



JRC SCIENTIFIC AND POLICY REPORTS

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

## DCF – Assessment of NP Changes (STECF-13-02)

Edited by Michael W. Ebeling & Cristina Castro Ribeiro

This report was reviewed by the STECF by correspondence and adopted by  
written procedure on 6 February 2013

Report EUR 25827 EN

European Commission

Joint Research Centre

Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Contact information

STECF secretariat

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 79838

EUR 25827 EN

ISBN 978-92-79-28753-4

ISSN 1831-9424

doi:10.2788/85053

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2013

© European Union, 2013

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

Printed in Italy



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DCF – Assessment of National Programmes (STECF-13-02).....	5
Background .....	5
Request to the STECF .....	5
STECF observations.....	6
STECF conclusions .....	6
STECF recommendations.....	6
Expert Working Group EWG-12-20 .....	7
1 Executive summary.....	8
2 Conclusions of the Expert Working Group.....	8
3 Recommendations of the Expert Working Group.....	9
4 Introduction and terms of references.....	18
4.1 Introduction.....	18
4.2 Terms of Reference for EWG-12-20.....	19
5 Review of NP amendments.....	21
5.1 Comments and remarks by country / Review of biological sections .....	21
6 Regional Database.....	28
6.1 Regional database (RDB-FishFrame) .....	28
6.2 Mediterranean and Black Sea Regional databases (Med&BS RDB).....	29
7 STECF EWG schedule for 2013 .....	30
8 EWG-12-20 List of Participants.....	31
9 List of Background Documents .....	34

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

## DCF – Assessment of National Programmes (STECF-13-02)

**THIS REPORT WAS REVIEWED BY CORRESPONDENCE AND ADOPTED BY WRITTEN PROCEDURE ON 6 FEBRUARY 2013.**

### Background

Data collection currently occurs under the Data Collection Framework (DCF)<sup>1</sup> and the multi-annual Union programme for data collection established there under.<sup>2</sup> The Second Financial Instrument for the CFP funds the DCF.<sup>3</sup>

Member States establish DCF National Programmes in accordance with provisions of the multi-annual Union programme for data collection (*Article 4 of Council Regulation 199/2008*). Revisions to the DCF 2011-2013 National Programmes for 2013 were submitted by some Member States to the Commission by 31/10/2012 (in accordance with *Article 5 of Council Regulation 199/2008*).

### Request to the STECF

The STECF EWG 12-20 met in Brussels, Belgium, from 10th-14<sup>th</sup> December 2012 with the following Terms of Reference:

#### 1. Evaluation of revised DCF National Programmes for 2013

To evaluate the proposed amendments to the 2011-2013 National Programmes (NP) for the year 2013 submitted under the Data Collection Framework (Council Regulation (EC) 199/2008) using the '*Guidelines and Procedures*' developed in SGRN 09-03<sup>4</sup> as well as the '*Guidelines on amendment of National Programmes 2011-2013 for the year 2013*', reviewed by EWG 12-08. The evaluation with regard to the latter is to determine whether a resubmission of the 2011-2013 National Programmes (NP) for the year 2013 is required. The evaluation will be based on the overarching criteria of conformity and scientific relevance.

The 2011 to 2013 NP have already been evaluated (SGRN 10-01)<sup>5</sup> and this review will focus on revisions made to the original programmes and to the former amendments (which have been already evaluated during EWG 11-19).

---

<sup>1</sup> Council Regulation 199/2008 concerning the establishment of a Community framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the Common Fisheries Policy and Commission Regulation 665/2008 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation 199/2008.

<sup>2</sup> Commission Decision 93/2010 adopting a multiannual Community programme for the collection, management, and use of data in the fisheries sector for the period 2011-2013.

<sup>3</sup> Council Regulation 861/2006 establishing Community financial measures for the implementation of the common fisheries policy and the Law of the Sea and Commission Regulation 1078/2008 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation 861/2006 as regards the expenditure incurred by Member States for the collection and management of basic fisheries data

<sup>4</sup> Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) - Report of Sub-group on Research Needs (SGECA/SGRN 09-03). Review of Guidelines for the National Programs and Technical Reports under the Data Collection Framework. (eds. Vigneau, J. & Raid, T.). 2009. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg, EUR 24101 EN, JRC 55709, 138 pp.

<sup>5</sup> Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) - Evaluation of 2011-2013 National Programmes linked to the Data Collection Framework - Report of the Subgroup on ResearchNeeds (SGRN 10-01) (eds

## **2. Comments made by LM and RCM's**

To review the comments and action points made by the 2012 RCM's and the Liaison Meeting in order to ensure that these recommendations are followed up.

## **3. Regional Data Bases**

Review of the progress on the development of Regional Databases (RDBs) following the RDB Steering Group Meetings and the RDB Workshops, as well as the discussions at the 2012 RCMs and the 2012 Liaison Meeting on this issue.

## **4. Topics to consider for next year's meetings**

Develop a schedule of actions to be implemented by STECF EWGs and STECF Plenary meetings in 2013, in preparation of the adoption and implementation of the DC-MAP.

STECF EWG scheduled for 2013 are (*tentative*):

- DC-MAP 2014-2020 Review (1) - April 2013
- Evaluation of 2012 MS technical reports related to the DCF & DC-MAP 2014-2020 Review (2) – End June 2013
- Assessment of AWP's under the DC-MAP - November 2013

## **5. AOB**

### **STECF observations**

STECF notes that the EWG 12-20 adequately addressed all of the above Terms of Reference and that additional issues under AOB did not arise. Revision to the DCF 2011-2013 National Programmes for 2013 in terms of conformity and scientific relevance were reviewed and discussed. Progress regarding the development of Regional Databases and the relevant recommendations from the 9<sup>th</sup> Liaisons meeting, the RCMs and PGECON were also reviewed and discussed together with the proposed schedule and content for potential meetings in 2013 in relation to the DCF and its successor the DC-MAP.

### **STECF conclusions**

STECF agrees with the findings and conclusions given in the Report of the EWG 12-20 and concludes that the recommendations listed in Section 3 of the Report should be give due consideration by those parties identified for follow-up action.

### **STECF recommendations**

STECF has no specific recommendations.

**EXPERT WORKING GROUP EWG-12-20**

## **REPORT TO THE STECF**

### **EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON DCF – Assessment of NP Changes (EWG-12-20)**

**Brussels, Belgium, 10<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> December 2012**

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

## **1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The STECF Expert Working Group (EWG 12-20) on DCF - Assessment of NP changes for 2013 met in Brussels from December 10<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup>. The list of participants may be found in Chapter 8. The terms of reference can be found in Chapter 4.2. Main task was the evaluation of submitted National Programmes (NP) amendments for the year 2013 (Chapter 2 and detailed in 5.1). In addition, relevant recommendations from the 9<sup>th</sup> Liaison meeting, RCMs and PGECON were reviewed (see Chapter 3). The status of the development of Regional Data Bases was presented (report in Chapter 6) and reviewed. A schedule of actions necessary in 2013 for the implementation of the new DCMAP was developed (Chapters 2 and 7). The work took place in plenary as well as in Sub-groups, the latter for the NP evaluation process.

## **2 CONCLUSIONS OF THE EXPERT WORKING GROUP**

STECF EWG 12-20 concluded on the necessity of actions to be taken by the European Commission in those cases, where the evaluation of the amended National Programmes resulted in the judgement of pending issues being of substantial importance. For Finland, Greece, Ireland, Malta, Spain, Sweden and the UK the Expert working Group found relevant issues that need further action, while for Slovenia no further action is required. The main issues are detailed in chapter 5.1.

In this context STECF-EWG 12-20 wants to remind MS of the guidelines for resubmission of NP, in particular it asks that MS conform to the code of good practise to revise the sampling effort each year based on experience gained from the sampling plans in place and based on the most recent statistics of landings and effort. Such a revision, if made approximately within the same budget as stipulated in the NP and if compliant with the RCM recommendations and the guidelines for NP resubmission, can be made at any moment during the year and should not lead to a resubmission of the NP to the commission which needs further scientific evaluation.

EWG 12-20 only reviewed those recommendations from 9<sup>th</sup> LM, RCMS 2012 and PGECON 2012 that were directed to STECF and DG MARE. There was an EWG in 2012 for recommendations dealing with new DCMAP and further meetings will take place in 2013. Comments and remarks on the recommendations are presented in chapter 3.

The current status of Regional Data Base development was presented and EWG 12-20 did not see any further actions to be advised by this meeting.

For 2013 the group advises that two meetings in relation to DCMAP 2014-2020 are required, one dedicated to the review of the Commission Proposal of the new regulation in mid March (preliminarily scheduled from 11<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup>), one for the final discussion of the new regulation in June (preliminarily scheduled from 10<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup>). After the first meeting on the new DCMAP in 2013 a guidelines group for bid submission should start work and it is suggested to undertake this work inter-sessionally. The guidelines group should meet with the second STECF EWG on new DCMAP in 2013 and have finalised guidelines before the RCM meetings.

Additionally evaluation meetings regarding the technical reports at the end of June/beginning of July and one evaluation meeting for the Annual Work Plans (AWP) under the new DCMAP at the end of the year are concluded to be necessary. The group thinks that a prolonging of the deadline for the submission of the AWP until the end of November is advisable.



### 3 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXPERT WORKING GROUP

Coming from TOR 1:

<b>1. LM recommendation in relation to the content of MS NP.</b>	
EWG 12-20	Some of the recommendations made by RCM and agreed by LM require substantial modifications of the NP for MS with fisheries in the area. Furthermore, derogations are discussed in the regional context within each RCM, and regional agreement may be given to support these requests. As a consequence, MS concerned may have to resubmit their NP including the follow-up actions with reference to RCM and LM agreements. For a better tracking of the agreements and requirements, STECF-EWG_12-20 recommends LM to include a section in its report on 'Derogations and recommendations with impact on NP' with a table summarising the agreements, specifying the MS concerned and which section of the NP should be modified.
Follow Up Action Needed :	LM
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE, LM
Time Frame	LM Meeting 2013

<b>2. General comment on the pilot study time frame from implementation to evaluation by STECF</b>	
EWG 12-20	When a MS proposes a pilot study in its NP, details of the duration of the study should be given, together with information on when the results are to be expected. This and which STECF Expert Group will be responsible for the evaluation should be included in the guidelines.
Follow Up Action Needed :	MS, DG MARE, STECF
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	MS, STECF EWG on guidelines
Time Frame	2013

<b>3. Changes relating to MS organizations responsible for coordination of the National Programme.</b>	
EWG 12-20	Such changes require a resubmission but only in terms of communication between MS and the Commission. If these are the only changes by the MS and this is clearly stated as the reason for resubmission there should be no need for STECF EWG to review the document. This should be included in the guidelines.
Follow Up Action Needed :	DG MARE, STECF
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	STECF EWG on guidelines
Time Frame	2013

<b>4. DCF historical recommendations and agreements</b>	
EWG 12-20	It's a common concern that some recommendations and agreements are bouncing back every year even though the same issues were discussed and agreed previously. It is understandable that the rules may change from the DCR to the DCF and from the DCF to the DC-MAP, but within a regulation framework, keeping the memory of all the agreements and recommendations in a historical document or a FAQ web-page or any easy-to-access means should be undertaken.
Follow Up Action Needed :	DG MARE, STECF
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE
Time Frame	2013

5. WKPICS3	Considerations for
EWG 12-20	STEF-EWG12-20 recommends WKPICS3 to consider the perceived contradiction between the ranking system for defining the metiers to sample and the survey design based on sampling frames, and come up with practical solutions.
Follow Up Action Needed :	DG MARE, STECF, ICES-WKPICS3
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE
Time Frame	2013

### On TOR 2

STECF EWG 12-20 reviewed all recommendation coming from the 9<sup>th</sup> LM addressed to DG Mare or STECF with the exemption of recommendations dealing with the NEW DCMAP. Unless otherwise stated, STECF 12-20 agrees with those reviewed recommendations.

### LM 8<sup>th</sup> follow up recommendations:

On number 15 (original text in italic, comment/recommendation from EWG 12-20 in bold letters):

*Concerning Sampling of métier related variables: Making usage of the outcome of the Lot 2 pro-ject on VMS and logbook data: In order for all MS to gain the knowledge concluded in the Lot 2 project on VMS and logbook data, the RCM recommends a training workshop on how the different appropri-ate tools can be used. LM 2011: supports this approach and recommends that MS gain experience with the VMS tools dur-ing 2012, before reporting to a workshop in 2013.*

*LM 2012: Not completed and should be taken by SC-RDB*

**STECF EWG 12-20 reminds MS to gain experience with VMS &Logbook tools before the proposed workshop takes place as the experience exchange will be crucial for the success of the Workshop.**

On number 37 (original text in italic, comment/recommendation from EWG 12-20 in bold letters):

*Quality issues : Stock variables - RCM NA recommends DG MARE and STECF to reflect on the construction on a meta information database to hold the details of the national programmes, with the view of eventually replacing the current set of Excel tables.*

*LM 2011: notes that this information will be included in the RDB in future, once filled with MS data.*

*LM 2012: Ongoing. SC-RDB to discuss on sampling plans in the RDB-FishFrame.*

**STECF-EWG\_12-20 stresses that the idea of replacing the current set of Excel tables by standard outputs of the RDB would have the double benefit of insuring the quality of the meta-information and providing a strong incentive to MS for uploading their data into the RDB. Testing such outputs will be undertaken in 2013 within those RCMs having a RDB in place (see section on RDB). Compatibility of excel tables with these outputs should be sought when drafting the details of the DC-MAP. STECF-EWG\_12-20 notes that issues related to the standard outputs and inclusion of new sampling design in the RDB are both dealt**

with in the RCM Baltic recommendation on ‘Standard reports in the Regional database’(see section 3.2.4 of 9<sup>th</sup> LM report)

On number 38 (original text in italic, comment/recommendation from EWG 12-20 in bold letters):

*Concerning Metier variables : Regional ranking - RCM NA recommends STECF to investigate more closely the methods used by MS to deal with <10m transversal variables.*

*LM 2011: recommends that STECF EWG 11-18 discusses this issue and adds a corresponding ToR.*

*LM 2012: To be taken by PGECON in 2013*

**STECF EWG 12-20: As vessels in the <10m segment are not required to complete logbooks some information on transversal variables are lacking for biological studies. The issue concerning such data collection will be dealt in a dedicated workshop<sup>6</sup> early in 2013, and data availability should be re-addressed by RCMs. PGECON should also have a look at these variables, in particular in terms of connection with economic use. What is needed for the economists to be able to fully use the transversal information? They are important**

- for determining to which segment belongs a vessel
- as co-variables for explaining economic results and heterogeneity within segments
- as entry to bio-economic models

**The attendance of economists and biologists is strongly recommended. Conclusions of both - the dedicated workshop and PGECON - should be made available before the June STECF EWG meeting on the DC-MAP (see section 2).**

On number 45 (original text in italic, comment/recommendation from EWG 12-20 in bold letters):

*Concerning Large pelagic issue: Workshop proposal concerning large pelagic sampling: The two groups (RCM LDF and RCM MED&BS) propose a joined workshop among ICCAT representatives, scientists involved in large pelagic sampling, as well as representatives from RCM LDF and RCM MED&BS in order to harmonize the biological sampling issues on large pelagic and specify additional data or modifications that should be included in the future DCF, taking into account the ICCAT requirements for stock assessment.*

*LM 2011: recommends that STECF set up an EWG in 2012.*

*LM 2012: COM to check the follow up. LM doesn't endorse this recommendation as LM considers this as a task for the RCMs. The RCM should invite the relevant end-user to deal with this issue.*

*Given the confusion which RCM is dealing with large pelagic fish. LM requests the Commission in cooperation with the relevant chairs to provide the RCM LDF and RCM Med&BS with a final conclusion where large pelagics are dealt with. The deadline for this decision is the December NC meeting where the decision will be announced.*

**STECF-EWG 12-20: Concerning the large pelagic coordination among RCM Med&BS and RCM LDF, EGW 12-20 refers to the LM 2009 recommendation and supports the decision that all the sampling activities for the large pelagic species, included in Appendix VII of Decision 2010/93/EU for the Mediterranean and Black Sea area (i.e. albacore (ALB), swordfish (SWO), bonito (BON) and bluefin tuna (BFT)), will be managed solely by the RCM Med&BS.**

**RCMLDF will then deal with all other large pelagic species, operating outside the Mediterranean and/or third countries and in international waters, as several tuna fleets operating in the Atlantic or the Indian Ocean and Pacific.**

---

<sup>6</sup> Workshop on Common understanding and statistical methodologies to estimate/re-evaluate transversal data, with a special focus on the small-scale fisheries. Brest, France, 1<sup>st</sup> quarter 2013.

On number 48 (original text in italic, comment/recommendation from EWG 12-20 in bold letters):

*Concerning Economic variables: Data calls - RCM is aware that too many data calls take place each year requiring too much administrative costs to MS, especially having in mind that every data call contains the whole set of data available. Given that the new DCF does not oblige for the data to be destroyed after 20 days, the Group does not realize why the same set of data are required more than once in the same year and in different formats every time. The Group suggests that one coordinated data call takes place each year.*

*LM 2011: recognizes the observed differences in Data Calls and the Commission will follow-up.*

*LM 2012: The issue raised has improved but still ongoing*

**STECF EWG 12-20 agrees with the recommendation and suggests taking this approach also for biological and transversal variable data calls. The EWG further recommends going further and to omit the data call structure and to replace it by deadline only. Data calls would only be made in exceptional cases. MS should be able to submit biological and economic data whenever they are available rather than being restricted to a defined time window. Moreover, MS would be able to update older data whenever better data are available. This approach would have another advantage: Both recent data and amended older data can be made available earlier compared to the data call approach.**

### **On recommendations from 9<sup>th</sup> LM**

On the recommendation: Feedback from data end users: Time period for provision of data (see 9<sup>th</sup> LM report, section 3.2.2 RCM MED&BS, page 25)

<b>6. Feedback from data end users: Time period for provision of data</b>	
RCM Med&BS 2012 recommendation	RCM Med&BS, recalling its 2011 recommendation and also the STECF EWG 11-20 recommendation on a harmonized time period required for data to be available for transmission to end-users, recommends that the time period of 6 months following the end of the collection of transversal and biological data is respected by the data calls and the end users. In case this time period of 6 months continues not being respected by the data calls, the Group stresses the importance that the National Correspondents follow a common approach requesting the respect of this time period and NOT submit the data.
Follow Up Action Needed:	LM to consider
Responsible For Follow Up Action:	JRC, DG MARE, LM, MS, RCM Med&BS, National Correspondents.
Time frame (Deadline):	
LM 2012 comments	LM doesn't endorse this recommendation. This issue should be taken up between the Commission and MS involved while taking into account current agreements in RCM Med&BS as well as current and future regulations and legal obligations.
STECF 12-20 comments	STECF EWG 12-20 agrees with the request for an agreed deadline for the provision of data to end users. This should be achieved by MS and end users at the appropriate RCM but should take into account deadlines as outlined in MS NP's and any

<b>6. Feedback from data end users: Time period for provision of data</b>	
	legal obligations under the current legislation.

**On recommendations by PGECON**

**1. PGECON 2012**

*Recommendation*

*The group suggested to consider the RCM as the legal group tackling biological variables while another group (like PGECON) should be set up for economic issues only. Who should attend this legal group (Eurostat participation could be useful) and how decisions should be taken within the group should be clarified by the new regulation.*

*LM 2012 comments*

*In terms of number of participants (27 experts from 16 Member States), PGECON can be considered a success. A concern remains that biological and economic data collection need to remain interconnected. It was considered whether bio-economic models should be included in the DCF. Thus the needed connection between economic data and biological data becomes more transparent*

**STECF-EWG1220 agrees that if economic issues be completely separated from RCM's, leaving them only for PGECON, it will have a negative effect on coherence between economic and biological information as well as leaving no perspective to bio-economic models. Interconnection could be reached by addressing more tor's concerning transversal and economic data in RCM's or inviting to attend a group of biologist e.g. to PGECON or a respective STECF EWG accordingly creating tasks for bio-economic issues.**

**2. PGECON 2012**

*Recommendation*

*PGECON recommended that if Ecosystem Indicator will be kept in the future DCF, then the name of the indicator should be changed into "value of landings per fuel cost"*

*LM 2012 comments*

*No specific comment from LM*

**STECF-EWG 12-20: The coefficient under consideration is called "fuel efficiency of fish capture". In fact, the name should be adjusted, but prior to that it should be evaluated whether the coefficient is really needed. Moreover, it should be checked whether the coefficient is the most useful one in this context. It appears possible that another coefficient might be more helpful, e.g. weight of catch/volume of fuel consumed.**

**3. PGECON 2012**

*Recommendation*

*"direct subsidies" should include:*

*refunds of fuel duty, subsidies for temporary cessation, socio-economic compensation for fishermen*

*"direct subsidies" should exclude:*

*Fuel tax exemption ,Subsidies for permanent cessation of fishing activities, investment subsidies (fleet modernization)*

*LM 2012 comments*

*No specific comment from LM*

**STECF-EWG1220 agrees with the clarification of „direct subsidies“ definition.**

#### 4. PGECON 2012

##### *Recommendation*

*Participants analyzed the prices per capacity unit estimated in different countries. This exercise showed that there still exist differences in the application of the method. This comparative exercise should be repeated also during the next year meeting.*

##### *LM 2012 comments*

*Question to PGECON: If errors are found during this exercise, will MS adjust their capacity data retrospective*

**STECF-EWG 1220 agree with an open question regarding the need for a comparative exercise concerning “price per capacity unit” to take place on the next year PGECON meeting.**

#### 5. PGECON 2012

##### *Recommendation*

*A comparison of the quality indicators achieved by MS was carried out by PGECON in order to share experiences and to improve the surveys implemented at national level. The group considered useful to repeat this exercise in the next PGECON.*

##### *LM 2012 comments*

*No specific comment from LM*

**STECF-EWG 1220 agrees that the comparison of quality indicators regarding economic variables is a useful exercise to monitor quality.**

#### 6. PGECON 2012

##### *Recommendation*

*As general recommendation, the group considered that the inclusion of additional variables in the new DCMAP should depend on a cost-benefit analysis, where the specific objectives and needs for each variable should be considered.*

##### *LM 2012 comments*

*There should be a close liaison between the Commission and PGECON to establish which new variables are desired by the Commission and what the expected costs are to collect these variables according to PGECON. Both socio economic indicators and spatial indicators may be needed by the Commission as new variables. The Commission is working on a cost benefit analysis for socio economic indicators.*

**STECF-EWG 1220 agrees with LM comment on necessity of a thorough cost benefit analysis on the collection of additional variables.**

#### 7. PGECON 2012

##### *Recommendation*

*In case there exists in a Member States a fleet segment with a very low productivity and/or a very low of activity, it should be possible to estimate economic data with no obligation to collect them through a specific survey. The threshold in activity or in production, as well as models for estimations, should be agreed at regional level within a well established legal framework.*

##### *LM 2012 comments*

*The LM supported this suggestion.*

**STECF-EWG 1220 agrees with the LM comment.**

#### 8. PGECON 2012

*Recommendation*

*PGECON suggested that the DCF should not be altered with respect to the resolution requirements as it is practically impossible to get comprehensive cost data for higher resolution scales. It is considered essential to keep the current segmentation of the fleet also to ensure consistency on data series.*

*LM 2012 comments*

*The list of current variables collected should be discussed with endusers to determine whether all the variables collected now are needed. There are some concerns about the access MS have to fishermen accounts. Accountants are more reluctant to provide data. This should be discussed in the next PGECON.*

**STECF-EWG 12-20 agrees with the issues and proposals made by LM2012.**

**On TOR 4**

<b>7. Suitable venues for evaluation meetings</b>	
EWG 12-20	STECF EWG meetings need suitable venues that allow efficient working. This includes internet connection, that shared drives or ftp servers are available, suitable desks and seats and fresh air, beamer etc. In particular, evaluation meetings need at least two rooms of this kind (beamer, suitable desk and seats, internet access etc.) to ensure sub-groups can work efficiently. This was not available at EWG 12-20 and also EWG 11-19.
Follow Up Action Needed :	DG MARE, STECF-Secretariat
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE, STECF-Secretariat
Time Frame	Schedule for Meetings 2013

<b>8. Postpone deadline for AWP submission</b>	
STECF EWG 12-20 recommendation	In order to fulfil the coming requirements of the new DCMAP in the first year appropriately, EWG 12-20 recommends to postpone the deadline for submission of the AWP to end of November 2013
Follow Up Action Needed:	STECF, DG MARE
Responsible For Follow Up Action:	DG MARE
Time frame (Deadline):	Before new DCMAP implementation

<b>9. Development of guidelines for new DCMAP</b>
---



<b>9. Development of guidelines for new DCMAP</b>	
STECF-EWG 12-20 recommendation	The Guidelines group for the new DCMAP should start immediately after acceptance of results from "STECF-EWG 13-xx new DCMAP review part 3", shall take part in the "STECF-EWG 13-xx new DCMAP review part 4" meeting, and finish intersessionally about end of July/mid of August in order to be ready before RCMs take place.
Follow Up Action Needed:	DG MARE, STECF, JRC
Responsible For Follow Up Action:	DG MARE
Time frame (Deadline):	Before RCMs 2013

<b>10. EWG meeting on eligible surveys</b>	
STECF EWG 12-20 recommendation	In order to review the list of eligible surveys under new DCMAP, by having in mind that RCMs 2012 have already compiled a list for the respective areas (TOR 8 of RCMs 2012), STECF EWG 12-20 recommends an EWG meeting in order to evaluate those lists and come up with a list of eligible surveys under DCMAP.
Follow Up Action Needed:	STECF, DG MARE; JRC
Responsible For Follow Up Action:	DG MARE
Time frame (Deadline):	Before new DCMAP implementation

## 4 INTRODUCTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCES

### 4.1 Introduction

Data collection currently occurs under the Data Collection Framework (DCF)<sup>7</sup> and the multi-annual Union programme for data collection established there under.<sup>8</sup> The Second Financial Instrument for the CFP funds the DCF.<sup>9</sup>

Member States establish DCF National Programmes in accordance with provisions of the multi-annual Union programme for data collection (*Article 4 of Council Regulation 199/2008*). Revisions to the DCF 2011-2013 National Programmes for 2013 were submitted by some Member States to the Commission by 31/10/2012 (in accordance with *Article 5 of Council Regulation 199/2008*). The main aim of this EWG is to evaluate these revisions to the DCF 2011-2013 National Programmes for 2013 in terms of conformity and scientific relevance.

Further the progress of the Regional Database will be presented to the group and possible actions discussed. Additionally the relevant recommendations from the 9<sup>th</sup> Liaisons meeting, the RCMs and PGECON will be reviewed. Finally the time schedule and content of next year's meetings of this EWG will be discussed and assessed. Issues under AOB did not occur.

---

<sup>7</sup>Council Regulation 199/2008 concerning the establishment of a Community framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the Common Fisheries Policy and Commission Regulation 665/2008 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation 199/2008.

<sup>8</sup> Commission Decision 93/2010 adopting a multiannual Community programme for the collection, management, and use of data in the fisheries sector for the period 2011-2013.

<sup>9</sup> Council Regulation 861/2006 establishing Community financial measures for the implementation of the common fisheries policy and the Law of the Sea and Commission Regulation 1078/2008 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation 861/2006 as regards the expenditure incurred by Member States for the collection and management of basic fisheries data

## 4.2 Terms of Reference for EWG-12-20

### Scientific Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

#### Expert Working Group (EWG)

STECF – EWG 12- 20

10<sup>th</sup> December to 14<sup>th</sup> December 2012

Brussels, Belgium

#### Terms of Reference

##### 1. Evaluation of revised DCF National Programmes for 2013

To evaluate the proposed amendments to the 2011-2013 National Programmes (NP) for the year 2013 submitted under the Data Collection Framework (Council Regulation (EC) 199/2008) using the '*Guidelines and Procedures*' developed in SGRN 09-03<sup>10</sup> as well as the '*Guidelines on amendment of National Programmes 2011-2013 for the year 2013*', reviewed by EWG 12-08. The evaluation with regard to the latter is to determine whether a resubmission of the 2011-2013 National Programmes (NP) for the year 2013 is required. The evaluation will be based on the overarching criteria of conformity and scientific relevance.

The 2011 to 2013 NP have already been evaluated (SGRN 10-01)<sup>11</sup> and this review will focus on revisions made to the original programmes and to the former amendments (which have been already evaluated during EWG 11-19).

##### 2. Comments made by LM and RCM's

To review the comments and action points made by the 2012 RCM's and the Liaison Meeting in order to ensure that these recommendations are followed up.

##### 3. Regional Data Bases

Review of the progress on the development of Regional Databases (RDBs) following the RDB Steering Group Meetings and the RDB Workshops, as well as the discussions at the 2012 RCMs and the 2012 Liaison Meeting on this issue.

##### 4. Topics to consider for next year's meetings

Develop a schedule of actions to be implemented by STECF EWGs and STECF Plenaries in 2013, in preparation of the adoption and implementation of the DC-MAP.

---

<sup>10</sup> Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) - Report of Sub-group on Research Needs (SGECA/SGRN 09-03). Review of Guidelines for the National Programs and Technical Reports under the Data Collection Framework. (eds. Vigneau, J. & Raid, T.). 2009. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg, EUR 24101 EN, JRC 55709, 138 pp.

<sup>11</sup> Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) - Evaluation of 2011-2013 National Programmes linked to the Data Collection Framework - Report of the Subgroup on ResearchNeeds (SGRN 10-01) (eds Connolly, P. & Virtanen, J.). 2011. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 24723 EN, JRC 63264, 248 pp.

STECF EWG scheduled for 2013 are (*tentative*):

- DC-MAP 2014-2020 Review (1) - April 2013
- Evaluation of 2012 MS technical reports related to the DCF & DC-MAP 2014-2020 Review (2) – End June 2013
- Assessment of AWP's under the DC-MAP - November 2013

## **5. AOB**

## 5 REVIEW OF NP AMENDMENTS

### 5.1 Comments and remarks by country / Review of biological sections

#### Slovenia

##### Review of biological sections

- Only the section on recreational fisheries is updated. The revised text brings only more detailed descriptions of the actions to be undertaken. This revision is not significant enough for resubmission of the National Programme.

##### Review of Economic sections

- There are no revisions for Economic, Transversal, Aquaculture and Processing Industry.

#### Ireland

##### Review of biological sections

- Section on proposed amendments should refer to the sections of the report modified. As an example of consequences, it is difficult to assess to which section refers the changes of reference years and figures in the salmon fishery.
- Section III.A. Description of the fleet. Update
- Section III.C. Metier variables. Split one métier into one with a selection device and one without, not affecting the overall sampling effort. The tables III.C reflect the split, but the naming convention used does not follow the RCM rules.
- Section III.D. Recreational fisheries. Three requests for derogations on the sampling of recreational Eel, Sharks and Sea Bass. These are based on the fact that the first two fisheries are on a catch and release basis and the other due to the low numbers of fish angled and the disperse nature of the fishery. *“Ireland presented a request for derogation from sampling recreational fisheries for sea bass, eel and sharks. RCM NA discussed the requests and concluded that the requests could be granted.”*(LM 2012). STECF-EWG12-20 supports the LM position.
- Section III.E. Stock variables. Inclusion of a Boar fish *Capros aper* pilot study for biological sampling. This action is a response to a RCM NA 2012 recommendation.
- Section III.G. Surveys. Spatial changes to the three underwater TV surveys, supported by WGNPHS. STECF-EWG12-20 agrees with the proposed changes, and recommends that in future, the MS conforms to the standard reporting structure breakdown.
- STECF-EWG12-20 agrees that MS had to resubmit their NP and supports the changes proposed.

##### Review of Economic sections

- Section III.B.1 - Change on the definition of direct subsidies by including direct payment. STECF-EWG 12-20 considers the amendment justified and as improvement of the NP;
- Section III.B.1. - Target and frame population. Change from probability survey to non-probability survey. STECF-EWG 12-20 does not have enough information to conclude if this revision would affect

the quality of the NP. STECF-EWG 12-20 would advise the MS to give more information next year in the respective Annual Report. STECF-EWG 12-20 considers that it is a Substantial revision.

- Section III.B.1. - Changes on data source. MS will use questionnaire to collect data instead of companies accounts, to collect data on : Other income, Wages and salaries of crew, Energy costs, Repair and maintenance costs, Variable costs, Non-variable costs, Value of physical capital: depreciated replacement value, Value of physical capital: depreciated historical value, Investments in physical capital, Debt/Asset ratio. This improves the NP.
- Section III.B.1. - Change in reference year (e.g. the 2013 programme will be based on the fleet register on the January 1st 2012). STECF-EWG 12-20 consider the change justified and that improves the NP
- Also change on clustering, MS proposes a new clustering scheme by presenting a total of 23 fleet segments instead of 14 originally presented. STECF-EWG 12-20 advises MS not to cluster these segments since the procedure is not in line with the guidelines on clustering coming from the EU Decision.
- Section III.B.1. - MS erased some explanatory paragraphs on “sentinel vessels” (p14), and on the “determination of sample size” (p15). Taking into account the impact this modification may have on the clustering process, EWG considers further explanations are needed.
- Section III.B.2. - MS includes additional raising procedures along with the Horvitz-Thompson estimator. STECF-EWG 12-20 recommends that additional information, such as the identification of the procedures and the algorithm formulation, is provided.

#### **Aquaculture and Processing Industry sections**

- Section IV.A.2. - Type of data collection. MS presented a modification on the data source. Instead of running two distinct surveys, MS proposes to have a single questionnaire, encapsulated within a two-component survey form, census and a sampling survey. STECF-EWG 12-20 agrees with the new approach. STECF-EWG 12-20 considers this is a Substantial revision and it is improving the NP.
- Section IV.A.2. - Sampling Stratification and allocation scheme – Due to confidentiality issues MS is segmenting the aquaculture units according to main activity, therefore some aquaculture culture techniques indicated as occurring in Ireland are included in segments with other similar entities in terms of size and culture method. The segmentation in the NP should follow the segmentation by species and techniques as regulation requires. In the NP planned clustering could be already described, but it should be very clear what the original population of the respective segments is. E.g. Table IV.A.1 indicates on growing for other marine fish. This is not reflected in table IV.A.2. Furthermore, IV.A.1 presents cages-salmon, but this is not mentioned in IV.A.2. This also occurs for mussels raft, other fresh water fish etc. MS is asked to clearly describe where segmentation has been done according to main activity (this is according the regulation/guidelines) and where it clustered segments/farms and in the latter case original population should be mentioned. For the presentation and data delivery it should be indicated, that entities have been merged and a reference to the NP should be made. STECF-EWG 12-20 considers this as substantial.
- Section IV.A.3. - MS modified the estimation method for variable unpaid labour. STECF-EWG 12-20 agrees with the modification.(justified but does not improve the NP)

**Ireland has some substantial revisions in their NP as above.**

#### **Greece**

##### Review of biological sections

- This is not a resubmission of the NP proposal for 2013, but the original proposal for 2011-2013 adopted by the Commission and not implemented so far. STECF-EWG 12-20 review refers here to the appropriateness of the NP 2013 with the recent developments and recommendations by STECF and RCM and other relevant expert groups.
- As a first stage before the implementation of the 2013 NP, Greece should undertake the ranking system with most recent set of data (at least with landings and effort data and strictly follow the metier naming convention as agreed at regional level) and adjust the sampling plan accordingly.
- During the implementation year, Greece should
  - follow the new MEDITS Scientific survey Guidelines;
  - review any updated recommendation on the coordination of Medits and Medias surveys and the relevant working groups (especially for ecosystem indicators<sup>1,2,3</sup>) and make sure that these are taken into account in the implementation of the NP;
  - Review and consider all relevant RCMED&BS 2011 and 2012 recommendations, including participation in the development of the Med&BS RDB (Mediterranean and Black Sea Regional database);
  - Clarify if action presented as a pilot study for eel in the first submission of the NP for 2011 is going to be carried out in 2013.
- STECF-EWG12-20 considers that the NP 2013 does not need to be resubmitted unless the update of the ranking and the follow-up of recommendations result in significant changes to the programme.

#### Review of Economic sections

- Section III.B.1 - MS should amend the definition of FTE. It is stated that National FTE calculation will be based on 2000 hours per year. This procedure should be applied for harmonized FTE, whereas national FTE is based on the national reference level for FTE working hours. In the Greece's case it should be derived as average number of hours of work per crewman per day at sea estimated through questionnaires.
- Section III.B.2 - In table III.B.3 data source section, for several variables (e.g. Number, Mean LOA, Mean vessel's tonnage/power/age) MS presents the type of data collection scheme instead of proper data source. E.g. census is mentioned as data source, but census is a collection scheme and no data source. MS may mean a national or European administrative (fleet) register, where all information has to be provided. But then the source would be fleet register or similar and not census. For such sections MS is asked to clarify the data source in III.B.3 table.
- Section IV.B.1 - Data acquisition sector for fish processing industry, MS refers the clustering to the Appendix XII which does not provide any information about the sector segmentation. If MS intends (although is not necessary) to apply the segmentation it must be done according guidelines which allow to segment according to the number of employees in the enterprise. Therefore MS is asked to amend data acquisition section IV.B.1 and table IV.B.2 of NP.

**For Greece National Programme it was found one substantial inadequacy in section IV.B.1, table IV.B.2., other remarks were of minor importance.**

#### **Finland**

##### Review of biological sections

- Section III.G. change in survey vessel and international task-sharing concerning BIAS survey in area SD 30. STECF-EWG12-20 supports the initiative by Finland to continue the survey despite the difficulties in 2012, and seek a permanent solution. Coordination is required between Sweden and Finland in order to resolve the situation relating to vessel use and survey duration for BIAS survey. STECF-EWG12-20 recommends Sweden and Finland to include a joint section outlining the interim solution and alternatives should a new Finnish vessel not be available. STECF-EWG12-20 recommends that

intercalibration and survey design issues are discussed in the forthcoming WGBIFS March 2013 meeting. Clarification from the EC is needed on the eligibility for funding of the echo-sounding equipment proposed by MS.

- Section III.E. Proposed changes for sampling stock-related variables for sprat from commercial catches, based on the Finlands small share of quota and landings and continue sampling from the surveys. STECF-EWG12-20 supports the proposal and remarks that this should not be regarded as a derogation but as an RCM agreement. In consequence, section VIII needs not to be amended.
- STECF-EWG12-20 agrees that MS had to resubmit their NP, supports the changes proposed and recommends the inclusion of a new text on the joint BIAS survey.

#### Review of Economic sections

- Section III.B.1. - Tables III.B.1. and III.B.3. have been modified.
- This is an improvement of the NP as the tables appear to contain more recent figures.

#### **Transversal section**

- Section III.F.1. - Table III.F.1 has been modified (yellow colour), but no further explanation of changes is provided. MS should explain it in the Annual Report.

#### **Aquaculture and Processing Industry sections**

- Section IV.A.2. - MS has modified the segmentation: Combined (food fish and juvenile production) + Natural food ponds (inland) which improves the NP
- Section IV.A.3. - Table IV.A.3. has been modified (yellow colour), but no further explanation of changes is given. MS should provide a clarification in the Annual Report.
- Sections IV.A.2-IV.A.3. – the sampling frame has been modified, which can be regarded as an improvement.
- Section IV.B.2. - Table IV.B.2. has been modified (yellow colour), but no further explanation of changes is provided. MS should explain in the Annual Report.
- Section IV.B.2. - The reference year is not well presented
- Section IV.B.2.c. The production survey is conducted biennially and the last survey was implemented in 2012 with 2011 data. STECF-EWG12-20 advises MS to provide more information and explanations how Finland will provide data for 2012. MS should explain it in the next Annual Report. (Substantial revision)

**Except for one substantial revision in paragraph IV.B.2.(c), the revised National Programme of Finland contains only minor changes.**

#### **Malta**

##### Review of biological sections

- Section III.C. Metier sampling derogation for trolling lines and hand and pole lines. Clarification is needed on the arguments brought for the derogation request, since the table figures in table III.C.1 contradicts the text (metiers selected by effort or by value). In either case, under the current regulation, STECF-EWG12-20 cannot support the request for derogation. STECF-EWG12-20 recommends MS to review relevant expert groups having dealt with sampling design, such as WKPICS and WKPICS2, and modify tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 accordingly. See also general comment on ....
- Section III.C. MS will conduct pilot studies on selected metiers to evaluate the magnitude of discards, following RCM recommendations. STECF-EWG12-20 agrees with the approach taken by MS.



- Section III.E. Request for exclusion of sampling of certain species of Group 1, group 2 and Group 3, for stock-related variables (weight, age, maturity and sex-ratio), based on the Regulation exclusion rule. STECF-EWG12-20 supports the proposal and remarks that this should not be regarded as a derogation but as an RCM agreement. However, MS should recognise that length sampling is a métier-related variable and is compulsory for all G1 and G2 species and those additional G3 species as agreed at the regional level, and MS should sample for length accordingly. This will have an implication on data collection for length and on the table III.C.5 where the mention 'not applicable' is not a valid entry.
- STECF-EWG12-20 agrees that MS had to resubmit their NP and requests updating of the NP 2013 for the elements detailed above.

#### Review of Economic sections

- Section III.B.1. MS has changed some explanations for Investments and Financial Position
- Section III.B.1. MS describes further the number of fishing enterprises/units
- Section III.B.1.b. Type of data collection: MS has mentioned that census will be applied
- Section III.B.1.b. Type of sampling strategy: MS has provided more details on Capital costs, replacement and historic capital values which were also excluded from such sampling strategy as these variables are calculated according to the PIM methodology as proposed in the capital valuation report of study No FISH/2005/03.
- Section III.B. Estimation: MS has proposed possibilities to estimate the capital cost (PIM Method) and the capital value (PIM Method) and investments and the financial position (This will also contain the purchase of new engines, equipment and gear )

#### **Aquaculture and Processing Industry sections**

- Section IV.A. Data sources: MS has deleted the reference to the 1<sup>st</sup> January.
- Section IV.A. Target and frame population: MS has included species 'Amberjack' in the segment 'other marine fish cages'.
- Section IV.B. Definition: MS has rewritten the definition for Net investment by including vehicles.
- Section IV.B. Imputation of non-responses: MS has taken out the average values of segments to take account the average values. STECF-EWG1220 recommends MS to detail this option and to provide more information next year in the respective annual report.

**Regarding the guidelines, STECF-EWG1220 concludes that the revisions are minor.**

**In general revisions are acceptable for Malta.**

#### **Sweden**

##### Review of biological sections

- Section on proposed amendments should refer to the sections of the report modified.
- Section III.G. Change in survey vessel and international task-sharing concerning BIAS survey in area SD 30. Coordination is required between Sweden and Finland in order to resolve the situation relating to vessel use and survey duration for BIAS survey. STECF-EWG12-20 recommends Sweden and Finland to include a joint section outlining the interim solution and alternatives should a new Finnish vessel not be available.
- STECF-EWG12-20 agrees that MS had to resubmit their NP, supports the changes proposed and recommends the inclusion of a new text on the joint BIAS survey.

##### Review of Economic sections

- MS has changed the development of databases, divided into two institutes. STECF-EWG 12-20: this revision is minor for the Swedish National Program but it could explain the additional costs of the program.

## UK

### Review of biological sections

- Section III.C. Biological Metier variable. MS intends to shift from quota sampling to probability based sampling in line with the post recent developments in sampling design (WKPICS & WKPIDS). STECF-EWG12-20 agrees with this approach and is of the opinion that UK implementation could serve as an example for all the MS.
- No endorsement by STECF or the Commission is provided for ending the pelagic onboard observer programme as from 2012. MS is asked to clarify / seek approval by RCM.
- The request for derogation for sampling HMD\_MOL and DRB\_MOL metier was supported by a working document presented and agreed at both RCM NA and RCM NS&EA 2012 meetings. STECF agrees with the approach taken by MS.
- Section III.D. MS will not carry out any sampling programme for recreational fisheries in 2013, stating that the large 2012 programme needs to be evaluated before going further. STECF-EWG12-20 recognizes that sampling design for recreational fisheries is still work on progress (ref ICES WGRFS 2012) and that the approach taken by MS to interpret the data in order to assist the setting of an appropriate survey design is scientifically sound.
- Section III.G. The modification of the UKQ1WCCSMGS survey proposed by MS is already endorsed by STECF plenary meeting.
- The modifications of the groundgear, sweeps configuration and survey design of the DCF co-funded Scottish Western IBTS (IBTS Q1) and IBTS Q4 has caused major problems in the assessment process. The consequence of these changes is that both surveys are seen as being ended in 2010 and 2011 respectively (in ICES WGCSE report 2012). The consequences on the eligible list of surveys funded through the DCF must be evaluated by STECF.
- STECF-EWG12-20 agrees that MS had to resubmit their NP and requests clarification as to the reasoning for cessation of sampling for pelagic vessels at sea.

### Review of Economic sections

## **Aquaculture and Processing Industry sections**

- Section IV.A. - the MS will conduct a pilot study in 2013 to improve the data collection following the request coming from STECF 12-13. STECF-EWG12-20 expects that the pilot studies will improve the quality of data next year to meet the guidelines and it will improve the NP. MS should provide further information on the impact of this study in the next annual report. The further results should be in line with data collection
- Section IV.A. - Tables IV.A.2. and IV.A.3. have been modified in response to Commission queries (ARES(2012)367272 (29/03/2012)) and improve the National Program.

**These changes are substantial.**

## Spain

### Review of biological sections

- Section III.C. Adjustment of sampling effort in the North-East Atlantic to optimise the sampling design against actual fleet activity. STECF-EWG12-20 agrees with the approach but suggests that the modified text should be positioned in the relevant section of the NP.

- Information on the termination of the pilot study of the tuna fleet Atlantic and Indian Oceans. STECF-EWG12-20 recommends that the outcomes of the pilot study be given as an annex of the Annual Report 2012, detailing the steps taken by MS in term of routine data collection for this fleet. See also general comment.
- Section III.D. Information on the termination of the pilot study on recreational fisheries for eel. STECF-EWG12-20 recommends that the outcomes of the pilot study be given as an annex of the Annual Report 2012, detailing the steps taken by MS in term of routine data collection for this fleet. See also general comment.
- Section III.G. Information on the possible change of a vessel for the PELACUS acoustic survey. STECF-EWG12-20 recommends that the issue be brought to the chairperson of the working group WGACEGG with all detailed information in advance of the survey.
- STECF-EWG12-20 is of the opinion that updating information on the follow-up of RCM and optimisation of sampling design based on the most recent information are not sufficient reasons for resubmitting a NP.

#### Review of Economic sections

- There are no revisions for Economic, Transversal, Aquaculture and Processing Industry.

## 6 REGIONAL DATABASE

### 6.1 Regional database (RDB-FishFrame)

The Steering Committee for the Regional database (RDB-FishFrame) met in December 2012. The ToR of the meeting was:

**The steering committee (SC) for the regional database (RDB) met 6-7<sup>th</sup> of December 2012 in Copenhagen in order to**

- a) Respond to recommendations put forward to the SC by the Liaison meeting and summarise how FishFrame has been used in the regional coordination meetings
- b) Update the data policy document dealing with access rights, data confidentiality and data ownership issues.
- c) Develop a strategy including a work plan for a road map on development of FishFrame, taking requirements from a design based approach to sampling and raising into account.
- d) Plan and agree on ToRs for the RDB workshops 2013
- e) Agree on ToRs for the SC 2013

The following gives a summary of the outcome of the meeting relevant for STECF EWG 12-20. As no draft- or final report was available before the STECF EWG 12-20 meeting, the summary is based on personal notes from the meeting. Only point b), c) and d) is found relevant for this section as point a) is covered elsewhere in the STECF EWG 12-20 meeting report (by point 2 at the ToR). Point e) is at present not yet finalized.

Comments from the National Correspondents from Spain, France, Portugal and Belgium were submitted to SCRDB. Most comments were concerned data confidentiality issues and particularly the definitions of users and the data access rights of each group. The SCRDB has mapped the following user groups to various data access rights:

User groups	Access roles in RDB	Data access level	Entrance condition
RCMs + key persons in DG-MARE	<b>National Data editor</b>	Unlimited access to data from all countries	Password required
ICES Advisory Working groups (specifically excluding Science expert group)	<b>National Data editor</b>	Unlimited access to data from all countries	Password required
STECF	<b>Data reader</b>	Access to all reports of aggregated data available in the report module	Password required
Everyone else	<b>guest</b>	Only access to tables giving the overview of the content of the data in the database	No password required

It was not clear if all members of e.g. a RCM should have unrestricted access to data in the database or just key-representatives for the group.

Recently, in the light of the outcome of WKPICS I and II and other Wks, the usefulness of the quota based stratification of the sampling and raising structure in RDB-FishFrame has been questioned. Some countries have already start the process towards a design based sampling scheme and processing and it is expected that the new

DCMAP will support the design based sampling approach. The present status of RDB-FishFrame in concern of the capability to cope with various sampling schemes and strategies is:

- Countries can upload and process data in FishFrame if quota based sampling schemes are used;
- The present Exchange format and processing modules do not support a design based sampling approach;

The consequences are that:

- Almost all countries were able to respond on the data call (July 2012) for upload of data even though some countries had to massage the data in order to comply with the Exchange Format.
- Not all countries can at present use FishFrame for processing data due to coding and sampling strategy issues;
- The RCM work on regional coordination can be supported because the FishFrame output sampling overview reports are based on non-raised data.

To allow design based sampling to be supported by RDB includes rather substantial changes in the database processing modules and some changes in the Exchange format too. The SCRDB suggests a stepwise approach for the development: the first step is the most crucial modification of the existing CS-files in the Exchange Format so it will be able to hold information needed for supporting the design based sampling approach. This will allow all countries to upload data with only minor compiling of sampling data and this means that the RDB will be able to support the RCM work. The next steps will be to develop processing modules (internal or external to the RDB) in order to be able to raise the data and support e.g. assessment WGs. Later on it might be needed to make substantial changes in the Exchange Format in order to make it more flexible for accommodating various models of statistical sound sampling and raising strategies.

In order to deal with the long perspective a “think tank” has been established in order to scrutinize the possibility to re-think the upload aggregation level, to re-design the database architecture and raising procedures in order to comply completely with statistical sound sampling schemes and subsequent statistical correct central or decentralize processing.

In order to be able to work in a more continuous manner and to reduce the response time, the SCRDB has decided to establish a number of sub-groups, which Intercessional shall work with the issues mentioned above.

Three RDB workshops will be eligible in 2013. The first one will be a hands-on workshop dealing with upload of data based on the revised Exchange Format. This workshop will support the data call prior to the RCM meetings in the autumn 2013. The terms of reference of the remaining two workshops will be decided when the draft of the new DCMAP is published and the intercessional sub-groups has come up with the new revised Exchange Format.

## **6.2 Mediterranean and Black Sea Regional databases (Med&BS RDB)**

The first Steering Committee for the Mediterranean & Black Sea Regional Database (Med&BS RDB) was held 29th – 30th November 2012 in Rome, at GFCM headquarters (General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean),

The Steering Committee (SC) was established during RCM Med&BS 2012 (Madrid, July 2012), and it includes one person per MS, at least one economist for transversal data, the chairs of MEDIAS and MEDITS scientific surveys and a GFCM representative.

During the meeting the priority issues have been evaluated in order to establish a regional database in the region: what type of data should be stored in the database and what can be done with the data in the database.

After a background review of the RDB under the current Data Collection Framework has been carried out, an overview on the database structure (e.g. typology of data, level of aggregation, confidentiality...) in each country was conducted. Thereafter the SC discussed the possible implementation of a Regional Data Base for the Mediterranean and Black Sea area: contents, priorities and needs (link with RCM Med&BS, Liaison meeting and GFCM).

During the meeting the governance for the Med&BS RDB has been discussed and the identification of the body responsible for the development of the data processing features within the database.

SC agreed on the possibilities that RDB could be hosted by GFCM and managed by the SC. GFCM should provide human resources, technical expertise and IT infrastructure that can be updated in order to provide database development, administration and security.

A first draft of a Data Policy document has been also proposed and discussed. The goal of this policy is to define how the data uploaded into the RDB Med&BS could be stored and used in accordance with agreement made between the data submitters, data users and host.

SC agreed that the RCMMed&BS should be responsible for the content governance of the RDB, while SC should be responsible for the technical governance. RCMMed&BS should be responsible for deciding data access and sharing policy levels. RCMMed&BS should also prioritize and develop road maps for data uploads as well as identify areas for development.

The SC proposed that the MED&BS RDB should include, as a first step, biological and transversal data the format of which will be discussed during the second meeting with final approval by RCMMed&BS. In relation to the inclusion of survey data, it has been decided to await the decision of the respective WGs (MEDITS and MEDIAS) given that a regional database for surveys is under development. For the economic data it has been decided to wait for the final decision of the next RCMMed&BS which will be taking into account the outputs of PGECON 2012.

## **7 STECF EWG SCHEDULE FOR 2013**

- DC-MAP 2014-2020 Review (1) – March 11<sup>th</sup> -15<sup>th</sup> 2013
- DC-MAP 2014-2020 Review (2) – 10<sup>th</sup> -14<sup>th</sup> of June 2013
- Evaluation of 2012 MS technical reports related to the DCF beginning of July
- Assessment of AWP's under the DC-MAP (December?)

<b>Invited experts</b>			
Name	Address	Telephone no.	<a href="#">Email</a>
Paolo CARPENTIERI	MIPAF Viale dell'Università 32 ROME Italy		<a href="mailto:paolo.carpentieri@uniroma1.it">paolo.carpentieri@uniroma1.it</a>
Irina DAVIDJUKA	Fish Resources Research Department Daugavgrivas 8 LV- 1048 RIGA Latvia	Tel +371 67617527 Fax +371 67616946	<a href="mailto:irina.davidjuka@bior.gov.lv">irina.davidjuka@bior.gov.lv</a>
Edvardas KAZLAUSKAS	Agriinformation and Rural Business Center V. Kudirkos str. 18 LT03105 VILNIUS Lithuania	Tel +37037397087 Fax +37037406691	<a href="mailto:edvardas.kazlauskas@vic.lt">edvardas.kazlauskas@vic.lt</a>
Emmanuel KOUTRAKIS	NAGREF Fisheries Research Institute Nea Peramos 64007 KAVALA Greece	Tel +302594022691 Fax +302594022222	<a href="mailto:manosk@inale.gr">manosk@inale.gr</a>
Gheorghe RADU	NIMRD Grigore Antipa Constanta Mamaia 300 900581 CONSTANTA Romania	Tel +40241543288 Fax +40241831274	<a href="mailto:gpr@alpha.rmri.ro">gpr@alpha.rmri.ro</a>
Tiit RAID	Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu		<a href="mailto:tiit.raid@gmail.com">tiit.raid@gmail.com</a>
Joel VIGNEAU	IFREMER Avenue du General de Gaulle 14520 PORT-EN- BESSIN France	Tel +332 315156 00 Fax +332315156 01	<a href="mailto:Joel.Vigneau@ifremer.fr">Joel.Vigneau@ifremer.fr</a>
Henrik DEGEL	Danish Fisheries Research Institute. Charlottenlund Slot,2920. Charlottenlund Denmark	Tel +4533963386 Fax +4533963333	<a href="mailto:hd@aqua.dtu.dk">hd@aqua.dtu.dk</a>
Violin RAYKOV	Institute of Oceanology – BAS,40 Parvi Mai str, 9000 Varna Bulgaria	Tel +359877958939	<a href="mailto:vio_raykov@abv.bg">vio_raykov@abv.bg</a>
Michael EBELING	Thünen Institute for Sea Fisheries. Palmaille 9,22767. Hamburg Germany	Tel.: +49-40- 38905186	<a href="mailto:Michael.Ebeling@vti.bund.de">Michael.Ebeling@vti.bund.de</a>
Constantin STROIE	NAFA Romania. 2-4 Carol I Bvd, sector 3,31672. Bucharest Romania	Tel +040.21.634.44.29 Fax +040.21.332.61.32	<a href="mailto:estroie@ymail.com">estroie@ymail.com</a>

Stephen WARNES	Cefas. pakefield road,nr330ht. Lowestoft United Kingdom		<a href="mailto:steve.warnes@cefas.co.uk">steve.warnes@cefas.co.uk</a>
Angeles ARMESTO	Instituto Español de Oceanografía. Cabo Estay-Canido,36200. Vigo Spain	Tel +34986492111 Fax +34986498626	<a href="mailto:angeles.armesto@vi.ieo.es">angeles.armesto@vi.ieo.es</a>
Cecile BRIGAUDEAU	Des requins et de Hommes. Impasse Kerjacob,29810. lampaul-plouarzel France	+33 6 58 12 62 54	<a href="mailto:cecile@desrequinsetdeshommes.org">cecile@desrequinsetdeshommes.org</a>
Jörg BERKENHAGEN	VTI-Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Fo. Palmaille 9,22767. Hamburg Germany	+49 040 38905- 206	<a href="mailto:joerg.berkenhagen@vti.bund.de">joerg.berkenhagen@vti.bund.de</a>
ALEJANDRO SANCHO	Instituto Español de Oceanografía. Centro Oceanográfico de Canarias. Vía Espaldón , dársena pesquera, Parcela 8 38180 Santa Cruz de Tenerife Spain		<a href="mailto:alejandro.sancho@oceanografia.es">alejandro.sancho@oceanografia.es</a>
Jukka PÖNNI	Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute. Viikinkaari 4, PL 2, 00790 Helsinki	Tel +358 205 751 894 Fax +358 205 751 891	<a href="mailto:jukka.ponni@rktl.fi">jukka.ponni@rktl.fi</a>
Tomasz NERMER	The Sea Fisheries Institute in Gdynia. Kollataja 1,81-332. Gdynia Poland	Tel +48587356211 Fax +48587356110	<a href="mailto:nermer@mir.gdynia.pl">nermer@mir.gdynia.pl</a>

<b>European Commission</b>			
Name	Address	Telephone no.	Email
Christoph PRIEBE	European Commission rue Joseph II, 79 B-1000 BRUSSELS Belgium	Tel +3222976860	<a href="mailto:christoph.priebe@ec.europa.eu">christoph.priebe@ec.europa.eu</a>
Bas DRUKKER	European Commission rue Joseph II, 79 B-1000 BRUSSELS Belgium	Tel +322297 Fax +3222950774	<a href="mailto:bas.drukker@ec.europa.eu">bas.drukker@ec.europa.eu</a>

<b>JRC Experts</b>			
Name	Address	Telephone no.	Email
Cristina	European	Tel +39033278	<a href="mailto:cristina.ribeiro@jrc.ec.europa.eu">cristina.ribeiro@jrc.ec.europa.eu</a>



CASTRO RIBEIRO	Commission - Joint Research Centre IPSC Maritime Affairs Unit (TP 051) Via E.Fermi, 2749 I - 21027 Ispra (VA) Italy	Fax +390332789658	
-------------------	---	----------------------	--

## 9 LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background documents are published on the meeting's web site on:  
<http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/stecf/ewg1220>

List of background documents:

1. EWG-12-20 – Doc 1 - Declarations of invited and JRC experts.
2. Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 of 25 February 2008 concerning the establishment of a Community framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the Common Fisheries Policy.
3. Commission Regulation (EC) No 665/2008 of 14 July 2008 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 concerning the establishment of a Community framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the Common Fisheries Policy.
4. 2008/949/EC Commission Decision of 6 November 2008 adopting a multiannual Community programme pursuant to Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 establishing a Community framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the common fisheries policy.
5. Draft Report of the 9th Liaison Meeting - Meeting between the Chairs of the RCMs, the chair of ICES PGCCDBS, the chair of PGMED, the chair of the Regional Database Steering Committee, the ICES representative, the Chairs of STECF DCF EWG's and PGECON and the European Commission. Brussels, October 2012.
6. Guidelines for Amendments of 2011-2013 NPs for 2013. Ares(2012)847827 - 11-7-2012
7. Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) - Report of Sub-group on Research Needs (SGECA/SGRN 09-03). Review of Guidelines for the National Programs and Technical Reports under the Data Collection Framework. (eds. Vigneau, J. & Raid, T.). 2009. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg, EUR 24101 EN, JRC 55709, 138 pp.
8. Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) - Evaluation of 2011-2013 National Programmes linked to the Data Collection Framework - Report of the Subgroup on Research Needs (SGRN 10-01) (eds Connolly, P. & Virtanen, J.). 2011. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 24723 EN, JRC 63264, 248 pp.

European Commission

EUR 25827 EN – Joint Research Centre – Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Title: Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries. DCF – Assessment of NP Changes (STECF-13-02).

STECF members: Casey, J., Abella, J. A., Andersen, J., Bailey, N., Bertignac, M., Cardinale, M., Curtis, H., Daskalov, G., Delaney, A., Döring, R., Garcia Rodriguez, M., Gascuel, D., Graham, N., Gustavsson, T., Jennings, S., Kenny, A., Kirkegaard, E., Kraak, S., Kuikka, S., Malvarosa, L., Martin, P., Motova, A., Murua, H., Nord, J., Nowakowski, P., Prellezo, R., Sala, A., Scarcella, G., Simmonds, J., Somarakis, S., Stransky, C., Theret, F., Ulrich, C., Vanhee, W. & Van Oostenbrugge, H.

EWG-12-20 members: Armesto A., Berkenhagen J., Brigaudeau C., Carpentieri P., Davidjuka I., Degel H., Ebeling M. W., Kazlauskas E., Koutrakis E., Nermer T., Pönni J., Radu G., Raid T., Raykov V., Ribeiro C. C., Sancho A., Stroie C., Vigneau J., Warnes S.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

2013 – 34 pp. – 21 x 29.7 cm

EUR – Scientific and Technical Research series – ISSN 1831-9424 (online), ISSN 1018-5593 (print)

ISBN 978-92-79-28753-4

doi:10.2788/85053

#### Abstract

The Expert Working Group meeting of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries EWG 12-20 was held from 10<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup> December 2012 in Brussels, Belgium to evaluate the MS proposed amendments to the 2011-2013 National Programmes (NP) for the year 2013 submitted under the Data Collection Framework. The EWG report was reviewed by written procedure by the STECF in early February 2013.

**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.

As the Commission's in-house science service, the Joint Research Centre's mission is to provide EU policies with independent, evidence-based scientific and technical support throughout the whole policy cycle.

Working in close cooperation with policy Directorates-General, the JRC addresses key societal challenges while stimulating innovation through developing new standards, methods and tools, and sharing and transferring its know-how to the Member States and international community.

Key policy areas include: environment and climate change; energy and transport; agriculture and food security; health and consumer protection; information society and digital agenda; safety and security including nuclear; all supported through a cross-cutting and multi-disciplinary approach.

---

The Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) has been established by the European Commission. The STECF is being consulted at regular intervals on matters pertaining to the conservation and management of living aquatic resources, including biological, economic, environmental, social and technical considerations.