCF. This information is crucial for the accurate calculation of ROI.
- **Current revenue divided by break even revenue**
A third of MS delivered information on Current Revenue / Break-even Revenue. As with ROI, it is likely that some MS do not have information on depreciation and interest and therefore are unable to complete the calculation.

Social indicators

Over a third (38%) of MS reported a social indicator. The social indicators are based on data collection under the DCR and the accuracy and reliability of the data collected for the social indicators is questionable. We suggest that the Commission could discuss with MS to further consider how the quality of the data in relation to the social indicators can be improved.

Often MS data from DCR is not available until after the reporting period for the annual reports on balance. The Commission should give guidelines and encourage MS to report social indicators for most recent year (three years) that data is available.

In some cases no explanation is given as to why a social indicator has not been reported. MS should reveal why social indicators have not been reported, this may help to resolve any underlying problems and make it possible to report indicators in subsequent years.

Average crew share wage per FTE

Some MS or fleet segments may not pay crew using the crew share system and therefore may be unable to report on this indicator as it is currently defined. As a solution, an alternative measure of salary could potentially be used when vessels do not pay wages using crew share. In addition, FTE is also difficult to calculate accurately as data on hours worked are difficult to collect and interpret. This has been elaborated in an EU report on FTEs in the catching sector and in reality, this concept is often a case of considering whether work as a crew member is the principle or only employment of the crew, rather than any reference to number of hours worked.

Gross Value Added

Calculation of GVA requires estimation of crew share, interest and depreciation all of which are problematic to assess and therefore may not be available. Based on data collected under the DCR

8. ToR 4. Assess appropriateness of indicators for small scale fleets

The working group was asked to assess the appropriateness of the proposed indicators for small scale coastal fleets and fisheries, identify problems related to their use for this part of the fleet and consider possible alternatives.

Technical indicators

For smaller vessels and fleets which tend to use passive gears, days at sea per vessel can lead to misleading results and alternative measures of effort may be appropriate i.e. number of pots, km's of nets used. In most MS, data collection and effort reporting for smaller vessels and fleets is problematic.

Biological indicators

The calculation of any of the three biological indicators is appropriate regardless the fleet segment.

First, it is actually very desirable to include all fleet segments (small and industrial scale) as that is the only way to produce a robust estimation of the stock status and fishing mortality. It would only be irrelevant to include the small scale if catch/landing were negligible in weight.

Secondly, calculate the same indicator for all segments is the only way to permit comparison among fleet segments and member state.

Thirdly, there is a perception that data availability could be an issue. Therefore, there should be used an extra effort in the data collection for the small scale fleets because in some countries they are highly important in biological (landings), social and economic aspects.

Economic indicators

The economic indicators are found to be equally appropriate for small-scale coastal fisheries as well as larger fisheries. However, one general issue for small-scale coastal fisheries is that these vessels are often operated by one owner, having other incomes besides fishing, which may give a misrepresentation of the economic indicators. Specifically, the fishermen need to ensure that an appropriate proportion of crew share attributed from fishing is used when estimating these indicators.

Social indicators

There may be a problem collecting data from small-scale coastal fleets as regulations are not often in place to ensure compulsory data collection for these fleets.

Average crew share per full-time equivalent. Often crew working on small-scale coastal vessels are not employed full-time or crew share may not be used as method

for payment of salary. It is recommended that an alternative measure taking account of part-time crew working practices/other wage mechanisms be used to estimate average crew share per full-time equivalent for small-scale coastal fleets.

9. ToR 5. Improve the guidelines for balance indicators

Item 5. in the Terms of Reference asked the working group to recommend improvements to the Commission's Guidelines for balance indicators.

General comments

It is suggested that the Guidelines should more closely follow the recommendations made by the SGBRE working group report which was the origin of the guidelines.

The Commission should further discuss with MS to better define the guidelines requirements.

There is a lack of overview and comparison between the different indicators (biological, technical, social and economic).

Technical indicators

Only active vessels should be included when calculating the Technical Indicators. Member States should be clear on whether active vessels should be included or not.

In terms of transparency, the components of the Technical Indicator should be presented i.e. days at sea per vessel, GT and kW should be shown. In addition, the number of vessels in each segment should be shown so that coverage can be assessed.

Totals for segments should be provided instead or in addition to individual vessel detail.

Biological indicators

The guidelines are not clear with regard to biological indicators estimation and presentation. The STECF Report of the Working Group on the balance of the Fishing capacity and resources: Part II (SGECA/SGRST 08-01) has a great deal of detail and accurate explanation about the estimation of the indicator which where not included in the guidelines. We recommend that items 7.5, 7.6 and 7.7 from the report should be included in full in the guidelines.

Template table should be provided for the biological indicator 2 and 3 (as similarly used for the biological indicator 1).

Page 3 of guidelines: member state should make a statement explaining the length of the time series when data availability is shorter than the minimum required.

There should be strong encouragement on further data analysis using for instance, bio-economic models and other indicators, which can provide a robust picture of the fleet capacity and its balance with the fishing opportunities.

There should be strong encouragement to seek help from the scientific community.

Economic indicators

The guidelines could be improved in relation to the calculation of ROI by specifying the terms “investment”. It is recommended to use the word “capital value” instead, also suggested in DCF (the member states used DCF for the first time in the 2008 data collection). Still, there will be problems for the member states to actually estimate exact capital value figures, since this requires data for more than one year.

Social indicators

Social indicators are not given as much importance in the guidelines, consequently most MS do not specifically refer to the social indicators and very few conclusions/interpretations are drawn. It is recommended that the guidelines should be more explicit in stating that social indicators should also be reported.

It would be useful for MS to have calculation examples of social indicators in the guidelines (as is the case for technical, biological and economic indicators).

10. References

Lutchman I, Van den Bossche K, des Clers S, *Overcapacity - What Overcapacity? An evaluation of Member States reporting on efforts to achieve a sustainable balance between fleet capacity and fishing opportunities in 2007*. Institute for European Environmental Policy. July 2009.

JRC Publication: *Balance between fishing capacity and resources (part ii)* (SGECA/SGRST-08-01) joint subgroup on economic affairs (SGECA) and on stock reviews (SGRST). Prepared for the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF). April 2008.

Guidelines for an improved analysis of the balance between fishing capacity and fishing opportunities: The use of indicators for reporting according to Art. 14 of Council Regulation 2371/2002. DG Fisheries and Maritime Affairs, March 2008.

Council regulation (EC) No 2371/2002 of 20 December 2002 *on the conservation and sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources under the Common Fisheries Policy*

Commission regulation (EC) 1438/2003 of 12 August 2003: *Laying down implementing rules on the Community Fleet Policy as defined in Chapter III of Council Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002*

Appendix A

This appendix offers an example of a possible standardised template approach to summaries of MS annual reports.

Belgian Report Summary	
1. Overall assessment of balance and development year on year.	A full assessment of whether the capacity of the Belgian fleet is in balance with fishing opportunity is not given. However the report mentions that under-utilization of the 24-40m beam trawling fleet is not the result of an imbalance between balance and fishing opportunity but rather quota exchanging. No assessment of change in balance over-time is presented.
2. Size of the fleet (no. of vessels, total GT, total kW)	The report gave an overview of size of the Belgian fleet by segment. The fleet consisted of 100 vessels in 2008, 2 fewer than at the end of 2007. The report gave total capacity of the fleet as 19,007 GT and 60,620 kW.
3. Fleet segments with key species fished and total volumes landed	The Belgian fleet had two large segments; the 24-40m Beam Trawl fleet accounted for 48% of the total fleet and the 12-24m Beam Trawl fleet accounted for 45% of the total fleet. A breakdown of key species fished and volumes landed was provided. Plaice, Sole, Cod and Shrimp accounted for 51% of landings. Species and volumes landed by segment was not provided by segment.
4. Additions to and removals from the fleet during the year, expressed in number of vessels, giving fleet segment or some indication of vessel capacity	The report shows the changes in fleet capacity during 2008; 2 vessels were withdrawn adding 296 GT and 1,104 kW and 1 vessel was added with 11GT and 0kW. No breakdown of segment is provided.
5. Change in state of stocks and/or in fishing opportunity during the year	The report does not provide information on the change in state of the stocks and/or in fishing opportunity between 2007 and 2008. The report does show total quotas and TAC for 2008 for the main species and ICES areas.
6. Outline of effort reduction schemes, if any, during the year	No reference to an effort reduction scheme in 2008.
7. Statement of compliance with entry/exit scheme during the year	Belgium complied with the entry/exit scheme in 2008.
8. Plans for improvement in fleet management system	The report states Belgium's intention to implement a fleet adaptation scheme in accordance with the OP for the over 221kW beam trawl segment.
9. Length of report (over/under 10 pages)	The report was 9 pages long in total.
10 Application of the balance indicators (technical, bio, econ, social)	Belgium provided some but not all of the balance indicators.

Balance Indicator Diagram e.g.



Appendix B

Introduction

This appendix contains an evaluation of the French report which was carried out by JRC experts (John Anderson, Anna Cheilari, Jean-Noel Druon) following the SGBRE working group of 7th-11th September. The working group was unable to evaluate the French report as no English version of the report was available.

DG MARE and the JRC agreed that French speakers within JRC (Cheilari, Druon) would evaluate the report using the same criteria used during SGBRE 09-01 with the assistance of Anderson, who attended the original working group and was familiar with the report evaluation criteria. DG MARE confirmed that they had no objections in entrusting JRC scientists with the assessment of the French report, as long as the assessment was made according to the STECF framework.

While this evaluation of the French report follows the same methodology as developed and used during the SGBRE 09-01 working group, it is important to note that this evaluation has not been endorsed by the SGBRE working group due to the problems already outlined.

Results

The French report was evaluated against the requirements of Article 12 and 13 of Commission Regulation no. 1438/2003. The results of this evaluation using the scoring system used by SGBRE are given in table 12.1. While the French report includes information on most of the required elements (scoring 20 out of a possible 24 points for presence of information) the quality of the information provided in most cases could be improved (score of 18 out of a possible 36 points for quality). In particular, information on the development of fleets and the strengths and weaknesses of the fleet management system was lacking. In addition, no overall assessment on the balance between fleet capacity and fishing opportunities was provided, and none of the balance indicators set out in the Commission guidelines were included.

Comments on the Commission's summary of the French report are as follows:

- The Commission summary of the French report reflects most of the main points of the French report.
- The summary correctly notes that the guidelines were not applied in the French report.
- While the Commission summary reports the extent of fleet reduction carried out in France, the summary fails to mention that the requirements for compliance with the entry exit regime are respected.

Q	Elements to be included	Present		Quality scores	
		Max score	Actual score	Max score	Actual score
1A	i) Description of fleets	2	2	3	2
	ii) Link with fisheries	3	3	3	2
	iii) Development in fleets	3	3	3	1
1B	i) statement of effort reduction schemes	2	2	3	2
	ii) impact on fishing capacity of effort reduction schemes	3	3	3	2
1C	Statement of compliance with entry / exit scheme	2	2	3	2
1D	i) Summary of weaknesses & strengths of fleet management system	1	1	3	1
	ii) plan for improvements in fleet management system	2	2	3	2
	iii) information on general level of compliance with fleet policy instruments	1	1	3	2
1E	Information on changes of the administrative procedures relevant to fleet management	1	1	3	2
2	Report 10 pages or less?	1	0	3	
O	Overall: does report assess balance between capacity & opportunity?	3	0	3	0
	Total scores:	24	20	36	18

Table 12.1 Scores for inclusion and quality of required elements in the French report

ANNEX II DECLARATIONS OF EXPERTS

Declarations of invited experts are published on the STECF web site on <https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home> together with the final report.

European Commission

EUR XXXXX LL – Joint Research Centre – Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Title: Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries. Report of Working Group on the xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Author(s): xxxxxxxxxx

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

20YY – nnnn pp. – x cm

EUR – Scientific and Technical Research series – ISSN 1018-5593

ISBN X-XXXX-XXXX-X

DOI XXXXX

Abstract

xxxxxxxxx

How to obtain EU publications

Our priced publications are available from EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>), where you can place an order with the sales agent of your choice.

The Publications Office has a worldwide network of sales agents. You can obtain their contact details by sending a fax to (352) 29 29-42758.

The mission of the JRC is to provide customer-driven scientific and technical support for the conception, development, implementation and monitoring of EU policies. As a service of the European Commission, the JRC functions as a reference centre of science and technology for the Union. Close to the policy-making process, it serves the common interest of the Member States, while being independent of special interests, whether private or national.



AA-BB-XXXXX-LL-C

