



JRC SCIENCE FOR POLICY REPORT

Scientific, Technical and Economic
Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

-

Evaluation of
DCF Work Plans 2021,
WP/AR templates & guidance
(STECF-20-16)

Edited by Christoph Stransky and Zeynep Hekim

This publication is a Science for Policy report by the Joint Research Centre (JRC), the European Commission's science and knowledge service. It aims to provide evidence-based scientific support to the European policymaking process. The scientific output expressed does not imply a policy position of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use that might be made of this publication. For information on the methodology and quality underlying the data used in this publication for which the source is neither Eurostat nor other Commission services, users should contact the referenced source. The designations employed and the presentation of material on the maps do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the European Union concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Contact information

Name: STECF secretariat

Address: Unit D.02 Water and Marine Resources, Via Enrico Fermi 2749, 21027 Ispra VA, Italy

E-mail: jrc-stecf-secretariat@ec.europa.eu

Tel.: +39 0332 789343

EU Science Hub

<https://ec.europa.eu/jrc>

JRC122990

EUR 28359 EN

PDF ISBN 978-92-76-27167-3 ISSN 1831-9424 doi:10.2760/623199

STECF ISSN 2467-0715

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2020

© European Union, 2020



The reuse policy of the European Commission is implemented by the Commission Decision 2011/833/EU of 12 December 2011 on the reuse of Commission documents (OJ L 330, 14.12.2011, p. 39). Except otherwise noted, the reuse of this document is authorised under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). This means that reuse is allowed provided appropriate credit is given and any changes are indicated. For any use or reproduction of photos or other material that is not owned by the EU, permission must be sought directly from the copyright holders.

All content © European Union, 2020

How to cite this report: Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) – Evaluation of DCF Work Plans 2021 and WP/AR templates & guidance (STECF-20-16). EUR 28359 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2020, ISBN 978-92-76-27167-3, doi:10.2760/623199, JRC122990.

Authors:**STECF advice:**

Abella, J. Alvaro; Bastardie, Francois; Borges, Lisa; Casey, John; Catchpole, Thomas; Damalas, Dimitrios; Daskalov, Georgi; Döring, Ralf; Gascuel, Didier; Grati, Fabio; Ibaibarriaga, Leire; Jung, Armelle; Knittweis, Leyla; Kraak, Sarah; Ligas, Alessandro; Martin, Paloma; Motova, Arina; Moutopoulos, Dimitrios; Nord, Jenny; Prellezo, Raúl; O'Neill, Barry; Raid, Tiit; Rihan, Dominic; Sampedro, Paz; Somarakis, Stylianos; Stransky, Christoph; Ulrich, Clara; Uriarte, Andres; Valentinsson, Daniel; van Hoof, Luc; Vanhee, Willy; Villasante, Sebastian; Vrgoc, Nedo

EWG-20-16 report:

Stransky, C., Adamidou, A., Armesto, A., Avdic Mravlje, E., Berkenhagen, J., Davidjuka, I., Freese, M., Grati, F., Hekim, Z., Ioannou, M., Jakovleva, I., Kazlauskas, E., Koutrakis, E., Lontakis, A., McCormick, H., Nermer, T., Nicheva, S., Panayotova, M., Raid, T., Rodriguez, J., Sabatella, E., Spedicato, M.T., Sundin, J., Ulleweit, J., van Overzee, H., Vigneau, J., Vukov, I., Warnes, S., Wójcik, I., Zarauz, L. Zhelev, K.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF) - Evaluation of DCF Work Plans 2021 and WP/AR templates & guidance (STECF-20-16)	6
Request to the STECF	6
Summary of the information provided to the STECF	6
STECF comments.....	6
STECF conclusions.....	8
Contact details of STECF members	9
Expert Working Group EWG-20-16 report.....	13
1 Introduction	14
1.1 Terms of Reference for EWG-20-16.....	14
1.2 Structure of the report.....	17
2 Evaluation of Member States' Work Plans for 2021	18
2.1 Background information	18
2.2 Evaluation criteria, sheets and procedures.....	18
2.3 Formation of sub-groups and task allocation.....	18
2.4 Evaluation process	19
2.5 Evaluation results	22
3 Evaluation of 'test' Regional Work Plans.....	23
4 Preparation of WP/AR templates & guidance	33
5 Contact details of EWG 20-16 participants	40
6 List of electronic annexes.....	43
7 List of Background Documents	43

Abstract

Commission Decision of 25 February 2016 setting up a Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries, C(2016) 1084, OJ C 74, 26.2.2016, p. 4–10. The Commission may consult the group on any matter relating to marine and fisheries biology, fishing gear technology, fisheries economics, fisheries governance, ecosystem effects of fisheries, aquaculture or similar disciplines. This report deals with the evaluation of DCF Work Plans 2021 and WP/AR templates & guidance. The report was reviewed by the STECF at its 65th plenary meeting held virtually from 9-13 November 2020.

SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF) - Evaluation of DCF Work Plans 2021 and WP/AR templates & guidance (STECF-20-16)

The report of EWG 20-16 was reviewed by the STECF at its 65th plenary meeting held virtually from 9-13 November 2020.

Request to the STECF

STECF is requested to review the report of the STECF Expert Working Group meeting, evaluate the findings and make any appropriate comments and recommendations.

Summary of the information provided to the STECF

The EWG 20-16 met virtually 2-6 November 2020. Since the meeting took place the week before STECF PLEN 20-03, the final EWG report was not yet available to PLEN 20-03. The following STECF comments and suggestions are based on discussions among STECF members and a presentation of outcomes from the EWG 20-16 meeting made by the chairperson, a preliminary draft of the EWG 20-16 report, and related documents.

STECF comments

STECF notes that EWG 20-16 met to (i) evaluate amendments in Member States' national Work Plans under the Data Collection Framework (DCF) for the year 2021, (ii) evaluate two test Regional Work Plans and (iii) comment on the preparation of revised Work Plan/Annual Report templates & guidance. In 2020, several STECF EWGs using DCF data (provided by data calls) were postponed due to the Covid-19 pandemic, and for this reason, the EWG did not evaluate Data Transmission Issues as in previous years.

Evaluation of amended national DCF Work Plans 2021

The Work Plans describe the planning of data collection at national or regional level. Member States are requested to submit any amendment of their national Work Plans to the Commission within the legal deadline of 31 October of the preceding year of the implementation. STECF notes that eleven Member States submitted amended national Work Plans for the year 2021. The amendments covered all sections of the Work Plans.

Member State	Commercial catches 1ABC	Recreational fisheries 1D	Diadromous species 1E	By-catches 1F	Surveys 1G & 1H	Fishing activity 2A	Fleet econ. 3A	Aqua-culture 3B	Process-ing ind. 3C	Sampling plans 4A-D	Data quality (biological) 5A	Data quality (economic) 5B	Data availability 6A	Meetings 7A	Recommen-dations 7B	bilaterals 7C
BGR						X								X		X
CZE			X					X				X	X	X		
ESP		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X				X		
FRA	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
HRV	X				X	X				X	X	X	X	X		
IRL		X	X	X	X		X			X	X			X	X	X
LTU	X		X			X	X			X	X					X
LVA	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X
MLT	X				X	X	X	X	X	X			X			X
PRT	X	X		X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	
SWE			X	X	X			X		X	X			X	X	X

During the EWG, six Member States were contacted to update or clarify issues (marked as orange in the table). Nevertheless, all amended work plans were successfully evaluated at the end of the meeting and there were no outstanding issues to be followed up bilaterally between a Member State and the EU Commission after the finalisation of the meeting.

STECF notes that the EWG used the same evaluation criteria and evaluation sheets for the evaluation of the amended WPs as the previous EWGs on WP evaluation (EWGs 16-16, 17-13, 18-18 and 19-18).

STECF notes that the quality of the sections of the resubmitted Work Plans had improved from previous years and that most Member States used the instructions from EWG 19-18 on how to amend the work plan correctly. However, some issues still persisted and were resolved during the EWG:

- Biological data from sampling commercial fisheries: Nine Member States amended their WPs regarding this section. Overall, the Member States that resubmitted a Work Plan for this section addressed the comments and recommendations from previous year's evaluation (EWG 19-18).
- Recreational fisheries and diadromous species: Eight Member States amended their Work Plans regarding these sections. In most cases, the submitted amendments were minor updates of text and tables.
- Incidental by-catch and Pilot Study 2: Six Member States amended their Work Plans regarding this section. One Member State added a pilot study on the level of fishing and impact of fisheries on biological resources and marine ecosystem in a new ICES area. Another Member State changed the seasonality of the sampling scheme in their Pilot Study 2 on stomach contents due to administrative problems and Covid-19. For the rest, only small alterations and editorial changes were made.
- Research surveys at sea: Eight Member States amended their Work Plans regarding this section. One minor issue regarding changing survey name arose and was solved with the concerned Member State during the EWG. The remaining amendments included small alterations and some editorial changes.
- Fishing activity, economic and social data: Eleven Member States amended their Work Plans regarding this section. In general, the amended economic sections were of high quality and only minor issues were found.

As in previous advice (STECF PLEN 14-02, 14-03, 15-02, 16-02, 17-02, 17-03, 18-02, 19-03, 20-02) STECF reiterates that an online reporting platform, connected to a database containing information on fisheries and the planning and implementation of sampling, would be a more efficient way to monitor the execution of Member States' Work Plans. Parts of the existing databases from data calls (e.g. fleet economic data) and regional databases could be utilised for the purpose of providing overviews on fisheries and sampling effort by Member States.

Evaluation of Regional Work Plans

The EWG conducted a first test evaluation of two draft Regional Work Plans. The plans were submitted to the Commission by the Regional Coordination Groups for the Baltic Sea (RCG Baltic) and for the North Atlantic, North Sea & Eastern Arctic (RCG NANSEA). The Regional Work Plans included the sections on biological data collection (fisheries, surveys) and international/regional coordination.

STECF observes that the EWG provided comments on the approach and procedure but also detailed comments of the proposal by section. STECF further notes that the outcome of the evaluation of the test Regional Work Plans will be submitted to the RCGs for consideration in their intersession groups and for their June 2021 meeting. During that meeting, the RCGs are tasked to develop a full-scale Regional Work Plan (of three years) to be submitted to the Commission for adoption as a legal act.

STECF observes that even though the deadline for submission of National Work Plans is clearly stated in the legal text the deadline for submission of Regional Work Plans by the RCG is not yet defined.

Preparation of Work Plan and Annual Report templates and guidance

In September 2019 and in parallel with the finalisation of the ongoing revision of the European Union multiannual plan for the collection and management of data in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors (EU MAP), a revision of the templates for Work Plans and Annual Reports started. STECF notes that the EWG 20-16 reviewed the outcomes from an ad-hoc drafting group that had been tasked to review the templates and guidance text.

STECF notes that the EWG provided detailed comments by sections as well as provided some general conclusions. The outcome of the EWG will form the basis of the EWG 20-18 that is dedicated to finalising the templates and guidance for the Work Plans and Annual Reports.

STECF conclusions

STECF endorses the outcomes of the EWG 20-16 presented by the chairperson during the STECF PLEN 20-03. The final EWG report was not yet available at the time of the PLEN 20-03 meeting.

STECF concludes that overall, the quality of the resubmitted Work Plans has improved from previous evaluations and most Member States that resubmitted a Work Plan addressed the comments and recommendations from previous evaluation (EWG 19-18). There were, however, still minor issues caused by for example Member States not following the guidelines fully.

STECF concludes that the evaluation of the two test Regional Work Plans were successful. However, a follow-up in the RCGs (intersession groups) is needed before a full assessment can be performed.

STECF concludes that a full commitment of Member States concerned to change their national Work Plans in line with the proposals of the RCGs is crucial. Furthermore, deadlines for the Regional Work Plans need to be set within a time frame which allows that any changes of the Regional Work Plans can be implemented in the National Work Plans in time. STECF concludes that the preparatory work carried out by ad-hoc contracts as regards the revision of Work Plans and Annual Report templates and guidelines have been very useful and will, together with the outcome of EWG 20-16, allow for the finalisation of the revision during EWG 20-18.

Finally, STECF would like to further stress the need of an online reporting platform, in connection with a database, for the planning and implementation of Work Plans, on both Member States' and regional level.

Contact details of STECF members

¹ - Information on STECF members' affiliations is displayed for information only. In any case, Members of the STECF shall act independently. In the context of the STECF work, the committee members do not represent the institutions/bodies they are affiliated to in their daily jobs. STECF members also declare at each meeting of the STECF and of its Expert Working Groups any specific interest which might be considered prejudicial to their independence in relation to specific items on the agenda. These declarations are displayed on the public meeting's website if experts explicitly authorized the JRC to do so in accordance with EU legislation on the protection of personnel data. For more information: <http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/adm-declarations>

Name	Affiliation ¹	Email
Abella, J. Alvaro	Independent consultant	aabellafisheries@gmail.com
Bastardie, Francois	Technical University of Denmark, National Institute of Aquatic Resources (DTU-AQUA), Kemitorvet, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark	fba@aqua.dtu.dk
Borges, Lisa	FishFix, Lisbon, Portugal	info@fishfix.eu
Casey, John	Independent consultant	blindlemoncasey@gmail.com
Catchpole, Thomas	CEFAS Lowestoft Laboratory, Pakefield Road, Lowestoft, Suffolk, UK, NR33 0HT	thomas.catchpole@cefass.co.uk
Damalas, Dimitrios	Hellenic Centre for Marine Research, Institute of Marine Biological Resources & Inland Waters, 576 Vouliagmenis Avenue, Argyroupolis, 16452, Athens, Greece	shark@hcmr.gr
Daskalov, Georgi	Laboratory of Marine Ecology, Institute of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Research, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences	Georgi.m.daskalov@gmail.com
Döring, Ralf (vice-chair)	Thünen Institute [TI-SF] Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Institute of Sea Fisheries, Economic analyses Herwigstrasse 31, D-27572 Bremerhaven, Germany	ralf.doering@thuenen.de

Name	Affiliation¹	Email
Gascuel, Didier	AGROCAMPUS OUEST, 65 Route de Saint Briec, CS 84215, F-35042 RENNES Cedex, France	Didier.Gascuel@agrocampus-ouest.fr
Grati, Fabio	National Research Council (CNR) – Institute for Biological Resources and Marine Biotechnologies (IRBIM), L.go Fiera della Pesca, 2, 60125, Ancona, Italy	fabio.grati@cnr.it
Ibaibarriaga, Leire	AZTI. Marine Research Unit. Txatxarramendi Ugarte a z/g. E-48395 Sukarrieta, Bizkaia. Spain.	libaibarriaga@azti.es
Jung, Armelle	DRDH, Techopôle Brest-Iroise, BLP 15 rue Dumont d'Urville, Plouzane, France	armelle.jung@desrequinsetdeshommes.org
Knittweis, Leyla	Department of Biology, University of Malta, Msida, MSD 2080, Malta	Leyla.knittweis@um.edu.mt
Kraak, Sarah	Thünen Institute of Baltic Sea Fisheries, Alter Hafen Süd 2, 18069 Rostock, Germany.	sarah.kraak@thuenen.de
Ligas, Alessandro	CIBM Consorzio per il Centro Interuniversitario di Biologia Marina ed Ecologia Applicata "G. Bacci", Viale N. Sauro 4, 57128 Livorno, Italy	ligas@cibm.it ; ale.ligas76@gmail.com
Martin, Paloma	CSIC Instituto de Ciencias del Mar Passeig Marítim, 37-49, 08003 Barcelona, Spain	paloma@icm.csic.es
Motova, Arina	Sea Fish Industry Authority, 18 Logie Mill, Logie Green Road, Edinburgh EH7 4HS, U.K	arina.motova@seafish.co.uk
Moutopoulos, Dimitrios	Department of Animal Production, Fisheries & Aquaculture, University of Patras, Rio-Patras, 26400, Greece	dmoutopo@teimes.gr
Nord, Jenny	The Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (SwAM)	Jenny.nord@havochvatten.se
Prellezo, Raúl	AZTI -Unidad de Investigación Marina, Txatxarramendi Ugarte a z/g 48395 Sukarrieta (Bizkaia), Spain	rprellezo@azti.es

Name	Affiliation¹	Email
O'Neill, Barry	DTU Aqua, Willemoesvej 2, 9850 Hirtshals, Denmark	barone@aqu.dtu.dk
Raid, Tiit	Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu, Mäealuse 14, Tallin, EE-126, Estonia	Tiit.raid@gmail.com
Rihan, Dominic (vice-chair)	BIM, Ireland	rihan@bim.ie
Sampedro, Paz	Spanish Institute of Oceanography, Center of A Coruña, Paseo Alcalde Francisco Vázquez, 10, 15001 A Coruña, Spain	paz.sampedro@ieo.es
Somarakis, Stylianos	Institute of Marine Biological Resources and Inland Waters (IMBRIW), Hellenic Centre of Marine Research (HCMR), Thalassocosmos Gournes, P.O. Box 2214, Heraklion 71003, Crete, Greece	somarak@hcmr.gr
Stransky, Christoph	Thünen Institute [TI-SF] Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Institute of Sea Fisheries, Herwigstrasse 31, D-27572 Bremerhaven, Germany	christoph.stransky@thuenen.de
Ulrich, Clara (chair)	IFREMER, France	Clara.Ulrich@ifremer.fr
Uriarte, Andres	AZTI. Gestión pesquera sostenible. Sustainable fisheries management. Arrantza kudeaketa jasangarria, Herrera Kaia - Portualdea z/g. E-20110 Pasaia – GIPUZKOA (Spain)	auriarte@azti.es
Valentinsson, Daniel	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU), Department of Aquatic Resources, Turistgatan 5, SE-45330, Lysekil, Sweden	daniel.valentinsson@slu.se
van Hoof, Luc	Wageningen Marine Research Haringkade 1, IJmuiden, The Netherlands	Luc.vanhoof@wur.nl
Vanhee, Willy	Independent consultant	wvanhee@telenet.be

Name	Affiliation¹	<u>Email</u>
Villasante, Sebastian	University of Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, A Coruña, Spain, Department of Applied Economics	sebastian.villasante@usc.es
Vrgoc, Nedo	Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries, Split, Setaliste Ivana Mestrovica 63, 21000 Split, Croatia	vrgoc@izor.hr

EXPERT WORKING GROUP EWG-20-16 REPORT

REPORT TO THE STECF

EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON Evaluation of DCF Work Plans 2021, WP/AR templates & guidance (EWG-20-16)

Virtual meeting, 2-6 November 2020

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 INTRODUCTION

The STECF Expert Working Group (EWG) 20-16 met virtually from 2 to 6 November 2020, to (i) evaluate amendments in Member States' (MS) national Work Plans (WPs) under the Data Collection Framework (DCF) for the year 2021, (ii) evaluate 'test' Regional Work Plans and (iii) comment on the preparation of revised WP/AR templates & guidance.

The work was conducted by 30 independent experts (see the list of participants in section 5). The Terms of Reference are presented below and the agenda is included in Annex 1.

1.1 Terms of Reference for EWG-20-16

The aim of this EWG was:

1. to evaluate the amendments done by Member States to their national work plans (NWP) covering 2021 and submitted by 31 October 2020 in terms of conformity, scientific relevance of the data and quality of the methods and procedures.
2. to evaluate regional work plans (RWP) submitted by regional coordination groups (RCGs) by 31 October 2020 using the same terms as mentioned above; to provide feedback on the evaluation process.
3. to provide input on the preparation of new templates and guidance for the submission of future work plans and annual reports in line with the future EU MAP from 2022 onwards, based on the outcomes of ad-hoc contract work available on 23 October 2020.
4. To provide advice on other minor tasks related to DCF, if applicable and depending on available time.

Background

National and regional work plans

The work plan describes the planning of data collection on a national or regional level. Under the EMFF, the MS operational programmes must be supplemented by a work plan for data collection (Reg. 508/2014, Article 21)¹. In addition, regional coordination groups may prepare draft regional work plans which shall be considered to replace or supplement the relevant parts of the national work plans of each of the Member States

¹ [Regulation \(EU\) No 508/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 May 2014 on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and repealing Council Regulations \(EC\) No 2328/2003, \(EC\) No 861/2006, \(EC\) No 1198/2006 and \(EC\) No 791/2007 and Regulation \(EU\) No 1255/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council.](#)

concerned (Reg. 2017/1004, Article 9)². The deadline for submission of work plans to COM in a specified format³ is 31 October of the year preceding the application.

The evaluation criteria for the work plans were discussed for the first time in 2016 in relevant DCF groups (regional coordination meetings, liaison meeting) and compiled by a number of ad-hoc contracts. In addition, the COM compiled the general principles to be followed during the evaluation. A first evaluation of NWP for 2017-2019 took place in November 2016 during [EWG 16-16](#). The evaluation of NWP revisions for 2018 took place in November 2017 during [EWG 17-13](#), following resubmission of 2017-2019 NWP by 17 Member States. The evaluation of 16 amended NWPs for 2019 was carried out in November 2018 during the [EWG 18-18](#).

In November 2019, experts evaluated the NWPs covering 2020-2021 during the [EWG 19-18](#). The COM approved all WP through an implementing act by 31 December 2019. However, some MS received, in the evaluation grid comments to be addressed for next submissions. Following an informal communication with MS, the COM expects the submission of 10 amended NWPs covering 2021, for revision and evaluation. The definite number of NWPs will be known after the submission deadline (31 October 2020).

In addition, the RCGs are preparing regional work plans (RWP) and the COM is expecting, for the first time, the submission of two RWP. Again, the definite number will be known after the submission deadline (31 October).

The [Commission Implementing Decision \(EU\) 2016/1701](#) provided the format, rules and guidance for the submission of work plans 2017-2019 and set the basis for the submission of WP covering 2020-2021. In practice, it has proven to be efficient for NWPs, but it has never been used for RWPs. For the first time in 2020, the chairs of two different RCGs, on behalf of the MS involved, are expected to submit RWP⁴, to be evaluated by STECF experts. The aim of this submission is to allow STECF to have a first attempt in evaluating a 'test RWP', rather than officially submitting a RWP for COM adoption.

Input to work plan and annual report templates revision

In parallel with the finalisation of the ongoing revision of the European Union multiannual plan for the collection and management of data in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors (EU MAP - currently covered by COM decisions 2019/909 and 2019/910⁵), a revision of the templates for work plans and annual report has started.

First drafts of WP templates were prepared in September 2019 by the [EWG 19-12](#). A group of ad-hoc contractors prepares further drafts, including AR template and submission guidelines for MS. The outcomes, expected on 23 October, will feed into this [EWG 20-16](#). The final round of STECF work on the templates will be conducted by a dedicated group early 2021 ([EWG 20-18](#)).

² [Regulation \(EU\) No 2017/1004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2017 on the establishment of a Union framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the common fisheries policy and repealing Council Regulation \(EC\) No 199/2008 \(recast\).](#)

³ [Commission Implementing Decision \(EU\) 2016/1701 of 19.8.2016 laying down rules on the format for the submission of work plans for data collection in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors](#)

⁴ *Where a draft regional work plan is prepared, the Member States concerned shall submit it to the Commission by 31 October.* Art. 9.9 of Regulation (EU) 2017/1004

⁵ [Commission Implementing Decision \(EU\) 2019/909 of 18 February 2019 establishing the list of mandatory research surveys and thresholds for the purposes of the multiannual Union programme for the collection and management of data in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors.](#)

[Commission Delegated Decision \(EU\) 2019/910 of 13 March 2019 establishing the multiannual Union programme for the collection and management of biological, environmental, technical and socioeconomic data in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors.](#)

Data Transmission Issues

Up to 2018, the procedure on the evaluation of data transmission issues (DTi) did not provide for a timely improvement of data collection, taking longer than one year to finalize the cycle. Several EWGs on data transmission issues have argued that the evaluation of DTi should be done soon after the submission of data.

In 2018, a first attempt was done during the EWG 18-18, whereby DTi from 2018 data calls, were uploaded on the online compliance platform to be assessed in the same year. However, the EWG 18-18 experts could not assess DTi due to high workload, but agreed on the need of doing so. The EWG 18-18 suggested that the DTi of the first half of the year should be evaluated at the November meeting (EWG on WPs evaluation) and the DTi of the 2nd half of the year should be evaluated at the June meeting (EWG on AR evaluation). This exercise applies to STECF as end user.

In 2019, the EWG 19-18 evaluated DTi from the same year (January to June 2019), coming from the fleet economic data call. The exercise was satisfactory for all actors involved, mainly MS that could better plan their next steps to solve the issues. COM intends to continue along those lines when the regular EWG schedule will be restored after the COVID-19 pandemics. In 2020, several STECF EWG were postponed and for this reason, there are no DTi from the first half of 2020.

I. Specific tasks for the EWG

NWP/RWP

Experts are invited to evaluate the work plans submitted by Member States and regional coordination groups for 2021, in accordance with Article 10 of Regulation (EU) No 2017/1004, taking into account:

- the conformity of the work plans and any amendments thereto with the contents of Articles 6 and 9, and
- the scientific relevance of the data covered by the work plans for the purposes laid down in Article 1(1) and the quality of the proposed methods and procedures.

Taking into consideration that the EU MAP 2020-2021 is an extension of the preceding one, although split into two legal acts⁶, the same evaluation criteria and procedure will be used for this year's evaluation (see below) as in the past four years. Experts should pay particular attention to the comments provided by STECF 19-18 on MS NWP 2020-2021.

Input to work plan and annual report templates revision

Experts are invited to assess and complete the outcomes from the October 2020 ad-hoc drafting group. The aim is to prepare as much as possible the work of EWG 20-18 that will produce a complete draft of the document containing all necessary elements (general guidance, tables with quality check lists, particular guidance per table), as well as other accompanying guidance documents (for evaluators, for MS to assess if amendments are necessary etc.). The exact range of tasks will be agreed in the opening session of EWG 20-16, depending on the workload related to the NWP and RWP assessment.

II. EWG 20-16 report

The EWG should produce a Word document with general explanations and an Excel file with the assessment and comments of each WP. The document should include an

⁶ See note 5

overview of the assessment and overall evaluation of the (amendments of) Work Plans (horizontal issues, spanning many MS/ sea basins)

- Per Member State:
 - a) an evaluation of the work plan and any links to related section(s) of the work plans in the template provided by the Commission
 - b) where the Covid-19 pandemic has affected the implementing of approved work plans, hampering the data collection and imposing adaptations by MS to fill in the gaps of no-collected data, surveys not carried out, etc., experts are invited to compile relevant amendments done by MS because of the Covid-19 pandemic: modifications in the NWP to complete tasks not covered during 2020, and expected to be covered in 2021.
 - c) Member State-specific issues relating to data collection as described in the work plan.
- Per region, in case of submission of a RWP:
 - a) an evaluation of the coverage for the region/fishery for the specific section submitted and
 - b) an evaluation of the added value of a regional work plan vs a national one.

In their feedback, the EWG should identify the comments that require a reaction by the MS(s) (resubmission of the Work Plan or clarification to the Commission) and those that are 'for information' only.

The evaluation will be based on the evaluation criteria used by the STECF EWG 17-13. The EWG should pay particular attention that the submitted work plans:

- address the issues raised by STECF EWGs 16-16, 17-13, 18-18 and 19-18, as well as COM assessment grids during past evaluations.
- take into account RCG and PGECON recommendations
- where ongoing or planned pilot studies are described, the MS should provide the expected outcomes and the finalisation date, and take into account the information provided by the relevant grants (fishPi2, STREAM, RECOLAPE and SECFISH).

In addition to the above, experts are invited to provide feedback on the complete evaluation process of the regional work plans, including relevant issues encountered and how they solved them.

Finally, the report will include a section on the outcomes of the October 2020 ad-hoc drafting group on the WP/AR templates. Expected outcomes are a draft version of complete WP and AR templates, including all relevant tables, lists, formulas etc. and a draft version of guidelines for MS on submission of WP and AR.

1.2 Structure of the report

Sections 2-4 present the results produced by the STECF EWG 20-16. Section 2 contains a description of the Work Plan evaluation process of the EWG (ToR 1). In section 3, the EWG observations on the evaluation of 'test' Regional Work Plans are provided (ToR 2) and section 4 provides comments of the EWG on the preparation of revised WP/AR templates & guidance.

2 EVALUATION OF MEMBER STATES' WORK PLANS FOR 2021

2.1 Background information

To carry out the evaluation, the EWG was provided with the Work Plan (WP) tables and WP text (boxes) of those MS which submitted amendments to the WP 2020-2021 for the year 2021 and documents explaining the amendments and supporting information, such as relevant EWG reports (from EWG 19-18 and 20-08). For a full list of background documents, see Section 7.

2.2 Evaluation criteria, sheets and procedures

The EWG used the same evaluation criteria and evaluation sheets for the Work Plan (WP) amendments as the previous EWGs on WP evaluation (EWGs 16-16, 17-13, 18-18 and 19-18).

Overall, 11 MS submitted amended WPs. MS DCF National Correspondents were asked by DG MARE to be available during the EWG meeting to answer possible questions for clarification raised by the EWG. Several MS were contacted by the Commission during the EWG with the aim to solve the issues bilaterally ('ping-pong') before the end of the EWG. For all MS, the issues could be clarified during the EWG.

2.3 Formation of sub-groups and task allocation

The evaluation of WPs was split by sub-groups and experts were allocated to each sub-group according to their expertise. Each sub-group was tasked with the assessment of particular sections of the WP according to the table below.

Table 1 – Allocation of sections by sub-group and expertise

Sections	Sub-group	Expertise
Biological sampling of stocks and fisheries, by-catch and environmental impacts of fisheries (sections 1A, 1B, 1C; sections 4 and 5A), Data availability (section 6A), section 7	1	Biologists
Recreational fisheries, diadromous species (sections 1D and 1E; Pilot study 1); Data availability (section 6A), section 7	2	Biologists
Research surveys at sea (sections 1G and 1H), Incidental by-catch (Table 1F and Pilot Study 2); Data availability (section 6A), section 7	3	Biologists
Fishing activity data (section 2); economic & social data (sections 3A, 3B, 3C and 5B; Pilot studies 3 and 4); Data availability (section 6A), section 7	4	Economists

2.4 Evaluation process

MS generally replied fast to the requests of the EWG for clarification ('ping-pong'), which helped to finalise the WP evaluation. This procedure allowed DG MARE to plan and conduct the acceptance of WP amendments during the EWG and thereafter efficiently.

The table below shows which WP modules were amended by MS (orange cells: MS asked for clarifications).

Member State	Commercial catches	Recreational fisheries	Diadromous species	By-catches	Surveys	Fishing activity	Fleet econ.	Aquaculture	Processing ind.	Sampling plans	Data quality (biol.)	Data quality (econ.)	Data availability	Meetings	Recommendations	Bilaterals
	1ABC	1D	1E	1F	1GH	2A	3A	3B	3C	4A-D	5A	5B	6A	7A	7B	7C
BGR						X								X		X
CZE			X					X				X	X	X		
ESP		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X				X		
FRA	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
HRV	X				X	X				X	X	X	X	X		
IRL		X	X	X	X		X			X	X			X	X	X
LTU	X		X			X	X			X	X					X
LVA	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X
MLT	X				X	X	X	X	X	X			X			X
PRT	X	X		X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	
SWE			X	X	X			X		X	X			X	X	X

Biological data from sampling commercial fisheries

In order to ensure consistency when evaluating the revised WPs, the EWG took Portugal as the example to be assessed by the whole group, before dividing up into smaller groups of two or three experts to evaluate the remaining WPs. The results of these evaluations were then discussed in sub-group plenary to resolve any remaining points that required further discussion. Any issues identified for clarification or requiring resubmission by the MS were provided to the Commission for resolving these issues during the EWG.

In general, MS who resubmitted a WP addressed the comments and recommendations from EWG 19-18. There are, however, still issues caused by MS not following the guidelines - for example when naming Area and Stock. Some MS made adjustments to the WP for the current year (2020), which should not have occurred, as these WPs have been adopted and will be the reference for the Annual Reports 2020.

Some MS did not provide a document detailing the amendments made to the WP 2021 (such as the Annex proposed by EWG 18-18), which impacted on assessing any changes made. In some instances, information relevant to the WP was provided only in the amendments document when this should have been provided in association with the WP Text Box or into the table comment field.

In total, 'ping-pongs' between five MS and the Commission were conducted, and all issues were resolved during the meeting.

Recreational fisheries and diadromous species

The sections for recreational fisheries (Text Box and Table 1D) and diadromous species (Text Box and Table 1E) as well as proposed changes on pilot studies of the resubmitted WPs were reviewed by a sub-group of five experts. In most cases, amendments were minor updates of text and tables.

Only few changes in pilot studies were proposed. In one WP, a pilot study was prolonged. The majority of amendments were corrections or changes related to minor changes in numbers or specifics of data collection.

For recreational fisheries, only three MS proposed changes to their WPs. One MS made minor corrections to false threshold values, one MS added a phone survey and one MS prolonged a pilot study due to limitations caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Regarding diadromous fishes, seven MS proposed changes to their WPs. Most of the changes were subject to minor corrections, while three MS proposed changes or updates in methodology. Inconsistencies were observed in how sampling of diadromous species in marine waters and freshwaters were included in the WP tables. Sampling of diadromous species in marine waters must be included in Tables 1A, 1B and 1C, while a description of sampling in freshwaters should be presented in Table 1E. These issues could mostly be solved during the meeting.

One MS replied to the EWG inquiry and confirmed the plan to stick to reductions in the WP and thus not cover mandatory data collection for eels. The EWG was informed that this was discussed between the Commission and the MS and will be followed closely by the Commission. Other amendments by most of the MS were considered satisfactory, responses given during meeting solved remaining issues.

Incidental by-catch and Pilot Study 2

Six MS amended their WPs regarding incidental by-catch (Table 1F) and/or Pilot Study 2. Small alterations and editorial changes were made that were explained by the MS. In addition, one MS added a Pilot Study on the level of fishing and impact of fisheries on biological resources and marine ecosystem in an ICES area not covered in previous WP. Another MS changed the seasonality of the sampling scheme in their Pilot Study 2 on stomach contents due to administrative problems and Covid-19.

Research surveys at sea

The sub-group evaluating the modules related to surveys at sea (sections 1G and 1H) worked on eight amended WPs. Overall, the amendments included small alterations that were explained by the MS and some editorial changes. One minor issue regarding changing a survey name arose and was solved with the concerned MS during the EWG.

Fishing activity, economic and social data

A common evaluation approach was proposed at the beginning of the sub-group work. The economic and fleet activity sections (2A, 3A/B/C, 5B) as well as data availability and coordination sections (6A and 7) were checked for 11 WPs according to the list of amendments submitted by MS or, by direct comparison where no list of amendments was available. At first, it was decided to evaluate the MS reports by individual experts and then, for a more objective assessment, again by all experts in the subgroup repeatedly to go through the assessment. It was observed that six MS resubmitted the section on fishing activity, six MS for the fleet economics, five MS for the aquaculture sector and three MS for data collection on the fish processing industry.

The evaluation and comments of previous EWGs (EWGs 16-16, 17-13, 18-18 and 19-18) were taken into consideration.

The EWG focused on the evaluation of the amendments for the WP 2021. In some specific cases, however, it could be that the WP was not in line with the EU-MAP, even if it had been accepted (with comments, as issues were only minor). Furthermore, when the new version of WP is provided from MS, it revokes the previous WP. When the MS did not address previous STECF comments, the relevant comments from last year's evaluation were repeated.

The structure for the evaluation template was kept from the last year without changes.

The evaluation sheets for the Annual Reports (AR) 2019 and the MS comments on the STECF comments were provided as background documents. The issues raised during the AR evaluation (EWG 20-08) and to be addressed in the WP were checked in the MS WP 2021 and commented upon in the WP evaluation sheets.

The common approach for the evaluation of the Pilot Studies was discussed. There are still a few MS that are asking for pilot studies mainly under the aquaculture and fish processing sections. The current EU MAP allows MS to implement pilot studies for the collection of social and environmental data as well as for raw material in fish processing. For future WP submissions, however, the EWG suggests using the expression 'pilot study' only in the case where a pilot study is explicitly foreseen in the legislation. Any other study should just be called 'study' to avoid confusion.

Regarding the aquaculture sector, according to the COM Implementing Decision 2019/909, there are three types of the threshold which could be applied: *"No social and economic data on aquaculture need to be collected if the total production of the Member State is less than 1 % of the total Union production volume and value. No data need to be collected on aquaculture for species accounting for less than 10 % of the Member State's aquaculture production by volume and value. Additionally, Member States with a total production of less than 2,5 % of the total Union aquaculture production volume and value may define a simplified methodology such as pilot studies with a view to extrapolate the data required for species accounting for more than 10 % of the Member States' aquaculture production by volume and value."*

If MS apply the simplified methodologies when the sector is below some thresholds, this is too vague and difficult to evaluate. The EWG considers it useful to better define the framework for the 'simplified methodologies'.

For the simplification of the WP evaluation process, the EWG 20-16 suggests highlighting the amendments for the future WP text submission (as proposed by EWG 18-18).

The EWG 20-16 pointed out that timing between the WP submission and evaluation is too tight. It would be useful to receive the WP one month earlier than the deadline 31st of October to be able to pre-check the WPs before a full evaluation is being conducted (*cf.* Annual Report evaluation, e.g. EWG 20-08). This would in particular be relevant for the next round of WP evaluations in November 2021 (for the WPs 2022-2024).

In general, the economic sections in most WPs have a high level of quality and only minor issues were found. The corrections were requested from three MS during the meeting. The clarification was requested about reference year of Pilot Study for

environmental data, explanation about feasibility study for fish processing and correction of the table for Fishing Activity.

The following minor amendments for the WP 2021 sections were found:

Section 2A Fishing activity variables

- Update in Table 2A and removal of the column "Variable" was requested during the meeting.
- Changes in the length class.

Section 3A Economic and social data for fisheries

- Update of information of new strata and new clusters.
- Adjustment of estimates with the latest data collected.
- Addition of social data collection.
- Changes in planned sample rate for social data survey.
- Updates in a data source and type of data collection scheme for the value of quota and other fishing rights.

Section 3B Economic and social data for aquaculture

- Update of information of new strata and new clusters.
- Adjustment of estimates with the latest data collected.

Pilot study 4 Environmental data on aquaculture

- The reference year for the Pilot study for the environmental data collection was reported as '2021-2025'. The pilot study implementation cannot be extended beyond 2021. Clarification was requested from MS.

Section 3C Economic and social data for the processing industry

- Adjustment of the planned sample rates % for each segment.
- Amendment about feasibility study for the fish processing data collection in case when it is not planned to collect data on fish processing. The clarification about 'feasibility study' was requested from the MS.

Table 5B Quality assurance framework for socioeconomic data

- Update considering modifications added in Annual Report 2019 and new links and documents.

Table 6A Data availability

- Addition of the social data collection for aquaculture the data set's name.

Table 7B Follow-up of recommendations and agreements

In some cases, the recommendations from PGECON were not listed in Table 7B. However, PGECON provides several useful recommendations about social data collection and small-scale fishery data. Such recommendations could be applicable to most of the countries and it would be useful if such recommendations are mentioned by MS in Table 7B, especially when the social data collection is planned.

2.5 Evaluation results

The detailed evaluation results by MS are given in the electronic Annex 1.

3 EVALUATION OF 'TEST' REGIONAL WORK PLANS

The EWG 20-16 evaluated first 'test' Regional Work Plans (RWPs) for the Baltic Sea region and the regions North Atlantic, North Sea and Eastern Arctic (NANSEA). These RWPs were developed during summer/autumn 2020 in the Inter-Session Sub-Group (ISSG) on RWPs of the Regional Coordination Groups (RCGs) Baltic and NANSEA, checked by the involved MS and submitted by the RCG chairs on the 30 of October 2020. These RWPs represent draft (legally 'non-binding') documents/tables as 'test runs' for the next phase, in which 'real' RWPs will be submitted in October 2021 and will be subject to full evaluation and transcription into a legally binding Commission Decision.

While the institutional and legal aspects of setting up, implementing and reporting on RWPs are still to be discussed and decided upon, the EWG focused on the contents of the RWPs, which contained mainly biological aspects (stock-based sampling; surveys) and international coordination (section 7). All EWG sub-groups, however, commented on the RWPs.

Based on the general and detailed comments and proposals for improvements from this EWG, the RWPs will be further developed and updated by the RCGs (ISSG on RWPs, technical meeting in June and decision meeting in September) and scrutinized by MS before submission of final documents/tables.

One of the background documents for this ToR contained a questionnaire on RWPs, collated by the RCGs, which is addressed in the sections below.

Biological data from sampling commercial fisheries

General issues on RWP

In order to meet the needs and deadlines of a RWP, all MS need to agree to change their WP in line with RCG proposals, within a timescale that should be clear and achievable. Some effort needs to be spent to keep the process simple and avoid duplication of work. The EWG points out that an online platform for the WP/AR submission and evaluation, combined with a database holding WP/AR information and relevant fisheries data, would facilitate the production of an overview of planned regional sampling for inclusion in the RWP and subsequent alteration of MS WP if needed. Links to RWPs in MS WPs should be clearly defined, especially for the management authorities.

Role of STECF

Using the output of Table 1A to populate the tables for the WP/AR would result in the EWG receiving a document for evaluation, in which the quality evaluation in relation to Area/Stock/species name (for example) of the data presented in the WP will have already been done, except for some minor errors. The role of STECF will then be to ensure that the MS commitments detailed in the RWP are taken into account in the WP. The fact that less time will be required for basic data checking will leave more time for in-depth investigation of the data presented.

Several outstanding questions emerged, for which a clear guidance on how to proceed is needed:

- How this link between WP and RWP will be secured?
- How MS will report their activities regarding the RWP in their subsequent AR?
- How to avoid duplication of the same information in WP and in RWP? The MS responsibilities to the RWP need to be included in the WP/AR in order to be assessed.
- If STECF make recommendations on the RWP, how this will be followed up?

- How to avoid regional commitments being scattered in several documents?
(One idea would be a regional perspective in a WP, to add to the RWP. If WPs include a variable to spot regional sampling programmes, an extraction of all regional sampling in a region could be conducted directly from the compilation of WP. A database (the previously mentioned online platform tool) holding WP/AR information would make this process more efficient.)
- What will be the procedure for completing the assessment of the RWP during the EWG week, and if there are some problems or issues that need to be resolved, is there a process in place to achieve this?

Table 1A - current issues and questions

The EWG identified a few issues regarding the regional compilation of Table 1A:

It is not yet clear how to deal with the total EU share of the stock being < 10% of total landings. Moreover, it is difficult for an individual MS to obtain the correct information on the EU TAC and EU landing shares for all species/stocks. This is especially a problem for those species with no TAC. In order to produce regional figures, it would be appropriate that all MS use the same source⁷. It has to be clarified, however, which data source the figures should be obtained from and how the MS are supposed to calculate EU total landings in order to estimate their % share.

This emphasizes the need for a regional approach to Table 1A: The total sum of MS landings produced in Table 1A should be the value used to estimate the share in EU landings. As for the TAC as reference figures, it has to be considered that the TAC usually is the TAC before quota swaps (between MS) and that allocation of the TAC to stocks (e.g. using FIDES) is not always easy. It has to be clarified how to deal with combined species TACs (e.g. turbot/brill) for reporting purposes and how mixed species landings (monks/megrim etc.) are treated. It is difficult to produce a total figure if some of the fields contain text or the value of the total catch is repeated for all species and relies on comments in the text field to identify this. Furthermore, it has to be clarified how to integrate non-EU countries into the regional approach. The stocks 'selected for sampling' have to be coordinated at regional level.

Regarding the table format, there was some confusion in understanding the multiple information in each cell (selected for sampling in grey background, >10% share in bold). The EWG suggests that this information should be clarified. Current shading does not view easily. This needs to be changed and checked when viewing in different browsers to ensure clarity. A clear explanation of formatting used to display the different aspects should be included in the sheets.

Table 1A - ways forward

The objective should be to avoid MS reporting of combined areas/TACs to enable correct combination of landings by species/stocks. As example of good practice, the RCG Med&BS proposed an agreed landings table for MS to refer to in their WPs. Those tables are publicly available in the RCG report, which allows all MS to use the same data source. The benefit here is to be flexible on stock area modifications.

There was consensus in the EWG on the fact that Table 1A should be issued from a MS collaborative work, coordinated by an RCG from data gathered through an RCG data call. The output should be shown in the RCG report.

RCG LDF experience – multilateral agreements on regional sampling

The cooperation between MS within the RCG for Long Distance Fisheries (RCG LDF) proves that advanced regionally coordinated sampling programmes can be successful.

⁷ While the Implementing Decision 2019/909 chapter II refers to Eurostat in points 5 and 6 (thresholds in aquaculture), the reference is not so clear for points 2 and 3 (fish stocks).

The RCG LDF has conducted regional coordination and cooperation for several years and was in fact the first RCG to establish multilateral agreements containing regional sampling plans that provide examples for important elements of RWPs. The multilateral agreements between the MS concerned include financial commitments and are signed by duly authorised persons. Thus, the RCG LDF is already sufficiently prepared for the inclusion of the relevant regional elements into RWPs.

Recreational fisheries

Recreational fisheries data collection is currently carried out at pilot study level in most MS, following different methodologies. In order to include recreational fisheries into RWPs, it would be necessary to harmonize the data collection methodology among MS first for better comparability. Recent projects funded by DG MARE (STREAM, FishPi) were aimed at identifying areas of regional cooperation, including recreational fisheries, and provided guidelines on the best practice methodologies for sampling, processing, analysing and managing catch data and biological data in order to strengthen the regional cooperation among MS and develop a roadmap for regional plans. Outcomes of these projects should be considered together with the results of pilot studies on recreational fisheries when drafting future RWPs.

Diadromous fishes

Data collection and stock assessment methods for diadromous stocks differ largely from applied methods for most other species covered by the DCF, such as pelagic or demersal marine species. In addition, the assessment models developed for diadromous species differ in many cases from regular ICES stock assessment models and use a wide variety of data sources, of which some are rather fragmented. Most fisheries as well as the biological sampling for diadromous fishes take place in fresh- and transitional waters and cover specific life stages. Data from commercial sampling in coastal or offshore waters rarely, if at all, are used for stock assessment purposes.

Following a recommendation of the RCG Inter-Session Sub-Group on Diadromous Species (ISSG DIAD), it may be helpful to stay with current regulations for the time being. This would allow to wait for expected input from important end users (ICES, GFCM) before adjusting to regional biological data collection. For example, the outcome of the upcoming ICES WKFEA (Workshop on the Future of Eel Advice), initiated by WGEEL, may provide valuable input for optimized data collection. Also, outcomes from the current GFCM Liaison Action and associated GFCM Research Programme on European eel may provide valuable new outcomes that could improve future regional work plans.

In summary, data collection, coordination and its utilisation for diadromous species from an end-user perspective is still in progress and not sufficiently developed for orchestrated RWPs yet. As a result, the EWG proposes to remove diadromous species from Table 1A of the next submission of proposed RWPs and to hold this information separately. However, there remains an urgent need to further coordinate data collection on a regional scale in order to fulfil region-specific data needs and challenges for assessment for diadromous fishes as well as recreational fisheries, which should be implemented within the next submission of RWPs.

Research surveys at sea

The EWG considered the legal status of the RWP and concluded that the RWP should be seen as a multi-lateral agreement on a regional level. If the RCGs are supposed to set up the RWP, this will result in more responsibilities for the RCG (as foreseen in the recast DCF as increased regional mandate). The end users, however, have to be included in identifying the needs for elements to be incorporated into the RWP (e.g. the effort in age readings for a given stock).

Stock identification and/or distribution is a moving process. This requires a more coordinated participation in the sampling, both commercial sampling and surveys. As new stock configuration may emerge in the future, requiring cooperation from different countries, the RWPs should accommodate better for such situations.

The EWG has the following detailed comments on the tables and text boxes:

Table 1G:

- The table only includes the Days at Sea planned. Is this enough?
- The EWG encourages a database-compatible structure for this table, so more information (e.g. Days at Sea planned, targets etc.) can be captured (see Figure 3.1.b for an example).
- Variables "cost share" and "task share" should have separate columns in a database structure.
- The option "task share" may not have been used consistently over the surveys of both RWPs.
- Table 1H has not been included in the RWP, while it captures information (e.g. "Used as basis for advice (Y/N)") that could be included in Table 1G when presented as a database structure. The variable "type of data collected" from Table 1G in the WP is not included in Table 1G of the RWP.
- For future optimization of the number of columns, is the variable "Threshold agreement (Y/N)" necessary when this information is indirectly captured in the column "Threshold for cost sharing agreements"?
- For the triennial surveys, the number of days should be included when the RWP covers three years.

Text Box

- Text and maps should be presented in the same way for the different surveys:
 - o Type of information given for GRAHS differs from the other surveys
 - o Some maps include which countries cover which areas, others include haul positions.
 - o Manuals/methods used in the survey should be publicly available.
- The naming of the surveys in the text is not always consistent with naming of surveys in Table 1G (e.g. UWTV FU 16-22). The naming of the surveys should be in line with the EU MAP.
- Should national surveys that only have a national importance be included in the RWPs? Or should they first be mandatory before included in the RWP? As the international importance of national surveys may change through time, it is important that this will be detected when they are only presented in the national WPs.
- The presented surveys in the RWP are mandatory in the regulation and coordinated at international level through the relevant WGs. What is the added

value for including the surveys in the RWP? Add a heading in the survey text on: "added value of including surveys in the RWP" (e.g. cost-sharing, exchange of knowledge on international level).

- Some national surveys collect data at local level (e.g. stock life stages) that is relevant for the stock assessment. Such information should be reported and could be captured in Table 1G with the variable "Used as basis for advice (Y/N)".
- It would be useful to give some detail in the RWP on the actions/plans towards data sharing, quality checks and common tools as a database, if not yet available or in place.

Table 7A:

- It is confusing that this table consists of two separate tables. The EWG suggests that the two tables reported separately are merged into one and a column is added on the subject (e.g. ICES, RCG etc.).
- Is it really necessary to have the number of participants in Table 7A? Maybe just mark it as an 'x' when a MS participates a meeting. Number of participants can be included in the AR.

Table 7B:

- As this table can change annually, there will be a need to adjust the RWP annually.
- Maybe a follow-up action column should be included in this Table.
- Only one MS filled in an 'x' for recommendation R04 but the meaning is not clear . What does this mean?

Table 7C:

- The EWG encourages a database-compatible structure for this table.
- Each part of an agreement (service) should have a separate line. This will also avoid lines with only plusses (see Figure 3.2.b for an example).
- Add a column on subject (e.g. surveys, commercial sampling).
- The process of the agreements is not always clear and should be included in Table 7C, e.g. the delivered age data for assessment purposes for the receiving country.

Figure 3.1.a: First two lines of Table 1G in the RWP Baltic

Region	Name of survey	Acronym	Mandatory (Y/N)	Threshold agreement (Y/N)	Threshold for cost sharing agreements	Area(s) covered	Period (Month)	Frequency	Total Days at sea planned	DEU Days at sea planned	DNK Days at sea planned	EST Days at sea planned	FIN Days at sea planned	LTU Days at sea planned	LVA Days at sea planned	POL Days at sea planned	SWE Days at sea planned	Relevant international planning group - RFMO/RFO/O	Database
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q1	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	1st Quarter	Annual	112	23	36			2	9	28	14	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q4	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	4th Quarter	Annual	106	18	36	5		2	11	23	11	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS

Figure 3.1.b: Proposed database-compatible structure of Table 1G

Region	Name of survey	Acronym	Mandatory	Threshold	Threshold for	Area(s)	Period	Frequency	Total Days	Relevant	Database	MS	Days at Sea planned	Target	Used as basis for advice (Y/N)	type of data collected	etc.
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q1	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	1st Quarter	Annual	112	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	DEU	23 xx	xx		xx	xx
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q1	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	1st Quarter	Annual	112	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	DNK	36 xx	xx		xx	xx
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q1	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	1st Quarter	Annual	112	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	EST	xx	xx		xx	xx
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q1	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	1st Quarter	Annual	112	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	FIN	xx	xx		xx	xx
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q1	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	1st Quarter	Annual	112	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	LTU	2 xx	xx		xx	xx
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q1	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	1st Quarter	Annual	112	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	LVA	9 xx	xx		xx	xx
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q1	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	1st Quarter	Annual	112	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	POL	28 xx	xx		xx	xx
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q1	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	1st Quarter	Annual	112	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	SWE	14 xx	xx		xx	xx
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q4	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	4th Quarter	Annual	106	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	DEU	18 xx	xx		xx	xx
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q4	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	4th Quarter	Annual	106	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	DNK	36 xx	xx		xx	xx
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q4	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	4th Quarter	Annual	106	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	EST	5 xx	xx		xx	xx
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q4	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	4th Quarter	Annual	106	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	FIN	xx	xx		xx	xx
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q4	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	4th Quarter	Annual	106	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	LTU	2 xx	xx		xx	xx
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q4	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	4th Quarter	Annual	106	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	LVA	11 xx	xx		xx	xx
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q4	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	4th Quarter	Annual	106	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	POL	23 xx	xx		xx	xx
Baltic Sea	Baltic International Trawl Survey	BITS Q4	Y	N	NR	3aS, 3b-d	4th Quarter	Annual	106	ICES WGBIFS	DATRAS	SWE	11 xx	xx		xx	xx

Figure 3.2.a: First two lines of Table 7C in the RWP Baltic

Data transmission	Access to vessels	Validity	Contact persons	Content	Coordination	Description of sampling / sampling protocol / sampling intensity	DEU	DNK	EST	FIN	LTU	LVA	POL	SWE	Comments
Poland is responsible for submitting the data to the relevant expert groups	N/A as sampling is on shore	valid since 2013, updated in 2018	POL: Tomasz Nermer - nermer@mir.gdynia.pl DEU: Marko Freese - marko.freese@thuenen.de and Jan-Dag Pohlmann - jan.pohlmann@thuenen.de	Biological sampling of eels from commercial fisheries in the Oder River Basin District will be covered within the Polish national Programme		The target sample sizes are 100 yellow and 100 silver eel from commercial fisheries. Sample size might be adjusted to a lower level depending on the availability of eel from the Polish commercial fisheries.	-						+		agreement file available at Germany https://www.dcf-germany.de/sampling/ ; Poland http://dcf.mir.gdynia.pl/?page_id=365
Luke is responsible for storing the collected data from Estonian vessels to Finnish national database, and EMI in the case of sampling Finnish vessels, to Estonian national database. EMI and Luke are responsible for the incorporation of the data in Estonian and Finnish datasets respectively and to deliver that data to relevant ICES Expert Groups, and to the EC under the requirements of its Data Collection Framework. Both Member States will provide the required data for the species that are requested by the relevant ICES Expert Groups, and the data for the additional species to the respective other Member State as and when requested.		This agreement is valid in years 2020-2021	FIN: jukka.ponni@luke.fi; EST: Tiit.Raid@ut.ee	1. Herring and sprat fished by Finnish flagged vessels (OTM_SPF_16-104_0_0) that are landed in Estonia. 2. Herring and sprat fished by Estonian flagged vessels (OTM_SPF_16-104_0_0) that are landed in Finland.	NA	1. Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu (EMI) will carry out the biological sampling of herring and sprat in ICES SD's 29 and 32 if Finnish flagged vessels (OTM_SPF_16-104_0_0) are landing for first sale into Estonia. This sampling is part of the Estonian National Work Plan and eventual additional sampling cost will be covered by Estonia. 2. It has been agreed that Luke will carry out the biological sampling of herring and sprat in ICES SD's 29 and 32 if Estonian flagged vessels (OTM_SPF_16-104_0_0) are landing for first sale into Finland. This sampling is part of the Finnish National Work Plan and eventual additional sampling cost will be covered by Finland.			+	+					

Figure 3.2.b: Proposed database-compatible structure of Table 7C

Subject	Data transmission	Access to vessels	Validity	Contact persons	Content	Coordination	Description of sampling / sampling protocol / sampling intensity	Receiving country	Providing country
Biological sampling	Poland is responsible for submitting the data to the relevant expert groups	N/A as sampling is on shore	valid since 2013, updated in 2018	POL: Tomasz Nermer - nermer@mir.gdynia.pl DEU: Marko Freese - marko.freese@thuenen.de and Jan-Dag Pohlmann - jan.pohlmann@thuenen.de	Biological sampling of eels from commercial fisheries in the Oder River Basin District will be covered within the Polish national Programme		The target sample sizes are 100 yellow and 100 silver eel from commercial fisheries. Sample size might be adjusted to a lower level depending on the availability of eel from the Polish commercial fisheries.	DEU	POL
Biological sampling	Luke is responsible for storing the collected data from Estonian vessels to Finnish national database, and EMI in the case of sampling Finnish vessels, to Estonian national database. EMI and Luke are responsible for the incorporation of the data in Estonian and Finnish datasets respectively and to deliver that data to relevant ICES Expert Groups, and to the EC under the requirements of its Data Collection Framework. Both Member States will provide the required data for the species that are requested by the relevant ICES Expert Groups, and the data for the additional species to the respective other Member State as and when requested.		This agreement is valid in years 2020-2021	FIN: jukka.ponni@luke.fi; EST: Tiit.Raid@ut.ee	1. Herring and sprat fished by Finnish flagged vessels (OTM_SPF_16-104_0_0) that are landed in Estonia.	NA	1. Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu (EMI) will carry out the biological sampling of herring and sprat in ICES SD's 29 and 32 if Finnish flagged vessels (OTM_SPF_16-104_0_0) are landing for first sale into Estonia. This sampling is part of the Estonian National Work Plan and eventual additional sampling cost will be covered by Estonia.	FIN	EST
Biological sampling	Luke is responsible for storing the collected data from Estonian vessels to Finnish national database, and EMI in the case of sampling Finnish vessels, to Estonian national database. EMI and Luke are responsible for the incorporation of the data in Estonian and Finnish datasets respectively and to deliver that data to relevant ICES Expert Groups, and to the EC under the requirements of its Data Collection Framework. Both Member States will provide the required data for the species that are requested by the relevant ICES Expert Groups, and the data for the additional species to the respective other Member State as and when requested.		This agreement is valid in years 2020-2021	FIN: jukka.ponni@luke.fi; EST: Tiit.Raid@ut.ee	2. Herring and sprat fished by Estonian flagged vessels (OTM_SPF_16-104_0_0) that are landed in Finland.	NA	2. It has been agreed that Luke will carry out the biological sampling of herring and sprat in ICES SD's 29 and 32 if Estonian flagged vessels (OTM_SPF_16-104_0_0) are landing for first sale into Finland. This sampling is part of the Finnish National Work Plan and eventual additional sampling cost will be covered by Finland.	EST	FIN

Fishing activity, economic and social data

The EWG considers that the presentation and implementation of the RWP should imply a clear added value and improvement in the description of MS data collection activities. The common presentation of information already available in national WPs is not a sufficient purpose, but it should be complemented by a clear commitment by the involved MS to coordinate methodological approaches or to share effort in data collection activities.

It is considered that compilation of overview tables of data and information already presented in the WPs could be easily achieved through an online platform / reporting tool, connected to a database containing the relevant fisheries/economic data.

The procedure for the presentation of a RWP from the RCG ECON is also to be clarified. In particular, it should be determined if the "economic" sections should be part of the RWPs from other RCGs to avoid overlaps in regional plans, or if the RCG ECON can prepare an additional RWP only dealing with economic and social variables.

A RWP for economic and social data could cover information/tables on: a) data availability (Table 6A), b) planned regional and international coordination (Table 7A) and c) follow-up of recommendations and agreements (Table 7B). However, point b) should also consider regional specificities, for instance Mediterranean MS deliver economic and social data also to GFCM, and therefore, there is a need for those MS to coordinate their data collection activities within GFCM/SAC working groups.

A RWP for economic and social data could also propose a common quality assurance framework (QAF; text & table). In this case, the RWP could include a general commitment by involved MS to apply recommendations from RCG ECON, Eurostat quality standards and preparation of the methodological report. This RWP on QAF should then be complemented by national WPs describing national statistical tools and approaches.

The section on fishing activity could also be included in the RWP, as the framework of the Control Regulation is rather consistent and homogenous at regional level. However, also in this case, the added value should go beyond the presentation of tables already available in WPs. It would be advisable that RWP provide detailed information on the agreement at marine regional level for collection of effort variables for vessels of less than 10m length, as requested in the footnote of Table 4 in the EU MAP (COM Delegated Decision (EU) 2019/910).

The EWG also discussed that, if a RWP is presented, it could be used to display an overview of segments and data needs for the different sectors (fleet, aquaculture and processing), also to help in clarifying issues like coverage, clusters and thresholds. This will imply to include additional WP tables compared to the present ones, but information to compile these additional tables could be easily derived from the economic data calls (JRC database).

As a general point of view, the EWG would not recommend including common tables with sampling schemes (current Tables 3A, 3B and 3C) in the RWP, as these tables reflect national specificities (structure of the fleet, aquaculture plants and structure of the processing sector). These national specificities determine the type of data collection and the sample rates. Also, the sample rates, besides the need of statistical optimization, reflect budget constraints that are not the same for all MS. An alternative approach could be to include in the RWP simplified Tables 3A, 3B and 3C to report common approaches in data collection for specific variables, like for instance the "capital" ones or the debts and assets.

Regarding the format for the presentation of the RWP, the EWG considers that a "matrix" structure of the tables, like the ones used in the RWP Baltic and RWP NANSEA, could be suitable for this purpose. However, discussion on RWPs could advance and be more effective, once a definite work plan format according to the new EU MAP will be available.

Questions on RWPs

The following questionnaire is based on a background document provided to the EWG that was collated by the RCGs during the drafting of the RWPs.

- 1) Who should submit the RWPs? We think it could be the chairs of respective RCGs.
The EWG proposes that the chairs of respective RCGs submit a RWP, following the regional consent and mandate given by the RCG.
The procedure for the presentation of a work plan from the RCG ECON is also to be clarified. In particular, it should be determined if the "economic" sections should be part of the regional work plans from other RCGS to avoid overlaps in regional plans, or if the RCG ECON can prepare an additional RWP only dealing with economic and social variables
- 2) How should the evaluation feedback-loop look like in November when STECF is assessing the RWPs? Chairs can facilitate as focal points, but it is not in chairs power to change the content of the RWP (it should be regional consent). So it needs to be taken into account that more time is needed for answers.
The RCG chairs can facilitate the process, the loop would require a bit longer time, and the evaluation of the RWP by the STECF EWG should precede the WP evaluation, as the WP will probably refer to the RWP that should have been already evaluated.
- 3) How should the reporting look like? Will there be a regional annual report or should each MS present two AR (one covering the WP and the other RWP part) or should there be one AR per MS, where information from WP and RWP can be presented together?
It is preferred to keep it simple where it is recognized that the responsibility of carrying out the activities lies with the MSs. Only one AR per MS should be preferred. Information from the national and regional parts should be presented together.
- 4) In the future, would tables in the WP be replaced by RWP tables (so some tables are only in RWP and others only in WP)? Or should parts in RWP that are of MS responsibility, be also copied to the WP? Or should regionally coordinated rows end up only in RWP and national things in WP, so that both WPs will contain same tables but with different content? This year we are planning to have a duplication, so that information in RWP will also be reflected in WP.
In principle, activities included in tables of a RWP should not be duplicated in the WP tables. The WP should only make clear reference to these tables including activities undertaken by the RWP. Tables of the RWP (format/template) should be structured to accommodate the needing of such plan. The parts of the WPs carried out under a regional umbrella should be always responsibility of the MSs, these should thus make reference to the activities moved to the RWP. There can be a transition phase of RWP submission where duplication of both the WP and RWP is allowed.
- 5) All in all, there are elements in the submitted draft RWP text/tables which can be subject to changes annually. RWP is a statement of plans and intentions, just as WP and there should be a feedback loop for explaining changes in the plan (as AR is for WP). The RWP should follow that same logic as WP.
The EWG agrees with this approach.
- 6) Legal framework and flexibility for annual amendments of the RWP: Do we want a RWP with flexibility to update changes annually (such a WP) or do we want a more stable figure? Which will be the legal instruments to approve the RWP and how much flexibility for changes do they allow? (for more details about this issue, please, read the Comments made to the RWP Baltic (20201027_Comments Draft Baltic RWP.pdf)
It would be preferable that the RWP is something more stable, so not very much prone to continuous changes, but there can be particular situations as emerging scientific knowledge, new tools etc. which result in adjusting the RWP. If the RWP is endorsed by the MSs in the WP, the responsibility is always with the MSs
- 7) How will the RWP deal with non-EU countries?
This cooperation could be undertaken under the umbrella of the relevant RFMO, for example for the Mediterranean and Black Sea the GFCM. But this point might require specific reflexion as the situation can be different among the regions and RFMOs. For the northern RCGs non-EU countries should be invited as third parties.

- 8) Regional scope of the RWP. Some RCGs are covering more than one region as defined in Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU.

Yes, but if the RWP is addressing a specific subregion of the RCG, it would be in any case the RCG that can submit a proposal related to the sub-regional level. The RCG LP and LDF are exceptions, as they are pan-regional groups where a different approach is needed.

4 PREPARATION OF WP/AR TEMPLATES & GUIDANCE

As part of the preparations for this ToR, a group of ad-hoc contractors drafted revised WP/AR templates and guidance text, as well as a document explaining the changes and a code list file providing suggestions for standard entries for several variables (column headings) of the WP/AR templates. Overall, the approach followed for the structure of the templates aims at integration into an online reporting tool/platform (to upload WP and AR) connected to a database holding WP/AR information.

JRC experts on databases/data calls joined the EWG 20-16 on Thursday 5th November. The JRC experts' views were positive towards a database approach for the work plan submissions although no formal commitment for the development, implementation, host or maintenance were done. The JRC experts are open and willing to support this transition with their expertise on certain data calls and databases.

The proposals for new templates of WP and AR as well as for the guidance to fill them in are in the electronic annexes of this report. The work will continue during STECF EWG 20-18 in early 2021.

Comments of the individual WP/AR tables and sections

Table 1.1 (former Table 5A)

Historically, large text files were produced for inclusion in the WP and AR in order to describe the MS sampling plans. The intention of Table 5A with links to the documentation on MS websites / other sources was to minimise the amount of text produced without losing the information provided.

The EWG considered the contractor proposals:

- Option 1: Revision of current Text Box and Table 5A to a single Table 1.1
- Option 2: Annex 1 Quality Report (QR) replacing the actual WP and AR templates (Text Box and Table 5A)

The EWG discussed both options, which resulted in a new option of a three-step process which seemed to meet most needs and would be proposed for further discussion:

- Step 1 - Keep Table 1.1 simplified with QR section headers rather than the actual full list of questions, to provide an overview of quality documentation availability.
- Step 2 - Produce QR sheets for each individual sampling scheme / survey. This would be an overview of the process only but would provide more useful information in an easily accessible way for which individual steps have been documented.
- Step 3 - Within the sections of the QR, provide links to more detailed information on procedures in national web pages or other management bodies (surveys standard manuals etc.) as required.

The QR sheets should either be mandatory as an Annex to the WP (in English) as per reporting requirement or a link to them (new Table 1.1) provided for MS publicly accessible websites. The detailed information (links in QR report) would be preferably in English, as at least an overview to the generality of what is available in English in the QR report, but MS language would be allowed/permitted.

The proposal above is also aimed at reducing the amount of text required for Text Box 2.5 (ex-4A), especially removing any details on quality issued in this Text Box.

The outcome of the EWG 20-16 regarding Quality issues should be addressed to the relevant subgroups of the RCGs dealing with quality assurance (including ISSG on Data Quality) which should be included in future discussions, as some of them have already spent much time working on these issues. Discussions should be held to try to obtain a common format/structure for the QR reports with those being developed by the economists where possible.

The current proposed table would need modification to reflect the sections of the QR. A field will be required in the QR on whether the scheme is national or regional.

The sampling scheme name in the code list is to be further looked at. In the case of regional sampling schemes, the name of the sampling scheme should be agreed regionally and used by all MS involved.

The proposed table is thought to be less informative than the proposed Quality Report. The proposed GFCM structure is preferred. A potential risk of the Annex text is that it will be a very long document which is difficult to evaluate. The Annex should therefore be accompanied with a structure (with max. number of words) with some mandatory elements. It must be noted that when considering an online reporting platform, the proposed Quality Report should be assessed as well in the evaluation process.

Table 1.2 (former Table 6A)

The EWG agrees with the proposals of the contractors and has no additional comments.

Table 1.3 (former Table 7A)

The EWG agrees with the proposals of the contractors and has no additional comments.

Table 1.4 (former Table 7B)

The EWG agrees with the proposals of the contractors and has no additional comments.

Table 1.5 (former Table 7C)

- Follow a database-compatible structure for this table.
- Each service should have a separate line (in the case of multipurpose agreements).
- A column on the subject (e.g. surveys, commercial sampling) should be added.

- The process of the agreements is not always clear and should be included in the table, e.g. the delivered age data for assessment purposes for the receiving country.

Table 2.1 (former Table 1A)

In this table, the columns REGION, SPECIES, RFMO/RFO/IO and AREA should be pre-filled according to EU MAP Delegated Decision Table 1 to avoid misspellings and room for interpretation.

This table is intended to reflect the planning of MS dedicated for length sampling in column N. The variable code list (in guidance code list excel file) should be corrected and '@' replaced by '-at-' to avoid misunderstanding.

Column M 'regional agreement' Y/N explained in comments and guidance – an option could be to insert here the name of agreement from Table 1.5 (former 7C). It should be very clear in the guidelines that the regional agreement in this case is related with specific species/stock and should not be confused with agreement regarding regional sampling scheme.

All threshold rules (code list file needs revision) should apply to this table with the exception of EU MAP Implementing Decision rules for surveys.

It should be explicit in the AR headers that it is length measurements. There should be clarity in the guidelines (no ambiguity) that the value expected from AR is the total number of length measurements from at-sea and on-shore sampling, from commercial and recreational and from all fractions of the catches. The total number of samples should be the total number of PSUs where the related stocks appeared (excl. 0).

Table 1A should not be entirely filled by MS, for the following reasons:

1. The transcription of the region, stocks and area names in the WP are prone to too many errors. The solution is either a pre-filling of columns C-F in the WP template and/or a full creation within a RWP. The former has the merit of being easily and quickly implementable.
2. The filling of the European landing share implies to add each MS landings from the same source; the filling of the European TAC share implies that each MS uses exactly the same references in the FIDES database. This work could be better carried out collectively in a RWP.

The following questions should be addressed:

1. Should MS submit full list of Stocks from the EU MAP Delegated Decision or only from those regions in which it conducts a fishery?
2. How to refer to the exact stock entries from Table 2.1 into Table 2.2. Should there be a stock and area/stock Agreed standard list in the code list file or restriction with drop-down list or any other feature?
3. Specific to MED&BS, should MS fishing only in BS restrict the species list to only GSA 29? The principle should be that MS fishing in a region should keep all stock entries of the region. For the BS, the question is if this principle should apply to sub-region?

Table 2.2 (former Tables 1B and 1C)

The column I 'End-user specific request' relies on clear list of requirements (which variables and MS) being listed in a Data Call. The EWG suggested to allow filling of the field with Y/N/U, where U=Unknown if MS is unsure as to if it should provide data based on end-user request. In case when MS marked field as 'Unknown', an explanation in the comments field would be required.

In the guidance document, it should be specified that column K is mandatory and column L is optional and should only be used when a clear target is planned for sampling biological variables of a given stock.

This table is by stock and includes all biological variables (to be) collected. The sampling schemes, however, are not designed stock-based. As a consequence, the inclusion of some variables in this table need to be revised:

- "Sampling scheme": It would imply that lines for the same stock will be replicated if it is sampled in different sampling schemes (i.e. in the port & at sea).
- "Is there a RWP in force?": The same stock may be sampled in a national sampling scheme and in a regional sampling scheme. Additionally, in the case of sampling schemes for mixed-fisheries fleets (i.e. Iberian trawlers), many stocks will be spotted as YES in this table, even if their contribution to the total catch is small. This variable would be much more useful in Table 2.5.
- Include length as a variable. If so, is column "Covered by a commercial sampling scheme for length" needed in Table 2.1?
- Include stomach sampling as variable.

Table 2.3 (former Table 1D)

Regarding Table 2.3, no issues were identified.

General comment: Currently, pilot studies use a variety of methodologies since data collection for recreational fisheries is not yet harmonised pan-regionally. Once MS finish their pilot studies at the end of 2021 and start regular data collection, it will be necessary to harmonise methodologies and evaluate data quality. Hence, the EWG 20-16 recommends to use the Quality Assessment Toolkit (QAT) that was specifically developed and implemented by the ICES Working Group on Recreational Fisheries Surveys (WGRFS) for assessing the recreational fisheries data quality at country level.

In addition, in order to harmonize methodologies for recreational fisheries data collection among Mediterranean countries, the EWG 20-16 recommends to use the "Handbook for data collection on recreational fisheries in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea", which will soon be published. It is currently available at FAO GFCM website as a draft version:

https://gfcmsitestorage.blob.core.windows.net/website/Publications/GFCM_WGRF_2020_Handbook%20for%20RF%20data%20collection_WEBSITE.pdf.

Table 2.4 (former Table 1E)

Regarding Table 2.4, no issues were identified.

The code lists related to diadromous species were updated (see electronic annexes) by adding:

- Code list 'Life stages': eel life stages using WGEEL standard terminology,
- Code list 'Variable': all variables required by the EU MAP (abundance standing stock, abundance of recruits, biological variables (length), biological variables (weight), biological variables (sex ratio), biological variables (age), smolt abundance, parr abundance, number of ascending individuals in rivers); "other" as a variable for national assessment needs.

Table 2.5 (former Table 4A)

A column should be added to reflect the existence of a RWP as in Table 2.2.

Issues regarding the RWP and WP:

- Link with RWP in the WP: line of a Regional Sampling Plan (RSP) in the WP, column Regional agreement = Y
- Reporting realisation of the RWP in the AR: easy if there is a line in Table 2.5
- Duplication of information: questions remain on reporting RSP information both in the WP and in the RWP;
- Quality reporting: refer to a Regional sampling scheme QR (developed together with RSP) and reported in the WP Table 1.1.

The EWG proposes to change names from "Sampling Frame" to "Sampling stratum", as they are currently.

The PSU type in the guidance should not have the list of modalities => code list

Proposal on inclusion of PETS fields from old Table 1F: For the WP, the inclusion of several fields from Table 1F in Table 2.5 was proposed. However, for the AR, two options were proposed: In the first option, the report of the monitoring of the accidental catches of PETS by groups (mammals, reptiles, etc.) was maintained, as in Table 1F, and in the second option, it was proposed to report the monitoring of accidental catches of PETS in only one column, without distinction of groups. Option 2 was preferred by the EWG.

It should be clarified if Table 2.5 should contain only the sampling schemes for length sampling, or also for biological parameter sampling.

Table 2.6 (former Table 1G)

- The survey acronym should be in the code list. National survey can then be named "Other".
- Add column before the AR columns (grey columns) "Are survey data used as basis for advice (Y/N)?" as this variable was used to determine whether a national survey (proposed survey acronym = "Other") should be considered to be mandatory.
- Two options have been proposed for the survey text. When the text is provided in Annex I (option B) instead of in the general text (option A) it must be ensured that the Annex is considered as relevant as the main text of the WP and should not be considered as additional information. Furthermore, the Annex numbering should be dedicated to the specific topic. In other words, surveys should have their own Annex number in the WPs. An advantage of including the survey information in an Annex is that it can be reviewed once and only reviewed again when changes are made.
- "Type of sampling activities" should be included in the code list, e.g. fish hauls, hydrography, plankton hauls, acoustic profiles, litter hauls etc.
- Code lists: Should "Survey-acronym; for mandatory surveys in accordance with EU MAP Impl. Dec. Table 1" (row 18) be for Table 2.6 instead of 2.5?

Table 2.7 (new)

The EWG proposed to refer to this table, related to stomach sampling, as Table 4.1 to match with the Chapter II section 4 of the EU MAP.

The EWG considers that it is possible to remove this table by incorporating the stomach information as variable in Table 2.2 and type of sampling activity in Table 2.6. Information on columns "Metagenomic techniques", "Link to sampling protocol" could be included into the proposed Annexes for Data Quality and/or Surveys.

It is not clear what the added value is of column "Number of person days planned for analysis".

Table 3.1 (former Table 2A) - Fishing activity variables data collection strategy

- The name for the columns and some appropriate definitions were changed from "not covered by Control Regulation" to "under complementary data collection", because according to the EU MAP, the complementary data collection can be implemented also for the fleet collected under the Control Regulation but 'not at the right aggregation level for the intended scientific use'.
- The column "Complementary data collection (Y/N)" was deleted, as the table should be filled only for the fleet segments where additional data collection is planned.
- The column "Segment or Cluster Name (either name of segment or cluster, in case of clustering)" was renamed as "Segment Cluster Name (either name of segment or cluster, in case of clustering)".
- The definition for the fleet population was altered to the definition in Table 5.2 *Fleet total population and clustering* revised - "The population shall be based on the active and inactive vessels registered in the Union Fishing Fleet Register as defined in Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/218 on December 31st of the reporting year and vessels that do not appear on the Register at that date but have fished at least one day during the reporting year."

Table 5.1 (former Table 3A) - Population segments for collection of economic and social data for fisheries

- The new columns "Updated planned sample rate" and "Ratio planned rate/updated rate" were included in Table 5.1
- The column "Reference year" was renamed to the "Work Plan reference year". A new more detailed clarification was provided: "The social data should be collected in 2024 for reference year 2023. In case the reference year is different, the MS should provide the explanation in the text box". Changes were applied for the Tables 3.1, 6.1 and 7.1.
- A new column was added to the table for the Annual Report part "AR reference year". Changes were applied for the Tables 3.1, 6.1 and 7.1.

Table 6.1 (former Table 3B) - Population segments for collection of economic and social data for aquaculture

- The paragraph "Description of the threshold application" was included in the Text Box 6.1, where the % of the MS production from the latest EU aquaculture production reported to the EUROSTAT should be provided.

New revised draft versions of the WP/AR templates & guidance are provided in the electronic annexes to this report.

Due to limited time for discussions, the EWG 20-16 addresses the outstanding issues to the upcoming EWG 20-18 (Finalisation of the Work Plan template for data collection): The tables, text

boxes and code lists for the fishing activity and economic sections should be checked and harmonised to be as consistent as possible. The needs for the annual WP/AR evaluation should be considered during the development of the templates. The format in the text boxes for the Quality Assurance Framework suggested to replace former Table 5b as well as the inclusion of the "Methodological Report" in the WP should be checked and discussed. The names for the Text Boxes (3.1; 5.1; 5.2; 6.1; 7.1) should be changed according to the content provided in the Text Box. The section 7.1 should be in line with the final version of the EU MAP and latest RCG ECON 2020 recommendations and the links to the legislation, code list and definitions should be revised accordingly.

Taking into consideration that economic data is annually submitted in the frame of data calls to the JRC database, the following tasks should be followed in the near future for the development of a WP online reporting platform development:

1. Work Plans

- Foresee the storage of WP tables 2022-2024 (according to the WP table templates format provided in the electronic annex) in a database feeding the online reporting platform;
- Test the WP/AR templates by inserting relevant information for several MS from different regions and subsequent submission of the tables to the database.
- Organise the WP 2022-2024 Excel tables submission by the MS to the database before 31st of October 2021. The upload system should check the codes according to the "code list". WP tables with wrong codes should be rejected. It could be the same approach that usually is used for uploading the data for the data calls.
- Foresee an online reporting platform (like Tableau) where the end user can access or extract the WP tables.

2. Annual Reports

- Revise the templates for the data calls submission and include the columns with the additional information required for the Annual Report (example: add activity indicator, planned rates, sampling scheme etc.).
- Add additional tables, or fields in existing tables, in the database with information from the file "code list".
- Create queries in the database which implies the links between EU MAP requirements, planned parameters for the data collection in the WP and real information provided in the frame of the data calls.
- Test the use of the data query with obtaining of the information for MS Annual Reports and Data Transmission.

The implementation of these tasks will simplify the submission of WPs, Annual Reports and checks for the Data Transmission. The use of the online reporting tool for WP and AR also will increase the quality for the evaluation.

5 CONTACT DETAILS OF EWG 20-16 PARTICIPANTS

¹ - Information on EWG participant's affiliations is displayed for information only. In any case, Members of the STECF, invited experts, and JRC experts shall act independently. In the context of the STECF work, the committee members and other experts do not represent the institutions/bodies they are affiliated to in their daily jobs. STECF members and experts also declare at each meeting of the STECF and of its Expert Working Groups any specific interest which might be considered prejudicial to their independence in relation to specific items on the agenda. These declarations are displayed on the public meeting's website if experts explicitly authorized the JRC to do so in accordance with EU legislation on the protection of personnel data. For more information: <http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/adm-declarations>

STECF members		
Name	Address¹	Email
GRATI, Fabio	National Research Council (CNR), Institute for Biological Resources and Marine Biotechnologies (IRBIM), Largo Fiera della Pesca, 2, 60125, Ancona, Italy	fabio.grati@cnr.it
RAID, Tiit	Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu, Mäealuse 14, Tallin, EE-126, Estonia	tiit.raid@gmail.com
STRANSKY, Christoph (EWG chair)	Thünen Institute of Sea Fisheries, Herwigstr. 31, D-27572 Bremerhaven, Germany	christoph.stransky@thuenen.de
Invited experts		
Name	Address	Email
ADAMIDOU, Angeliki	Fisheries Research Institute, Greece	adamidou@inale.gr
ARMESTO, Angeles	Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Spain	angeles.armesto@ieo.es
AVDIC MRAVLJE, Edvard	Fisheries Research Institute, Slovenia	edoavdic@gmail.com
BERKENHAGEN, Jörg	Thünen Institute of Sea Fisheries, Germany	joerg.berkenhagen@thuenen.de
DAVIDJUKA, Irina	Institute of Food Safety - Animal Health and Environment - "BIOR", Latvia	irina.davidjuka@bior.lv
FREESE, Marko	Thünen Institute of Fisheries Ecology, Germany	marko.freese@thuenen.de
IOANNOU, Myrto	Department of Fisheries and Marine Research, Cyprus	mioannou@dfmr.moa.gov.cy
JAKOVLEVA, Irina	Fisheries Service under Ministry of Agriculture, Lithuania	irina.jakovleva@zuv.lt
KAZLAUSKAS, Edvardas	Agriculture Information and Rural	edvardas.kazlauskas@vic.lt

	Business Center, Lithuania	
KOUTRAKIS, Emmanouil	NAGREF - Fisheries Research Institute, Greece	manosk@inale.gr
LIONTAKIS, Angelos	AGRERI, Greece	aliontakis@agreri.gr
MCCORMICK, Helen	Marine Institute, Ireland	helen.mccormick@marine.ie
NERMER, Tomasz	National Marine Fisheries Research Institute, Poland	nermer@mir.gdynia.pl
NICHEVA, Simona	Executive Agency for Fisheries and Aquaculture, Bulgaria	simona.nicheva@iara.government.bg
PANAYOTOVA, Marina	Institute of Oceanology – BAS, Bulgaria	mpanayotova@io-bas.bg
RODRIGUEZ, Jose	Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Spain	jose.rodriguez@ieo.es
SABATELLA, Evelina	NISEA Società Cooperativa, Italy	e.sabatella@nisea.eu
SPEDICATO, Teresa	COISPA Tecnologia & Ricerca, Italy	spedicato@coispa.it
SUNDIN, Josefin	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden	josefin.sundin@slu.se
ULLEWEIT, Jens	Thünen Institute of Sea Fisheries, Germany	jens.ulleweit@thuenen.de
VAN OVERZEE, Harriet	Wageningen Marine Research, The Netherlands	harriet.vanoverzee@wur.nl
VIGNEAU, Joël	IFREMER, France	jvigneau@ifremer.fr
VUKOV, Ivana	Ministry of Agriculture, Croatia	ivana.vukov@mps.hr
WARNES, Stephen	Independent expert, United Kingdom	stevewarnes44@gmail.com
WÓJCIK, Ireneusz	National Marine Fisheries Research Institute, Poland	iwojcik@mir.gdynia.pl
ZARAUZ, Lucía	Fundacion AZTI, Spain	lzarauz@azti.es
ZHELEV, Kolyo	Executive Agency for Fisheries and Aquaculture, Bulgaria	kolyo.zhelev@iara.government.bg

JRC expert		
Name	Address	Email
HEKIM, Zeynep	DG JRC	Zeynep.hekim@ec.europa.eu

European Commission

Name	Address	Email
HEKIM, Zeynep	DG JRC, STECF secretariat	JRC-stecf-secretariat@ec.europa.eu
GARCIA Alvarez, Blanca	DG MARE, C3	blanca.garcia-alvarez@ec.europa.eu
STERCZEWSKA, Monika	DG MARE, C3	monika.sterczewska@ec.europa.eu

6 LIST OF ELECTRONIC ANNEXES

Electronic annexes are published on the DCF dedicated report section of the STECF website on:
<https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/reports/dcf-dcr>

List of electronic annex documents:

EWG-20-16 – Annex 1 – Work Plan evaluation sheets by Member State (Excel file)

EWG-20-16 – Annex 2 – Changes to WP/AR templates (Excel file)

EWG-20-16 – Annex 3 – Changes to WP/AR guidance (Word file)

EWG-20-16 – Annex 4 – Changes to WP/AR guidance code lists (Excel file)

7 LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background documents are published on the meeting's web site on:
<http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/stecf/ewq2016>

List of background documents:

EWG-20-16 – Doc 1 – Declarations of invited and JRC experts (see also section 4 of this report – List of participants)

EWG-20-16 – Doc 2 – Considerations and options for the revision of the DCF Work Plan (WP) and Annual Report (AR) templates and guidance – October 2020 (ad-hoc contracts)

EWG-20-16 – Doc 3 – Draft Work Plan and Annual Report template tables (ad-hoc contracts)

EWG-20-16 – Doc 4 - Draft Work Plan and Annual Report guidance (ad-hoc contracts)

EWG-20-16 – Doc 5 - Draft Work Plan and Annual Report guidance – code lists (ad-hoc contracts)

EU MAP:

<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32019D0909&from=EN>

<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32019D0910&from=EN>

Work Plan template:

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32016D1701&from=EN>

Annual Report template:

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018D1283&from=EN>

Relevant STECF EWG reports (EWG 16-16, 17-13, 18-18, 19-18, 20-08):

<https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/reports/dcf-dcr>

GETTING IN TOUCH WITH THE EU

In person

All over the European Union there are hundreds of Europe Direct information centres. You can find the address of the centre nearest you at: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en

On the phone or by email

Europe Direct is a service that answers your questions about the European Union. You can contact this service:

- by freephone: 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (certain operators may charge for these calls),
- at the following standard number: +32 22999696, or
- by electronic mail via: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en

FINDING INFORMATION ABOUT THE EU

Online

Information about the European Union in all the official languages of the EU is available on the Europa website at: https://europa.eu/european-union/index_en

EU publications

You can download or order free and priced EU publications from EU Bookshop at: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publications>. Multiple copies of free publications may be obtained by contacting Europe Direct or your local information centre (see https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en).

STECF

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.

The European Commission's science and knowledge service

Joint Research Centre

JRC Mission

As the science and knowledge service of the European Commission, the Joint Research Centre's mission is to support EU policies with independent evidence throughout the whole policy cycle.



EU Science Hub

ec.europa.eu/jrc



@EU_ScienceHub



EU Science Hub - Joint Research Centre



Joint Research Centre



EU Science Hub



Publications Office
of the European Union

doi:10.2760/623199

ISBN 978-92-76-27167-3