

---

JRC Scientific and Technical Reports

---



# **SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF)**

-

## **Opinion by written procedure**

### **Evaluation of Revised National Programs for 2010 under the Data Collection Framework and Review of Surveys**

**Edited by John Casey & Hendrik Dörner**

MARCH 2010

EUR 24306 EN - 2010

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.ec.europa.eu](mailto:stecf-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu)  
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 57574

EUR 24306 EN  
ISBN 978-92-79-15355-6  
ISSN 1018-5593  
DOI 10.2788/80544

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

© European Union, 2010

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

*Printed in Italy*

**OPINION OF THE SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR  
FISHERIES BY WRITTEN PROCEDURE**

**Evaluation of Revised National Programs for 2010 under the Data Collection Framework and  
Review of Surveys**

**MARCH 2010**

**Background and request to STECF**

To be able to progress on National Programmes linked to the Data Collection Framework, the Commission requests the STECF to review and comment on Section one of the Report of the SGRN 09-04 Working Group held in Hamburg from 7-11 December 2009.

**STECF Observations**

Section 1 of the Report of the SG-RN 09-04 Working Group is attached at Annex A. The full SGRN-09-04 report will be reviewed during the STECF plenary meeting on 26 to 30 April 2010.

STECF notes that revised National Programmes (NPs) were received by the Commission from 10 Member States (Denmark, Netherlands, UK, France, Ireland, Spain, Portugal, Sweden, Italy and Cyprus). The SGRN 09-04 WG undertook a comparison between the initial and revised NPs and commented on the changes proposed noting the type of change, whether the change was a proposal from the Regional Coordination Meeting (RCM) and whether it implied a change to the implementation of the proposed NP. In addition, any other appropriate comments were also added.

STECF notes that Section 1 of the Report of the SG-RN 09-04 Working Group (Annex A), is merely a check on proposed changes and not an exhaustive review of the revised National Programmes. Furthermore STECF notes that the checking process indicated that the MS revisions addressed many issues, not only the recommendations of the relevant RCM's. Some derogations were sought and SGRN found it difficult to assess if all RCM recommendations had been addressed by the MS.

**STECF Conclusions**

STECF notes that the proposals in the revised National programmes received by the Commission for the 10 Member States indicated above are in accordance with the requirements of the DCF and recommends that they be accepted by the Commission.



**ANNEX I.**

**REPORT OF THE SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC  
COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECFF)**

**Sub Group on Research Needs (SGRN)**

**SGRN 09-04 Report  
Section 1 Only**

**Data Collection Framework  
Checking of 2010 Revised National Programmes**

**SGRN 09-04  
Hamburg, Germany, 7<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> December**

## **SPECIAL NOTE**

THIS SHORT REPORT CONTAINS ONLY SECTION 1 (CHECKING OF THE REVISED 2010 NATIONAL PROGRAMMES) OF THE FULL SGRN 09-04 REPORT. THE COMMISSION HAVE REQUESTED THIS ELEMENT OF THE REPORT AS SOON AS POSSIBLE IN ORDER TO FINALISE FINANCIAL DECISIONS IN RELATION TO THE 2010 DATA COLLECTION FRAMEWORK.

THE FULL SGRN 09-04 REPORT WILL BE REVIEWED DURING THE STECF PLENARY ON 26 TO 30 APRIL 2010.

**SECTION 1**  
**CHECKING OF REVISED 2010 NATIONAL PROGRAMMES**

---

Revised National Programmes were received by the Commission from 10 Member States (Denmark, Netherlands, UK, France, Ireland, Spain, Portugal, Sweden, Italy and Cyprus). SGRN “checked” these National Programmes in relation to the “track changes” in the revised Reports and have provided comments on these changes. It should be emphasised that this exercise was only a checking and not an exhaustive review of the revised National Programmes.

The checking process indicated that the MS revisions addressed many issues, not only the recommendations of the relevant RCM’s. Some derogations were sought and SGRN found it difficult to assess if all RCM recommendations had been addressed by the MS. SGRN has provided the Commission with both general and detailed comments on the MS revised National Programmes.

**COUNTRY: Denmark**

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

The revised Danish proposal as provided to SGRN, did not contain any tracked changes. In Section III.C.4 (Regional coordination) it is stated ‘RCM North Sea 2009 - No final report is available - Therefore, Denmark has not yet considered any actions to be taken’. A similar comment appears in Section III.D.3 (Regional coordination). There was no comment or tracked changes relevant to RCM Baltic 2009 so SGRN was unable to comment further. SGRN comments that if a revised proposal had been submitted with tracked changes, it was not available for checking by SGRN.

Section	Type of change	Stated in RCM ?	Change programme ?	COMMENTS
SEE NOTE ABOVE				

**COUNTRY: Netherlands**

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

Tracked changes were available for this revised NP. Although not relevant to the programme of activities, it is noted that the convention used for labelling métiers is inconsistent between the document text and the tables, but neither was fully in accord with the RCM conventions.

Section	Type of change	Stated in RCM ?	Change programme ?	COMMENTS
II.B (International coordination)	Update (a revised list of meetings to be attended)	NO	NO	SGRN was unable to check this updated list against a Commission-approved list

				of meetings
III.B.1 (Data acquisition)	Addition (a comment on beam trawlers being decommissioned)	NO	NO	SGRN considers this change relates more to data quality than a change in the programme
	Methodological (distinguishing between full time and part time employment)	NO	NO	SGRN considers this to be a clarification rather than a programme change
	Addition (development of model to calculate costs and revenues)	NO	?	It is not clear to SGRN whether this change requires additional resources and consequently comprises a change to the programme
III.C.2 (Data acquisition North Sea)	Update (staff exchange NL-GER)	YES	NO	This is additional information, not a change to the programme
	Update (reduction of number of observer trips for shrimp beam trawling)	YES (see RCM NSEA 20099 discussion section 9.2)	YES	No change to the financial bid, but a reduction in the activity to the minimum required.
	Update (closure of eel fishery in Q4 2010)	NO	YES	Reduction in absolute activity, caused by national eel management proposals.
III.C.4 (Regional coordination – North Atlantic & North Sea)	Update (North Atlantic & North Sea)	NO	NO	Additional comments made in response to RCM NSEA 2008 recommendations



III.C.2 (Data acquisition Pacific)	Update	NO	NO	Update of the text
III.C.4 (Regional coordination – other regions)	Update	NO	NO	Update of the text
III.C.5 (Derogations and non-conformities - other regions)	Update	NO	NO	Revised text
III.D.1 (Data acquisition – North Sea)	Addition (on recreational fisheries including eel)	YES	NO	Clarification
III.E.4 (Regional coordination – North Sea)	Update (North Sea)	NO	NO	Additional comments made in response to RCM NSEA 2008 recommendations
III.G.1.9 (surveys MEGS)	Update (there may be an adjustment due to the international planning)	NO	NO	Only change in time schedule
IV.A.1 (Aquaculture)	Update	NO	NO	
IV.A.2 (Data acquisition)	Addition (on oysters)	NO	?	It is not clear to SGRN whether this change requires additional resources and consequently comprises a change to the programme, or if it is simply clarification of the existing proposal
IV.B.1 (Data acquisition)	Update	NO	NO	Revised text
X	Update (financial basis of staff costs)	NO	NO	Staff rates changed in line with the financial regulation requirement of 210 productive days per year

	Update (financial forms)	NO	NO	Clarification
Annex 2 (bilateral agreement)	Addition	NO	NO	Additional text
Annex 5 (minutes of the bilateral meeting)	Addition	NO	NO	Additional text comprising the minute of a meeting that occurred between the first and revised version of the NP

**COUNTRY: United Kingdom**

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

No updates on the tables were available, only the revised text of the proposal.

Section	Type of change	Stated in RCM ?	Change programme ?	COMMENTS
III.B.1 (Data acquisition)	Update (non-sampling of inactive vessels)	NO	NO	SGRN considers this to be a clarification of the original programme
III.C.2 (Data acquisition-general methodology)	Update (England and Wales market sampling procedures)	NO	NO	Reflects the change of responsibilities for market sampling from MFA to Cefas.
III.D.1 (Data acquisition)	Update (recreational fisheries sampling)	NO	?	SGRN considers this to be more like a response to a clarification for the EU rather than to a recommendation from RCM NSEA 2009.  The text on the Welsh recreational sampling programme is confusing and it is not clear if this leads to a change in the programme.
III.G.1 (Surveys)	Addition (for one of the three MEGS surveys)	? (see comment)	YES	Historically, the RCMs called on the UK to reinstate its third

				<p>component of the survey having withdrawn from it in 2007.</p> <p>RCM NSEA 2009 commented on the requirement for additional fecundity sampling but stated this was a topic for WGMEGS to address.</p> <p>Both RCM NSEA 2009 and RCM N ATLANTIC 2009 commented on the necessary requirement for additional egg sampling coverage and referred the adaptation of surveys for discussion by SGRN 09-04.</p>
IV.B.1 (Data acquisition)	Addition (SEAFISH contracted in 2010 to survey the processing industry)	NO	? (see comment)	It is not clear to SGRN whether this is related to a request for clarification or it is an addition to the 2010 programme.

The UK survey planning process was not completed until after the original NP submission date. Because it was uncertain that a third UK survey would be agreed within the UK planning process, the UK could not commit to this in its original NP submission. The addition of a third component to the UK part of the 2010 mackerel egg survey is in response to comments in various ICES reports.

**COUNTRY: France**

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

Track changes should be used instead of yellow highlighting to facilitate the revision. Numbering of sections and sub-sections should follow a clear and logical order. Modifications regarding regional meetings should coincide with those in the NP of the MS also taking part in it.

RCMs recommend that methodological and data quality issues be handled in a SGECA subgroup, and do not consider additional studies by MS.

RCMs state that the clustering of segments should be agreed at regional level in order to ensure comparability of data per segment. Therefore, new segmentation in the long distance fisheries would benefit from the regional coordination on these fisheries.

Commission to check the inclusion of sampling in Corsica 2010

Section	Type of change	Stated in RCM ?	Change programm	COMMENTS
---------	----------------	-----------------	-----------------	----------

			e ?	
II - 1.1	Include IRD in the sampling programme.	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
II - 1.1	Include FranceAgriMer in the sampling programme.	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
II - 1.2	Ask for funding to attend PGMed.	No	No	Not in the remit of SGRN
II - 1.2	Ask for funding for trips for 3 people to attend the long-distance fisheries RCM	No	No	Not in the remit of SGRN
II - 1.2	Ask for funding for 5 people to attend 4 ICCAT WGs and for 7 people to attend 4 CTOI WGs.	No	No	Not in the remit of SGRN
II - 1.2	Ask for funding for meetings between IRD, IEO and AZTI for researchers on tuna fisheries.	No	No	Not in the remit of SGRN
III - 1.3	Recommendations of autumn 2009 RCM meetings for changes in the metiers to be sampled.	Yes	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
III - North Sea 1.3.2	New sampling of OTB_DEF_100-119 (>18m) onboard freezing trawlers.	Yes	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
III - North Sea 1.3.2	Bilateral agreement between France and Netherlands for sampling of freezer trawlers of OTM_SPF_32-54 (>18m) in North Sea.	Yes	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
III - North Atlantic 1.3.7	The same as previous one, but for North Atlantic.	Yes	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
III - North Atlantic 1.3.7	As recommended by RCM North-East Atlantic and Mediterranean onboard observers will start sampling by-catch in the bluefin tuna fishery	Yes	Yes	MS is asked to clarify the funding for this programme as ICATT also funds observer cover
III - North Atlantic 1.3.9	As recommended by the NEA RCM, the metier DRB_MOL will be sampled in 2010: 4 trips during the 2 quarters in	Yes	Yes	OK

	which the fishery is open.			
III - Mediterranean 1.3.4	As recommended by RCM Med and PGMed, France will sample bluefin tuna in the Gulf of Lion and in the Bay of Biscay.	Yes	Yes	SGRN points out that sampling is mandatory for this species in this area.
III - WECAF 1.3.5	Ask for funding for a pilot study on the sampling of swordfish and small tunids in Martinique using fish-aggregating devices.	No	Yes	MS is to clarify to the commission on the use of fish aggregating devices for swordfish.
III - IOTC 1.3.2	Re-distribution of sampling effort in the Indian Ocean due to changes in the area of activity of the fleets, caused by the activity of pirates.	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
III - IOTC 1.3.2	To carry out a study in 2010 in order to check if one metier of long liners in Reunion Island should be divided in two different metiers.	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
III - IOTC 1.3.2	To reinforce the onboard sampling of discards aboard long liners from reunion Island.	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
III - IOTC 1.3.3	Include in the programme a coordinator for the sampling and data processing in the Seychelles.	No	No	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
III - IOTC 1.3.3	Initiate the sampling of 3 new seiners that will start activity off Mauritius.	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
III - IOTC 1.3.3	To hire a biostatistician during 2 years to assist with the revision of the sampling plans for the tropical tunids.	No	No	Not in the remit of SGRN
III - IOTC 1.3.4	Ask for funding for 2 researchers to participate in the RCM of long-distance fisheries: 1 for seiners and 1 for long-liners.	No	No	Not in the remit of SGRN
III - IOTC 1.3.4	Ask for funding for meetings between French and Spanish researchers for planning the joint sampling of tuna.	No	No	Not in the remit of SGRN
III - ICCAT 1.3.7	Changes in sampling effort due to changes in the spatial	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals

	activity of the handliners and seiners in the Indian and Atlantic oceans.			with Commission
III - ICCAT 1.3.8	Ask for funding a technician to be based in Ivory Coast.	No	No	Not in the remit of SGRN
III - Recreational Fisheries 1.4.3	Follow the NEA and North Sea and East Arctic RCMs, of not sampling the recreational catches of eel in the North Sea, East English Channel and Atlantic.	Yes	Yes	OK
III - Recreational Fisheries 1.4.3	Proposal (Pilot Study) to evaluate the cost-efficiency of continuing to sample the recreational fishery of codfish.	No	No	OK (previous agreement in SGRN)
III - Recreational Fisheries 1.4.4	To cease the sampling of eel in the rivers of the handline recreational fisheries.	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
III - Recreational Fisheries 1.4.4	Sampling of recreational fisheries of salmon in rivers has been done in 2009 in a pilot-study.	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
III - Biological Variables 1.5.4	To continue and improve the international protocol for the sampling of sole in area VIId, and to carry out a case study for cod in area IIIa, as recommended by RCM NS&EA.	Yes	Yes	OK
III - Biological Variables - IOTC 1.5.2	To hire a technician for three months to help with age reading of tuna.	No	No	Not in the remit of SGRN
III - Surveys Mediterranean 1.7.4 ?	Ask for funding for the Channel Ground Fish Survey.	No	Yes	Not on the list of surveys .To be discussed with commission.
III - Surveys Mediterranean 1.7.4	Ask for funding for the development of a database/GIS tool for survey data, to be coupled to the existing one for fisheries statistics.	No	No	Not in the remit of SGRN
III - Surveys 1.7.4	Ask for funding for the development of tools for user-friendly queries to the survey database.	No	No	Not in the remit of SGRN
V - Ecosystems	Ask for funding for a monitoring project on tropical tuna to be developed by IRD.	No	Yes	Not in the remit of SGRN

V - Ecosystems	Ask for funding to hire a fisheries scientist or IT engineer for 6 months to develop a database and the procedures to calculate discard rates for tropical tuna.	No	No	Not in the remit of SGRN
V - Ecosystems	The environmental indicator "Fuel efficiency of fish capture" will not be calculated for tropical tuna.	No	Yes	MS asked to clarify
VI - Data Management 1.1.2	Ask for funding for a project to develop a data dictionary, organise the metadata and set up queries for the IRD data bases.	No	No	Not in the remit of SGRN
VI - Data Management 1.1.5	The enquiries for data collection for recreational fisheries have been removed from the programme.	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
Annexes	Inclusion of annexes with methodology on sampling of tropical pelagic fisheries, biological parameters of tropical tuna and database development for tropical fisheries.	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission

### *Economic comments*

For the processing industry, reference year, sample size and category of firm are changed at the same time, and therefore data comparability is worsened and economic analysis may not be meaningful. Information on stratification would be helpful in this case.

Section	Type of change	Stated in RCM ?	Change programme ?	COMMENTS
IV 1.2.1	Improved data quality: ref. to Eurostat for type of firms to be sampled	Yes	Yes	
VI 1.1.3	Comment on firms with processing as secondary activity	No	Yes	Not clear in relation to sample size in tables
IOTC 1.3.3	Improved data quality : reference to coverage rate, precision etc	Yes	No	
Table IV.B.1 and IV.B.2	Change in the reference year for the processing sector	No	Yes	
Table IV B.1	Change in the sample size	No	Yes	Possible change

				in stratification needs to be clarified
--	--	--	--	---

**COUNTRY: Ireland**

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

SGRN found that the tables and text were updated. Recommendations from RCM-NA and SGRN-09-01 were taken into account.

Section	Type of change	Stated in RCM ?	Change programme ?	COMMENTS
<b>III.A General description of the fishing sector</b>	Deepwater fishery and Eel Fishery no longer exists.	No	Yes. Removed	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
<b>III.C.2 Data acquisition Table III.C.3</b>	Based on gear/area/target similarities and <i>a priori</i> knowledge of the fisheries, metiers have been merged into existing metiers currently being sampled or collapsed to form a new metier for sampling purposes.  Four new metiers have been included in Table III.C.3 which will be sampled for Discards only	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
<b>III.C.2 Data acquisition Table III.C.2</b>	The self sampling programme initiated for Metiers OTB-DEF 6a and 6b will be expanded to cover 3 other metiers in the SW of the country. Statistical analysis will be carried out in order to ensure quality of data, only 2 sets of data received so far	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
<b>III.C.2 Data acquisition</b>	Less use of Contracted assistance for the collection of stock based data. Data collected by MI personnel	No	No	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
<b>III.C.2 Data acquisition Sampling of</b>	Additional Bi lateral to be set up with Denmark	No	In 2011-2013 programm	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with



foreign Landings			e	Commission
<b>III.C.5 Derogations and non-conformities</b>	Derogations on sampling seed mussels Following further analysis of the 2008 logbook data Ireland seeks derogations to sample discards fisheries based on the fact that the effort in these fisheries is below 20 days	No	No	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
<b>III.E.2 Data acquisition</b>	Collection of maturity data changed from survey to onboard observers	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
<b>III.E.3 Data quality</b>	Use of COST tool inserted	Yes	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
<b>III.G.2.4 Modifications in the surveys</b>	Change in Vessel use, survey split between two vesels	No	Yes	OK
<b>V. Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>	Omitted text inserted <i>Indicator 8: Discarding rates of commercially exploited species</i> <i>Indicator 9: Fuel efficiency of fish capture</i>	No	No. Work was already being carried out	The ammendmet comes from a request in SGRN/ECA 0902 report OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
<b>Table II.B.1</b>	Updated list of meetings	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission
<b>Table III.E.3</b>	Updated sampling numbers	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission

***Economic comments***

Economic data items obtained from different sources (logbooks and sales notes etc.) should take into account the recommendation by RCM NA to use common methods to ensure consistency and comparability of all economic variables when derived from different sources.

**COUNTRY: Spain**

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

SGRN has no General Comments.

Section	Type of change	Stated in RCM ?	Change programme ?	COMMENTS
III. G.2 Survey modifications	Add of 5 more days to IBTS 4Q in order to cover a wider depth range 30-800 instead of 70-500)	No	Yes.	SGRN agrees with the scientific justification for extending the survey but the Commission will check all of the other IBTS surveys submissions and see if there are any days remaining for funding.

***Economic comments***

Economic data items (including cost and employment variables) obtained from different sources should take into account the recommendation by RCM NA to use common methods to ensure consistency and comparability of all economic variables when derived from different sources.

**COUNTRY: Portugal****GENERAL COMMENTS:**

There are no specific requests for Portugal from the RCM NA

No updated tables were supplied so unable to check if new metier was included.

No reference in the NP to SGRN 09-01 recommendations.

- No sampling in the Indian Ocean, awaiting outcome of the long distance RCM? Fishery since 2007
- No mention of the use of the COST tool

Section	Type of change	Stated in RCM ?	Change programme ?	COMMENTS
III.C. 1 Selection of metiers to sample	New métier to sample based on updated logbook analysis – Set Gillnets (GNS), targeting either demersal and small pelagic fishes.	No	Yes	OK-Discussed in Bi Laterals with Commission

***Economic comments***

Economic data items obtained from different sources (logbooks, sales notes and surveys) should take into account the recommendation by RCM NA to use common methods to ensure consistency and comparability of all economic variables when derived from different sources.

**COUNTRY: SWEDEN****GENERAL COMMENTS:**

On the whole, the Swedish National Plan 2009-2010 (revised 2009-10-06) was clear and revised sections were easy to detect. In addition to changes in the table below, the revision of the Swedish NP included some clarifications on e.g. how to obtain by-catch estimates for eel trap net fishery. Those did not affect the programme but made the NP more clear for people not familiar with Swedish circumstances.

Section	Type of change	Stated in RCM ?	Change programme ?	COMMENTS
III D 2	Pilot study targeting recreational fishery of cod	YES	YES	Acceptable on the basis of chapters II B (1) and III B 3 3 of the 2008/949, and Baltic RCM recommendations

III E 2 (salmon) III E 5 (salmon)	Changes in river monitoring. Counting adults in Sävarån postponed to 2011.	NO	YES	Justification of time-table and budget of parts of river monitoring. Acceptable since river monitoring is a new element in DCF and new monitoring devices have to be constructed.
III E 5 (salmon)	Sampling salmon long-line fishery	YES	NO	NP should be prepared to act as agreed in RCM and WGBAST.
III C 2 III E 2	Change in herring length classification	NO	NO	OK
III C 2	Change in flounder sampling from harbour to concurrent	NO	NO	OK
III C 2 III E 2	Eel samples to include all size classes, SD 27 sampled as well	NO	NO	OK
III C 2	PTB FWS –métier: four randomized samples instead of 2	NO	NO	OK
III C 2	Anadromous trap net fishery: part of sampling in harbours, extra journals	NO	NO	OK

### **Detailed comments:**

Page 42, paragraph on Pilot study in ICES division 23 targeting recreational fishery of cod.

There should be a reference not only to chapter II B (1) but also to chapter III B 3 3 a-b of the 2008/949. Those paragraphs obligate MS's to estimate quarterly weight of the recreational catches and, where relevant, to carry out pilot surveys to estimate the importance of recreational fisheries targeting the species listed in Appendix IV.

The proposed pilot study is also in accordance with Baltic RCM recommendations. However, as this is a pilot study, it should not be restricted to the first months of the year as stated by the revised NP, but continued through the whole fishing season.

Page 49, Salmon index rivers

Monitoring of returning adult numbers in Sävarån is postponed one year from what was originally planned. The construction of monitoring devices in Mörrumsån and improving and operating smolt traps in Umeå/Vindelälven has turned out to be more expensive than originally planned. These changes in NP are well based and acceptable.

Page 51, Paragraph on Salmon

Chapter III B B1 2 of 2008/949 states that additional biological sampling of the unsorted landings should be carried out in order to estimate the share of the various stocks in the landings for salmon in the Baltic Sea. This is usually done through microsatellite-DNA analysis. In the Baltic RCM report, salmon samples from the main Basin are considered suitable for international co-operation. Several countries are taking part in the fishery. Both WGBAST and Baltic RCM recommend to “improve (salmon) data collection under the EU Data Collection regulation, particularly for the Main Basin. This includes revision of the scheme of biological sampling from catches established by WGBAST in 2005”. RCM plans that formal agreements on task sharing in genetic samples from the main basin are prepared before end of March 2010. Sweden should be prepared to act as agreed in RCM and WGBAST.

Some minor comments on the NP revisions.

Page 17: The latin names of the species should be *Clupea harengus membras*.

Page 19, 33 and 55: The plan refers repeatedly to long time series of by-catch composition in eel trap nets. It would be useful to give some details on such time series, e.g. when did they start and if they are they still continuing.

Page 20, paragraph on Trap net fisheries targeting anadromous species (FPO ANA 0 0 0)

It is not clear from the revised version of the NP if the information included in the extra journals is still collected. The revised version of the NP gives the impression that the extra journals will be removed from NP but the fishermen are still filling those. Also in table III C 3, a footnote should be added if information from extra journals is collected only in 2009 and not in 2010.

In the fifth line of page 20, from the end of the paragraph, the word “event” should be “even”. Also, in the last sentence of the same paragraph, the fishermen is probably bringing in the entire catch **from** the trap (not **in** the trap).

**COUNTRY: ITALY**

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

SGRN has no general comments.

Section	Type of change	Stated in RCM ?	Change programme ?	COMMENTS
<b>III.C. Biological - metier-related variables:</b>	According the outputs of the RCM Med&BS (Venice, 13-16 October 2009), MS proposes that the CV for length of demersal and small pelagic species to be calculated annually by all metier	Yes		<b>SGRN comment:</b> SGRN agrees with RCM outputs

	aggregated and per GSA and that CV for ages of all species to be calculated annually by all metier aggregated and at national level. Finally CV for length of large pelagic species to be calculated on a Regional basis (III C.3).			
<b>III.C. Biological - metier-related variables:</b> Large pelagics	For the large pelagic species, included both in group 1 and in group 2 list, the sampling intensity needed to achieve precision levels will be evaluated on a Mediterranean-wide basis, following both the RCMed&BS (Sète, 24-28 November 2008; Venice, 13-16 October 2009) and PGMed (Montpellier, 3-6 March 2009) recommendations. To follow this issue, in 2010, a minimum number of large pelagic fish to sample will be set at Regional level and a sampling intensity needed to achieve precision levels on a Mediterranean-wide basis will be proposed (Commission Decision 949/2008).	Yes		<b>SGRN comment:</b> SGRN notes that sampling levels for large pelagics were established by RCMed&BS (Venice, 13-16 October 2009). These sampling levels should be adopted by the MS for 2010 and eventually revised in the first part of the year according to any further RCM meeting decision.
<b>III.E Biological - stock-related variables.</b>	CV for age, sex and maturity of demersal and small pelagic species will be calculated annually at national level and by all metier aggregated. CV for age, sex and maturity of large pelagic species will be calculated on a Regional basis following the output of the RCMed&BS (Venice, 13-16 October 2009).	Yes		<b>SGRN comment:</b> SGRN agrees with RCM outputs.
<b>III.E Biological - stock-related variables.</b> <b>III.E.5. Derogations and non-conformities</b>	Italy requests derogation for biological sampling for some of the G2 species, due to missing landing data at Mediterranean level, due to inaccurate species identification for these species and thus due to the impossibility to calculate the sharing in the EU landing. It is also mentioned that there is the support of RCM-Med&BS, but the Commission rejected the Italian request (letter of 29th October		YES	<b>SGRN comment:</b> SGRN has in the February 2009 report requested Italy to provide information on the share in EU landings for the G2 species in order to evaluate the need for sampling of landings. The share in EU landings for the species for which derogation is asked is still not given and therefore it is not possible

	<p>2009, ref. 12390). The derogation is asked for the following species of Group 2: <i>Lophius budegassa</i>, <i>Lophius piscatorius</i>, <i>Eledone cirrhosa</i>, <i>Eledone moscata</i>, <i>Trachurus trachurus</i>, <i>Trachurus mediterraneus</i></p>			<p>for SGRN to decide on if the derogation can be accepted. Moreover, the reason for Italy for not being able to give the share in EU landings is that the rest of the countries don't give the landings for each species individually. However in PGMED 2009 there is a template as a reference for the selection of species to be included in the biological sampling and all these species are &gt;10% (even if most countries give mixed landings). SGRN recommends that RCM insists that all MS to deliver the landings by individual species.</p>
--	---	--	--	---

## ITALY

### 1. III.C. Biological - metier-related variables:

According the outputs of the RCMMed&BS (Venice, 13-16 October 2009), MS proposes that the CV for length of demersal and small pelagic species to be calculated annually by all metier aggregated and per GSA and that CV for ages of all species to be calculated annually by all metier aggregated and at national level. Finally CV for length of large pelagic species to be calculated on a Regional basis (III C.3).

**SGRN comment:** SGRN agrees with RCM outputs.

For the large pelagic species, included both in group 1 and in group 2 list, the sampling intensity needed to achieve precision levels will be evaluated on a Mediterranean-wide basis, following both the RCMed&BS (Sète, 24-28 November 2008; Venice, 13-16 October 2009) and PGMed (Montpellier, 3-6 March 2009) recommendations. To follow this issue, in 2010, a minimum number of large pelagic fish to sample will be set at Regional level and a sampling intensity needed to achieve precision levels on a Mediterranean-wide basis will be proposed (Commission Decision 949/2008).

**SGRN comment:** SGRN notes that sampling levels for large pelagics were established by RCMed&BS (Venice, 13-16 October 2009). These sampling levels should be adopted by the MS for 2010 and eventually revised in the first part of the year according to any further RCM meeting decision.

### 2. III.E Biological - stock-related variables.

CV for age, sex and maturity of demersal and small pelagic species will be calculated annually at national level and by all metier aggregated.

CV for age, sex and maturity of large pelagic species will be calculated on a Regional basis following the output of the RCMMed&BS (Venice, 13-16 October 2009).

**SGRN comment:** SGRN agrees with RCM outputs.

### III.E.5. Derogations and non-conformities

Italy requests derogation for biological sampling for some of the G2 species, due to missing landing data at Mediterranean level, due to inaccurate species identification for these species and thus due to the impossibility to calculate the sharing in the EU landing. It is also mentioned that there is the support of RCM-Med&BS, but the Commission rejected the Italian request (letter of 29th October 2009, ref. 12390)

The derogation is asked for the following species of Group 2: *Lophius budegassa*, *Lophius piscatorius*, *Eledone cirrhosa*, *Eledone moscata*, *Trachurus trachurus*, *Trachurus mediterraneus*.

**SGRN comment:** SGRN has in the February 2009 report requested Italy to provide information on the share in EU landings for the G2 species in order to evaluate the need for sampling of landings. The share in EU landings for the species for which derogation is asked is still not given and therefore it is not possible for SGRN to decide on if the derogation can be accepted. Moreover, the reason for Italy for not being able to give the share in EU landings is that the rest of the countries don't give the landings for each species individually. However in PGMED 2009 there is a template as a reference for the selection of species to be included in the biological sampling and all these species are >10% (even if most countries give mixed landings).

**SGRN recommends that RCM insists that all MS to deliver the landings by individual species.**

## ITALY

### 3. III.C. Biological - metier-related variables:

According to the outputs of the RCMed&BS (Venice, 13-16 October 2009), MS proposes that the CV for length of demersal and small pelagic species to be calculated annually by all metier aggregated and per GSA and that CV for ages of all species to be calculated annually by all metier aggregated and at national level. Finally CV for length of large pelagic species to be calculated on a Regional basis (III C.3).

**SGRN comment:** SGRN agrees with RCM outputs.

For the large pelagic species, included both in group 1 and in group 2 list, the sampling intensity needed to achieve precision levels will be evaluated on a Mediterranean-wide basis, following both the RCMed&BS (Sète, 24-28 November 2008; Venice, 13-16 October 2009) and PGMed (Montpellier, 3-6 March 2009) recommendations. To follow this issue, in 2010, a minimum number of large pelagic fish to sample will be set at Regional level and a sampling intensity needed to achieve precision levels on a Mediterranean-wide basis will be proposed (Commission Decision 949/2008).

**SGRN comment:** SGRN notes that sampling levels for large pelagics were established by RCMed&BS (Venice, 13-16 October 2009). These sampling levels should be adopted by the MS for 2010 and eventually revised in the first part of the year according to any further RCM meeting decision.

### 4. III.E Biological - stock-related variables.

CV for age, sex and maturity of demersal and small pelagic species will be calculated annually at national level and by all metier aggregated.

CV for age, sex and maturity of large pelagic species will be calculated on a Regional basis following the output of the RCMed&BS (Venice, 13-16 October 2009).

**SGRN comment:** SGRN agrees with RCM outputs.

#### III.E.5. Derogations and non-conformities

Italy requests derogation for biological sampling for some of the G2 species, due to missing landing data at Mediterranean level, due to inaccurate species identification for these species and thus due to the impossibility to calculate the sharing in the EU landing. It is also mentioned



that there is the support of RCM-Med&BS, but the Commission rejected the Italian request (letter of 29th October 2009, ref. 12390)

The derogation is asked for the following species of Group 2: *Lophius budegassa*, *Lophius piscatorius*, *Eledone cirrhosa*, *Eledone moscata*, *Trachurus trachurus*, *Trachurus mediterraneus*.

**SGRN comment:** SGRN has in the February 2009 report requested Italy to provide information on the share in EU landings for the G2 species in order to evaluate the need for sampling of landings. The share in EU landings for the species for which derogation is asked is still not given and therefore it is not possible for SGRN to decide on if the derogation can be accepted. Moreover, the reason for Italy for not being able to give the share in EU landings is that the rest of the countries don't give the landings for each species individually. However in PGMED 2009 there is a template as a reference for the selection of species to be included in the biological sampling and all these species are >10% (even if most countries give mixed landings).

**SGRN recommends that RCM insists that all MS to deliver the landings by individual species.**

**COUNTRY: CYPRUS**

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

SGRN has no General Comments.

Section	Type of change	Stated in RCM ?	Change programme ?	COMMENTS
<b>III.C.Biological–metier–related variables</b>  <b>III.C.5.Derogations and non-conformities</b>	Cyprus has asked for derogation for a modified sampling scheme 1.	?	?	This modified sampling was also included in the previous text (January 2009), but it was not explained in detail in the word file. The 2008 XL file has the same species as the XL and word files now. <b>SGRN comment:</b> It is not clear what this modification of sampling scheme 1 consists of and it is therefore difficult to judge on its justification.
<b>III.C.Biological–metier–related variables</b>  <b>III.C.5.Derogations and non-conformities</b>	Derogations for discard sampling from the drifting longlines on a triennial basis, instead of each year.	NO		The results of a pilot study on the evaluation of discards of the Cyprus fishery (November 2007), indicate that discards from the large pelagic longline fishery are not significant and involve non-commercial species. However, since onboard sampling is required on a triennial basis, for collecting of biological (maturity) data for swordfish that is never landed as whole, Cyprus intends to collect discards data during onboard sampling, which is done on a triennial basis.

				<b>SGRN comment:</b> SGRN agree with the MS proposal only to obtain discard estimates on triennial basis as the pilot study shows insignificant discard in longline fishery for large pelagic species.
<b>III.C.Biological–metier–related variables</b>  <b>III.C.5. Derogations and non-conformities</b>	Derogations for discard sampling from the bottom longlines, trammel nets and gillnets (small scale fishery).	YES		Derogation for not performing discard sampling from the small scale fishery was also requested in the 2006 NP, and was recommended by SGRN (SEC(2007)470 STECF-SGRN Report), since discards from these gears are very low. <b>SGRN comment:</b> SGRN agree with the MS proposal.
<b>Annex III. F2.Effort III. F3.Landings</b>	A methodological report on catch fisheries landings is added. It is a detailed description on the data collection methodology of the catches and landing of the Cyprus Fishery, the compilation of fishery statistics, details on the sampling techniques and an evaluation of the quality of the resulting estimates. and it is also mentioned in the text			<b>SGRN comment:</b> The report is useful and gives a nice overview.
<b>III. F2.Effort III. F3.Landings</b>	In these two chapters it is also noted that the method for the estimation of catch and effort data of the artisanal fisheries is under examination and that Cyprus is evaluating a report submitted by an external consultant in relation to a proposed modification of the methodology used. However a decision on the possible modifications is to be reached before the end			<b>SGRN comment:</b> The initiative is appreciated but the as long as no results and conclusions are presented, this information is not relevant for the present NP.

	of 2009.			
--	----------	--	--	--

## CYPRUS

### III.C.Biological–metier– related variables

#### III.C.5.Derogations and non-conformities

1. Cyprus has asked for derogation for a modified sampling scheme 1. However this sampling scheme was also included in the previous text (January 2009), but it was not explained in detail in the word file. The 2008 XL file has the same species as the XL and word files now.

**SGRN comment:** It is not clear what this modification of sampling scheme 1 consists of and it is therefore difficult to judge on its justification.

2. Derogations for discard sampling:

- From the drifting longlines on a triennial basis, instead of each year. The results of a pilot study on the evaluation of discards of the Cyprus fishery (November 2007), indicate that discards from the large pelagic longline fishery are not significant and involve non-commercial species. However, since onboard sampling is required on a triennial basis, for collecting of biological (maturity) data for swordfish that is never landed as whole, Cyprus intends to collect discards data during onboard sampling, which is done on a triennial basis.

**SGRN comment:** SGRN agrees with the MS proposal only to obtain discard estimates on triennial basis as the pilot study shows insignificant discard in longline fishery for large pelagic species.

- From the bottom longlines, trammel nets and gillnets (small scale fishery). Derogation for not performing discard sampling from the small scale fishery was also requested in the 2006 NP, and was recommended by SGRN (SEC(2007)470 STECF-SGRN Report), since discards from these gears are very low.

**SGRN comment:** SGRN agrees with the member state

### III. F2.Effort

### III. F3.Landings

#### Annex

3. A methodological report on catch fisheries landings is added at the end of the NP (a detailed description on the data collection methodology of the catches and landing of the Cyprus Fishery, the compilation of fishery statistics, details on the sampling techniques and an evaluation of the quality of the resulting estimates) and it is also mentioned in the text on\_effort (III. F2) and on landings (III. F3). **SGRN comment:** The report is useful and gives a nice overview.
4. In the previous two chapters it is also noted that the method for the estimation of catch and effort data of the artisanal fisheries is under examination and that Cyprus is evaluating a report submitted by an external consultant in relation to a proposed modification of the methodology used. However a decision on the possible modifications is to be reached before the end of 2009.

**SGRN comment:** The initiative is appreciated but the as long as no results and conclusions are presented, this information is not relevant for the present NP.



European Commission

**EUR 24306 EN – Joint Research Centre – Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen**

Title: SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF) - OPINION BY WRITTEN PROCEDURE – STECF opinion on part of the conclusions discussed by the SGECA/SGRN 09-04 Working Group ‘Evaluation of Revised National Programs for 2010 under the Data Collection Framework and Review of Surveys’.

Author(s): Casey, J., Abella, J. A., Andersen, J.L., Bailey, N., Balguerias, E., Cardinale, M., Curtis, H., Daures, F., Di Natale, A., Dobby, H., Döring, R., Figueiredo, I., Graham, N., Gascuel, D., Gustavsson, T., Hatcher, A., Kirkegaard, E., Kraak, S., Kuikka, S., Martin, P., Parkes, G., Polet, H., Prellezzo, R., Sabatella, E., Somarakis, S., Stransky, C., Vanhee, W., Van Hoof, L., Van Oostenbrugge & Virtanen, J.

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

2010 – 31 pp. – 21 x 29.7 cm

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

ISBN 978-92-79-15355-6

DOI 10.2788/80544

**Abstract**

The Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries gave its opinion by written procedure in March 2010 on request by the European Commission on part of the conclusions discussed by the SG-RN 09-04 Working Group ‘Evaluation of Revised National Programs for 2010 under the Data Collection Framework and Review of Surveys’.

**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.

LB-NA-24306-EN-N



© European Union, 2010

