



JRC SCIENCE FOR POLICY REPORT

Scientific, Technical and Economic
Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

–

Evaluation of DCF 2017 Annual
Reports
(STECF-18-10)

Edited by Jenny Nord & John Casey

2018

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 policy-making 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 which might be made of this publication.

Contact information

Name: STECF secretariat

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

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

Tel.: +39 0332 789343

JRC Science Hub

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

JRCXXXXX

EUR XXXXX EN

PDF	ISBN XXXXXXXX	ISSN 1831-9424	doi:XXXXXXXX
STECF		ISSN 2467-0715	

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2018

© European Union, 2018

Reuse is authorised provided the source is acknowledged. The reuse policy of European Commission documents is regulated by Decision 2011/833/EU (OJ L 330, 14.12.2011, p. 39).

For any use or reproduction of photos or other material that is not under the EU copyright, permission must be sought directly from the copyright holders.

How to cite: Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) – Evaluation of DCF 2017 Annual Reports (STECF-18-10). Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2018, ISBN XXXXXX, doi:XXXXXXXX, PUBSY No.

All images © European Union 2018

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 presents the STECF findings based on the Report of the Expert Working Group (EWG 18-17) which was held from 25-29 June 2018 in Brussels, Belgium to evaluate MS Annual Reports on data collection for 2017, the MS's data transmission to the end users during 2017. The report of the EWG was reviewed by the STECF during its 58th plenary meeting held from 2-6 July 2018 in Brussels, Belgium.

Authors:**STECF advice:**

Ulrich, C., Abella, J. A., Andersen, J., Arrizabalaga, H., Bailey, N., Bertignac, M., Borges, L., Cardinale, M., Catchpole, T., Curtis, H., Daskalov, G., Döring, R., Gascuel, D., Knittweis, L., Lloret, J., Malvarosa, L., Martin, P., Motova, A., Murua, H., Nord, J., Prellezo, R., Raid, T., Sabatella, E., Sala, A., Scarcella, G., Soldo, A., Somarakis, S., Stransky, C., van Hoof, L., Vanhee, W., van Oostenbrugge, H. , Vrgoc, N.

EWG-17-07 report:

NORD Jenny (Chair), ARMESTO Angeles, BELL Margaret, BERKENHAGEN Jörg, CASEY, John, DAVIDJUKA Irina, DEGEL Henrik, FACCHINI Maria Teresa, FARRUGIA Hazel, GODINHO Susana, HEKIM Zeynep, JACKSON Emmet, KAZLAUSKAS Edvardas, KOUTRAKIS Emmanuil, LIONTAKIS Angelos, NERMER Tomasz, NI CHONCHUIR Grainne, PANAYOTOVA Marina, RADU Gheorghe, REIS Dália, SABATELLA Evelina Carmen, ULLEWEIT Jens, VAN OVERZEE Harriet, VANDEMAELE Sofie, VIGNEAU Joël, WARNES Stephen, WOJCIK Ireneusz, ZHELEV Kolyo.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF) - Evaluation of DCF 2017 Annual Reports (STECF-18-10).....	5
Request to the STECF	5
STECF observations	5
STECF conclusions.....	10
Contact details of STECF members	11
1 INTRODUCTION.....	16
1.1 Terms of Reference for EWG-18-10	16
1.2 Structure of the report	18
1.3 Pre-screening exercise.....	19
2 EVALUATION OF MEMBER STATES ANNUAL REPORTS FOR 2017 IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 11 OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1004/2017	21
2.1 Setting the scene.....	21
2.2 Results	23
2.2.3 Results by subgroups.....	24
2.2.3.1 Subgroup 1	24
2.2.3.2 Subgroup 2	27
2.2.3.3 Subgroup 3	31
2.2.3.4 Subgroup 4	32
3 EVALUATION OF MEMBER STATES TRANSMISSION OF DCF DATA TO END USERS IN 2017 BASED ON INFORMATION FROM END USERS AND MEMBER STATES' CLARIFICATIONS & EXPLANATIONS IN RESPONSE TO THE END- USER FEEDBACK.....	38
3.1 Setting the scene.....	38
3.2 Results	41
4 CONTACT DETAILS OF EWG-18-10 PARTICIPANTS.....	44
5 LIST OF ELECTRONIC ANNEXES.....	48
6 LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS.....	49
ANNEX 1: AGENDA	50
ANNEX 2: ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	52
ANNEX 3: MS OVERVIEW	56
<i>Member state: Malta</i>	68
ANNEX 4: PRESENTATIONS BY OBSERVERS	74
ANNEX 5: PRESENTATION ON THE IT-TOOL FOR AUTOMATIC PRE-SCREENING	77

SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF) - Evaluation of DCF 2017 Annual Reports (STECF-18-10)

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

STECF observations

STECF notes that EWG 18-10 met in Brussels on 25-29 June 2018. Since the meeting took place the week before STECF PLEN 18-02, the EWG report was not yet available to PLEN 18-02. The following STECF opinion and recommendations are consequently based on the presentation of outcomes from the EWG 18-10 meeting made by the chairperson and subsequent discussion among members during the STECF plenary meeting 18-02.

STECF notes that EWG 18-10 addressed all Terms of Reference during the meeting despite the fact that many novel aspects (new evaluation template, new Annual Report (AR) template, updated guidance document, new IT-tool) had to be addressed, and there was a substantial increase in data transmission issues.

Evaluation of 2017 AR reports

STECF observes that EWG 18-10 participants used the new evaluation template, which included more than 200 questions. STECF notes that, as was the case in previous years, pre-screening played a key role for a more efficient evaluation during the EWG. This year, however, not all sections of the AR had been pre-screened due to a lack of sufficient pre-screeners for several specific topics, which increased the workload for the experts.

STECF notes that the EWG identified a variety of issues with the questions of the new evaluation template, mainly related to: repetition, unclear formulations, aspects not relevant for the evaluation, and generally the need to reduce the number of questions to focus on the most pertinent issues. STECF considers that there is further scope to improve the amended version of the evaluation template drafted by EWG 18-10, and suggests that EWG 18-18 in November 2018 reviews the updated draft.

STECF observes that the EWG used the term 'compliance class / levels' for the evaluation; STECF considers the term 'compliance' is not appropriate and should be replaced with 'evaluation class / levels' or similar. STECF further observes that EWG 18-10 suggests re-introducing the regional dimension in the evaluation template. STECF however considers that it is more appropriate for the regional dimension to be discussed by Regional Coordination Groups (RCGs).

Guidelines for evaluating ARs are already available, but EWG 18-10 felt additional guidelines are required to ensure a more consistent and less subjective approach to evaluating Annual Reports and data transmission issues. To this end the EWG 18-10 proposed a first set of rules/assessment criteria to guide the evaluators. STECF agrees that such an approach would increase objectivity and consistency in the responses from different evaluators and provide experts that are new to the process with valuable guidance. Hence, in addition to the existing guidelines for evaluators, preparation of a separate stand-alone document containing a comprehensive list of assessment criteria is highly desirable. STECF notes this work is still in progress.

IT Tool for automatic evaluation of AR

STECF notes that following recommendations from EWG 17-17 a Screening Support Tool (SST) was developed to serve as an automatic pre-screening tool. The tool is meant to facilitate structure and codification checks on the Work Plan (WP) or AR individually at the stage of submission at the MS. STECF observes however that the tool was not fully operational prior to and during the EWG 18-10 due to a variety of codification issues.

STECF notes that although EWG 18-10 considers that the developed tool has potential to support a more efficient evaluation process in the short term, the EWG once again considers that a regional database approach would be more useful for the overall management of the DCF in the long term. STECF considers that even if substantial resources are invested into the IT-tool for automatic pre-screening of AR reports in line with the recommendations made by the EWG, the final product will not match the flexibility and functionality an online tool coupled with regional databases would have. Moreover, the problems faced by the developers of the IT-tool in preparation of EWG 18-10 were primarily due to codification issues. Consistent reference lists are thus a prerequisite to render the IT-tool operational, and such references should be stored in a central database. STECF reiterates that ultimately regional databases and an online reporting tool are required for the more efficient compilation of ARs by Member States. Such an approach would also facilitate more effective monitoring of ARs and data quality.

Data transmission issues

The online tool, <https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/dcf/compliance>, introduced as a pilot in 2015 by the JRC to assist with reporting and evaluation of data transmission (DT) issues was used interactively by Member States, pre-screeners and the EWG 18-10. The EWG was requested to review the Member States' responses to the issues raised by end-users in relation to data transmission issues arising from 2017 data calls and assess whether the responses inserted by Member States satisfactorily explain why the issue had arisen. The EWG was requested to provide its comments directly online in the form of a draft STECF response and assessment for review and if appropriate, amendment by the STECF.

The process proved to be more efficient than in previous years, with all parties involved (pre-screeners, Member States and the EWG 18-10) being more actively engaged. DG MARE had requested Member States to respond to the issues raised online, and despite a few minor issues associated with the migration of the online tool to a new software environment, the comments from all Member States were successfully incorporated online. Similarly, comments and assessments from pre-screeners and the EWG participants were successfully incorporated online.

In reviewing the issues raised in response to 2017 data calls by EWG18-10, STECF PLEN 18-02 notes that in total, 292 issues raised by end users in relation to data calls issued in 2017 were entered on the on-line tool (Table 1).

Table 1. Data transmission issues - Overview at the start of EWG 18-10

End User	Data Call	DT issues in 2017
GFCM	GFCM	1
ICES	AFWG	3
	HAWG	2
	WGBFAS	1
	WGNSSK	1
	WGSFD	1
	WGWIDE	1
IOTC	IOTC	21
RCG NORTH ATLANTIC	RCM NA	1
RCG NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC	RCM NS & EA	3
RCM BALTIC	RCM BALTIC	2
RCM North Atlantic	RCM NA	2
STECF	FDI	2
	Fleet economics	21
	Med and BS	128
	Processing	102
Sum		292

STECF notes that a higher number of data transmission issues were flagged in 2018 compared to 2017 due to the call for data on fish processing industry, which takes place every other year and was thus not evaluated in 2017. STECF observes that the Terms of Reference of EWG 18-01 on fish processing industry did not request the EWG to assess data issues. The data quality chapter in the EWG 18-01 report instead was based on automatic identification of missing variables in the JRC database, without expert judgement. STECF considers that simply reporting the list of variables that were requested under a data call, but not reported, is not appropriate, as it cannot be assessed how large an impact data issues have had on the ability to undertake the work.

All issues were commented on by the relevant Member States and such comments were evaluated by pre-screeners, and their responses were also reviewed and if necessary amended by the EWG 18-10. The assessments given in Table 2 indicate the outcome of assessments undertaken by the EWG 18-10 and reflect what is documented online on the current compliance platform.

Table 2. Summary of EWG 18-10 assessments of Member States' responses to data transmission issues raised by end-users relating to data calls issued in 2017.

	EWG 18-10 assessment of MS' responses			
End-user	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unknown	Total issues
ICES	0	9	0	9
STECF	131	51	71	253
IOTC	16	1	4	21
RCG* BALTIC	0	0	2	2
RCG* NS & EA	1	1	1	3
GFCM	1	0	0	1
RCG* N Atlantic	1	2	0	3
Total	150	64	78	292

* Records listed with RCM as end user have been combined with those listed as RCG

A total of 64 'unsatisfactory' data transmission issues remained at the end of EWG 18-10. These issues were raised by ICES (9) STECF (51), RCG North Atlantic (2), RCG North Sea and East Atlantic (1), and IOTC (1) as end users. The unsatisfactory issues from STECF data calls were mainly related to the Mediterranean and Black Sea (25), Processing (21) and Fleet Economic (5) data calls. Issues marked as unknown are cases where the EWG did not feel that there was sufficient information either in the issue description or the MS' responses to make a judgement.

STECF observes that a high number of data issues were once again flagged for the Mediterranean and Black Sea data call. The majority of these issues were assessed by EWG 18-10 as "satisfactory", meaning that MSS' replies on each individual issue have been considered appropriate and the data issues do not refer to actual data collection failures. STECF considers that future stock assessment EWGs should be asked to primarily report issues that truly impacted the stock assessment process.

Generally, issues raised by end-users were diverse and in some cases unclear, which means that Member States were unable to directly address the issue and provide an explicit explanation as to why the issue had arisen. In many cases, even if an issue is clearly explained by end-users, the comments from Member States do not directly address the issue or are unclear. In such cases, it was extremely difficult for the EWG 18-10 and the STECF PLEN 18-02 to review and assess whether the issues have been adequately addressed by the Member States.

Moreover, because of the subjective nature of such assessments, some of the assessments may appear counter-intuitive and it remained unclear to STECF whether those would need to be followed up by Member States and DG MARE. For example there are instances where an end-user has reported an issue that certain data (variables) requested under a data call were not transmitted by a Member State. In response, the Member State has commented that the missing data will be provided when responding to the next data call, which presumably means that the MS is committed in its WP to collect this data. And yet the assessment is given as 'satisfactory', despite the fact that the Member State failed to provide data to end users.

A second type of counter-intuitive assessment relates to issues such as the end-user has pointed out that data for one or more years were not provided. The Member State commented to the effect that sufficient samples were not collected at the time and that their National workplan/programme was subsequently modified in an attempt to redress the shortfall, yet the assessment outcome is 'unsatisfactory'.

STECF notes that in general the assessment of data transmission issues is at present still too subjective, and numerous questionable issues remain. In view of these observations, in reviewing the report of EWG 18-10 and the associated comments on the online platform, the STECF PLEN 18-02 took the view that to attempt to review each issue in turn and if necessary amend the EWG 18-10 comments and assessments would not necessarily prove useful since they would be equally subjective. Therefore, the comments and assessments that remain on the DT on-line tool in the columns headed 'STECF comments' and 'STECF assessment' are exactly as drafted by the EWG 18-10.

Ways forward

Data transmission issues

STECF considers that the most important element in evaluating a MS's performance in collecting data is whether or not the data collected are transmitted to the relevant end users in response to a data call. It is only then that the results of data collection can be properly evaluated for coverage and quality. STECF thus considers that the reporting of DT issues by end-users is of paramount importance, and more important than the AR evaluation. If data are not transmitted to, or cannot be used by end-users it is irrelevant what data the MSs' report to have collected in their ARs. Consequently the main focus of the current process should shift from comparing ARs with NWPs, to assessing MSs' data transmission and data quality issues raised by end users. In parallel the data submitted should be compared with the data as reported in the ARs and the intentions as laid out in the NWPs. STECF notes also that the accurate reporting of DT issues must thus be systematically included in the priority terms of reference of all EWGs making uses of data collected through a data call.

STECF notes that the current online tool used in the evaluation of data transmission issues has not been developed to its full potential. A suggested way forward to further develop and improve the online tool is included in the EWG 18-10 report, including proposals to change both the content of the online tool and the access rights. STECF endorses these suggestions. STECF further agrees with EWG 18-10 that it is important to change the name from 'Compliance Tool' and the suggested alternative name 'DTMT (Data Transmission Monitoring Tool)'

STECF recalls the step by step procedure to identify and to assess DT failures suggested by PLEN 17-02 to ensure consistency among end-users and to guarantee a systematic consultation among end users and MSs, which is shown in Figure 1. STECF considers that the 'Consultation end users-MS' step before reporting to the DT failure is currently not fully efficient for all data calls, as seen from the high number of DT issues reported in some of those. Increased consultation between Member States and end users after the completion of the working group and before the reporting of data failures should help decrease the high number of issues considered 'unsatisfactory' which are then flagged to DG MARE. Ways to achieve this in the case of the Mediterranean and Black Sea data call could be discussed in a short scoping meeting. The aim of the meeting would be to improve common understandings and expectations for when a data gap shall be considered a transmission failure or not. Moreover, possibilities to improve the current process of assessing transmission failures could be discussed, including means of assessing transmission failures faster. The meeting would bring together key end-users from the relevant working groups and people involved in the DT assessment process. Key experts from STECF plenary, GFCM, RCG representatives, and Member States shall attend as well.




Figure 1. Process for identification and assessment of DT failures suggested by STECF PLEN 17-02.

Regional databases

STECF reiterates that regional databases coupled with an online reporting tool will greatly help monitor effectively the execution of ARs, DCF data quality and assess data issues raised by end-users.

STECF notes that detailed biological sampling data from three Regional Coordination Groups (North Atlantic, North Sea & Eastern Arctic and the Baltic), is already stored in a common format in the regional database. STECF further notes that for the Mediterranean and Black Sea region, the implementation of the regional database is still under discussion. There is however currently no regional database for the RCG for large pelagics.

STECF considers that the economic data collated within the data calls for Fishery Independent Data (FDI), fleet economics (Annual Economic Report), aquaculture and processing industry could be utilised for filling the Annual Report tables for the corresponding modules.

STECF further notes that metadata (e.g. on the number of samples from which the variables have been derived) and quality indicators could be reported with the raw data during data calls and stored in the respective databases.

STECF conclusions

STECF endorses the outcomes of the EWG 18-10 presented during the STECF PLEN 18-02; The final EWG report was not yet available at the time of writing.

STECF concludes that the current evaluation process, which has evolved and grown over time, is at present tedious, overly detailed and in many instances subjective. In addition much of the process still focusses on reporting aspects, rather than execution and quality aspects of the ARs and the quality of the data collected by the Member States. As a result pertinent aspects of the collection, reporting and transmission of DCF data are not always evaluated adequately at present.

STECF concludes that more emphasis should be placed on assessing MSS' data transmission and data quality issues raised by end users, and in a timelier manner (starting with EWG 18-18 this year). In parallel the data submitted should be compared with the data as reported in the ARs and the intentions as laid out in the NWP.

STECF notes that the bulk of 'unsatisfactory' issues which need to be followed up by DG MARE are related to the fish processing and the Mediterranean and Black Sea data calls.

Regarding the fish processing call, STECF recalls the need to include the assessment of data transmission issues in the TORs of all EWGs making use of the data, so that expert judgement can be used to decrease the number of issues flagged. STECF notes this is already the case for some EWG (e.g. Annual Economic Report EWGs), but not for all. Inclusion of data transmission issues on the TOR of the processing EWG would have reduced the number of data transmission issues raised for this data call.

Regarding the Mediterranean and Black Sea data call, STECF suggests that the introduction of an additional feedback loop to increase communication between MSs and end users after completion of the EWG and before the reporting of DT failures. STECF suggests that a short discussion meeting could be organised by DG Mare to address this specifically.

STECF notes also that there is scope for further improving the online tool.

As in previous advice (STECF PLEN 14-02, 14-03, 15-02, 16-02, 17-02, 17-03), STECF concludes that regional databases together with a web-based application would be the most efficient means to achieve this. STECF considers that regional databases together with a web-based application to support the preparation, management and assessment of the AR is the optimum solution to ensure efficiency and transparency in the overall DCF AR and data transmission evaluation process.

Regional databases would allow for direct comparisons between the Work Plans (WPs) and the Annual Report (AR), and allow for consistency and quality checks to be carried out on the data. Additionally, regional databases would facilitate some internal peer-review, where data collected by one MS can be more easily used, and thus cross-checked, by other users. STECF thus urges the Commission to investigate ways to establish database procedures and online reporting tools in order to achieve these objectives.

STECF notes that there is a need to adopt a more consistent and less subjective approach to evaluating Annual Reports and data transmission issues and suggests that in addition to the existing guidelines for evaluators, a separate stand-alone document containing a comprehensive list of assessment criteria for both ARs and DT issues should be prepared ahead of the 2019 Review of Member States ARs. Such a document is intended to be a tool to enhance efficiency and objectivity and not to have any legal status. For data transmission issues clear definitions of the various comment categories (satisfactory, unsatisfactory, unknown, not assessed) should be drawn up. STECF suggests that this might best be prepared at the STECF EWG 18-18 scheduled for the week beginning 5 November 2018.

In addition, STECF concludes that it in order to provide DG MARE with helpful advice it is paramount that sufficient time for checking consistency and clarity of EWG comments is given in forthcoming EWGs on evaluation of ARs.

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	Address ¹	Tel.	Email
STECF members			
Abella, J. Alvaro	Independent consultant	Tel. 0039-3384989821	aabellafisheries@gmail.com
Andersen, Jesper Levring	Department of Food and Resource Economics (IFRO) Section for Environment and Natural Resources University of Copenhagen Rolighedsvej 25 1958 Frederiksberg Denmark	Tel.dir.: +45 35 33 68 92	jla@ifro.ku.dk
Arrizabalaga, Haritz	AZTI / Unidad de Investigación Marina, Herrera kaia portualdea z/g 20110 Pasaia (Gipuzkoa), Spain	Tel.: +34667174477	harri@azti.es
Bailey, Nicholas	Independent consultant		nickbailey2013@btinternet.com
Bertignac, Michel	Laboratoire de Biologie Halieutique IFREMER Centre de Brest BP 70 - 29280 Plouzane, France	tel : +33 (0)2 98 22 45 25 - fax : +33 (0)2 98 22 46 53	michel.bertignac@ifremer.fr
Borges, Lisa	FishFix, Brussels, Belgium		info@fishfix.eu
Cardinale, Massimiliano	Föreningsgatan 45, 330 Lysekil, Sweden	Tel: +46 523 18750	massimiliano.cardinale@slu.se
Catchpole, Thomas	CEFAS Lowestoft Laboratory, Pakefield Road, Lowestoft Suffolk, UK NR33 0HT		thomas.catchpole@cefas.co.uk
Curtis, Hazel	Sea Fish Industry Authority 18 Logie Mill Logie Green Road Edinburgh EH7 4HS, U.K.	Tel: +44 (0)131 524 8664 Fax: +44 (0)131 558 1442	Hazel.curtis@seafish.co.uk

Name	Address ¹	Tel.	Email
STECF members			
Daskalov, Georgi	Laboratory of Marine Ecology, Institute of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Research, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences	Tel.: +359 52 646892	Georgi.daskalov@gmail.com
Döring, Ralf (vice-chair)	Thünen Bundesforschungsinstitut, für Ländliche Räume, Wald und Fischerei, Institut für Seefischerei - AG Fischereiökonomie, Palmaille 9, D-22767 Hamburg, Germany	Tel.: 040 38905-185 Fax.: 040 38905-263	ralf.doering@thuenen.de
Gascuel, Didier	AGROCAMPUS OUEST 65 Route de Saint Brieuc, CS 84215, F-35042 RENNES Cedex France	Tel: +33(0)2.23.48.55.34 Fax: +33(0)2.23.48.55.35	Didier.Gascuel@agrocampus-ouest.fr
Knittweis, Leyla	Department of Biology University of Malta Msida, MSD 2080 Malta		Leyla.knittweis@um.edu.mt
Lloret, Josep	Associate Professor (Professor Agregat), University of Girona (UdG), Spain		josep.lloret@udg.edu
Malvarosa, Loretta	NISEA, Fishery and Aquaculture Research, Via Irno, 11, 84135 Salerno, Italy	Tel: +39 089795775	malvarosa@nisea.eu
Martin, Paloma	CSIC Instituto de Ciencias del Mar Passeig Marítim, 37-49 08003 Barcelona Spain	Tel: +34.93.2309500 Fax: +34.93.2309555	paloma@icm.csic.es
Motova, Arina	Sea Fish Industry Authority 18 Logie Mill Logie Green Road Edinburgh EH7 4HS, U.K	Tel.: +44 131 524 8662	arina.motova@seafish.co.uk
Murua, Hilario	AZTI / Unidad de Investigación Marina, Herrera kaia portualdea z/g 20110 Pasaia (Gipuzkoa), Spain	Tel: 0034 667174433 Fax: +34 94 6572555	hmurua@azti.es
Nord, Jenny	The Swedish Agency of Marine and Water Management (SwAM)	Tel. 0046 76 140 140 3	Jenny.nord@havochvatten.se
Prellezo, Raúl	AZTI -Unidad de Investigación Marina Txatxarramendi Ugarte a z/g 48395 Sukarrieta (Bizkaia), Spain	Tel: +34 667174368	rprellezo@azti.es

Name	Address ¹	Tel.	Email
STECF members			
Raid, Tiit	Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu, Mäealuse 14, Tallin, EE-126, Estonia	Tel.: +372 58339340 Fax: +372 6718900	Tiit.raid@gmail.com
Sabatella, Evelina Carmen	NISEA, Fishery and Aquaculture Research, Via Irno, 11, 84135 Salerno, Italy	TEL.: +39 089795775	e.sabatella@nisea.eu
Sala, Antonello (vice-chair)	Italian National Research Council (CNR) Institute of Marine Sciences (ISMAR), Largo Fiera della Pesca, 1 60125 Ancona - Italy	Tel: +39 071 2078841 Fax: +39 071 55313 Mob.: +39 3283070446	a.sala@ismar.cnr.it
Scarcella, Giuseppe	1) Italian National Research Council (CNR), Institute of Marine Sciences (ISMAR) - Fisheries Section, Largo Fiera della Pesca, 1, 60125 Ancona – Italy 2) AP Marine Environmental Consultancy Ltd, 2, ACROPOLEOS ST. AGLANJIA, P.O.BOX 26728 1647 Nicosia, Cyprus	Tel: +39 071 2078846 Fax: +39 071 55313 Tel.: +357 99664694	g.scarcella@ismar.cnr.it gscarcella@apmarine.com.cy
Soldo, Alen	Department of Marine Studies, University of Split, Livanjska 5, 21000 Split, Croatia	Tel.: +385914433906	soldo@unist.hr
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	Tel.: +30 2810 337832 Fax +30 6936566764	somarak@hcmr.gr
Stransky, Christoph	Thünen Institute [TI-SF] Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Institute of Sea Fisheries, Palmaille 9, D-22767 Hamburg, Germany	Tel. +49 40 38905-228 Fax: +49 40 38905-263	christoph.stransky@thuenen.de
Ulrich, Clara (chair)	Technical University of Denmark, National Institute of Aquatic Resources, (DTU Aqua), Charlottenlund Slot, JægersborgAllé 1, 2920 Charlottenlund, Denmark		clu@aquaa.dtu.dk
van Hoof, Luc	IMARES, Haringkade 1, Ijmuiden, The Netherlands	Tel.: +31 61061991	Luc.vanhoof@wur.nl
Vanhee, Willy	Independent consultant		wvanhee@telenet.be

Name	Address¹	Tel.	Email
STECF members			
van Oostenbrugge, Hans	Fisheries Economics, Wageningen Economic Research, formerly LEI Wageningen UR, The Hague, The Netherlands		Hans.vanOostenbrugge@wur.nl
Vrgoc, Nedo	Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries, Split, Setaliste Ivana Mestrovica 63, 21000 Split, Croatia	Tel.: +385 21408002	vrgoc@izor.hr

REPORT TO THE STECF

EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON Evaluation of DCF 2017 Annual Reports (EWG-18-10)

Brussels, Belgium, 25-29 June 2018

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 (STECF-EWG 18-10) met in Brussels, Belgium from the 25th to the 29th of June 2018 to evaluate EU Member States Annual Reports (AR) on data collection in 2017 and data transmission issues (DT issues) raised in relation to data calls made in 2017.

Under the process of evaluation and approval of the outcomes of the National Work Plans (NWP), the European Commission is legally bound to consult STECF on the execution of the NWPs approved by the Commission and the quality of the data collected by the Member States (MS) in accordance with Article 11 of Regulation (EU) No 2017/1004¹.

The work was developed by 27 independent experts. The list of participants is included in Section 4. The draft agenda that was slightly modified during the EWG is included in Annex 1.

The evaluation of Annual Reports (AR) and Data Transmission Issues (DT issues) was undertaken by subgroups to which experts were allocated according to their expertise. Prior to the EWG assessment, MS' ARs for 2017 and DT issues raised in response to 2017 data calls underwent a pre-screening process. Automatic pre-screening of ARs was initially carried out using a newly-developed software tool. The results from the automatic pre-screening were used as a basis for subsequent manual pre-screening. All pre-screening was undertaken by experts under contract to DG MARE.

1.1 Terms of Reference for EWG-18-10

Background

Article 11 of the data collection framework (DCF) regulation (Regulation (EU) 1004/2017 prescribes inter alia, that Member States shall on an annual basis submit to the Commission a report on the implementation of their national work plans (AR) and that STECF shall evaluate:

- (a) the execution of the national work plans; and
- (b) the quality of the data collected by the Member States.

In preparation for the above, EWG 18-10 will be convened in Brussels from 25-29 June 2018.

Request to EWG 18-10

EWG 18-10 is requested to evaluate Member States' AR on the implementation of their National Work Plans (NWPs) in 2017 which have been submitted to the Commission by 31st of May 2018 and report their findings to the plenary meeting of the STECF, which will take place in Brussels from 2-6 July 2018.

In particular, the EWG 18-10 is requested to report its findings regarding

¹ REGULATION (EU) 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)

- (a) the execution of the NWP, including the results of the pre-screening of ARs as described below and
- (b) the apparent data transmission failures reported by end users for data calls launched during year 2017.

Prior to the EWG 18-10 meeting, a pre-screening of Member States ARs will be undertaken through a series of ad hoc contracts (refer to background for details). The Commission may address additional requests to the EWG in relation to specific issues that arise from the pre-screening exercise.

EWG 18-10 report

The report of the EWG 18-10 should contain the following:

1. At the EU and regional level:
 - (i) An overall evaluation of the execution of data collection, including an estimate of the performance of Member States, major issues and recurring issues across Member States. The overall evaluation should also aim to highlight any deficiencies in data collection in relation to end user needs at the regional level in order that such deficiencies can be taken into account in planning future regional work programmes.
2. For each Member State:
 - a. With regard to annual reports
 - (i) An overall evaluation of whether the Member State executed its data collection activities in accordance with its agreed NWP for 2017.
 - (ii) A completed AR template provided by the Commission, which will already include the result of the pre-screening exercises. The completed template should highlight:
 - any persistent or recurring issues regarding execution of data collection activities
 - any persistent or recurring issues regarding reporting of data collection activities
 - any issues that may require the Commission to take remedial action (request for resubmission of the Annual Report or clarification of specific issues). The Commission will seek clarification from MSs on any issues raised during the EWG meeting and feedback from Member State should be evaluated by the EWG during the meeting. The EWG is not required to evaluate feedback from MS received after 28 June (one day before the EWG meeting ends).
 - Any issues that are 'for information' only
 - (iii) A summary list of follow-up actions to be addressed by Member States at the end of the EWG.
 - b. With regard to data transmission (DT issues) issues:
 - (i) An overall evaluation of Member State performance, of main data transmission failures per end user and of recurring issues by Member State.
 - (ii) An evaluation of Member States' responses via the online IT platform to data transmission issues raised by end users for the provision of scientific advice (i.e. the STECF, RCGs, ICES, GFCM, ICCAT, IOTC, WCPFC, NAFO and other RFMOs to which scientific data is provided by Member States) in relation to data calls issued in 2017. The EWG is requested to identify and report any issues that have not been adequately accounted for by Member States, by:

- classifying the data transmission issues according to whether they relate to data coverage (data not reported), data quality (the agreed collection procedures were not adhered to or the planned number of samples was not achieved) or timeliness of submission (legal and/or operational deadlines not met)
 - identifying and evaluating the specific issues relating to data transmission, recurring issues from previous years, including an evaluation of whether any aspects relating to the execution of the NWP are likely to have seriously affected the quality of any of the data collected. The data sets affected shall be highlighted.
- (iii) Identify in the evaluation per Member State the comments which require a reaction from Member State (draft a summary list) and those points which are for information only.
3. An assessment of the IT tool for automatic evaluation of AR and suggestions for improvement, with concrete examples.
 4. Suggested improvements to the guidance document of the AR should be put forward to the Commission if deemed necessary, with the aim to circulate to MS for next year's exercise.

Following review and endorsement by the STECF in July 2018, all resulting documentation (annual report evaluation and summary list of follow-up actions and evaluation of data transmission failures and summary list of points which require reaction) will be communicated to Member States by DG MARE for follow-up in view of acceptance of annual reports.

Background information

The EWG should take into consideration the relevant files from previous STECF EWGs (STECF EWG 15-15; STECF EWG 16-08, STECF EWG 17-10) and particular attention should be paid to the Evaluation guidelines and guidance for the submission of documents produced by EWG 17-17, EWG 17-13 and of the 7-8/02 technical meeting on the AR template. The EWG should also take into account information from relevant ICES WGs (e.g. WGCATCH), JRC reports, PGECON reports, ESTAT-relevant work and that of other end users.

Prior to the EWG 18-10 meeting, a pre-screening of Member States ARs will be undertaken through a series of ad hoc contracts. The template for evaluation of ARs submitted by MSs by 31 May 2018 relating to data collection in 2017 will incorporate automatic checks against the 2017 NWPs for certain elements. The results of those automatic checks will be delivered by 15 June and the remaining elements of annual reports not covered by the automatic pre-screening, will be assessed by a second group of pre-screeners, who will be requested to highlight any issues that they consider require further review and discussion by the EWG. The results of the second round of pre-screening will be available no later than 21 June.

The EWG shall work on the basis of the submitted annual reports by Member States, the data transmission failures file uploaded on the IT platform, the results of the pre-screenings (automatic and the results of the second step pre-screening), the reports presented on the automation of the annual report template (development of automatic checks and pre-screening).

1.2 Structure of the report

The report is divided into the two main sections; evaluation of ARs (section 2) and evaluation of DT issues (section 3). Each part is further divided into sub-sections; setting the scene and results.

To ease navigation and comprehension, an overview of the structure of MS' Annual Reports is given in Table 1 below. For a more detailed description, please consult the Guidelines for submission of Annual Reports (EWG-18-10 – Doc 2 - DCF_AR-DT_eval_guidelines)

Sections of MS Annual Reports	
1A	List of required stocks
1C	Sampling intensity for biological variables
1D	Recreational fisheries
1E	Anadromous and catadromous species data collection in fresh water
1F	Incidental by-catch of birds, mammals, reptiles and fish
1G	List of research surveys at sea
1H	Research survey data collection and dissemination
2A	Fishing activity variables for data collection strategy
3A	Population segments for collection of economic and social data for fisheries
3B	Population segments for collection of economic and social data on aquaculture
3C	Population segments for collection of economic and social data for the processing industry
4A	Sampling plan description for biological data
4C	Data on the fisheries by Member State
5A	Quality assurance framework for biological data
5B	Quality assurance framework for socioeconomic data
6A	Data availability
7A	Planned regional and international coordination
7B	Follow-up of recommendations and agreements
7C	Bi- and multilateral agreements

Table 1. Section of MS Annual Reports

1.3 Pre-screening exercise

Prior to the EWG 18-10 all Excel sections of the AR were pre-screened by a newly developed IT-tool for automatic pre-screening. In addition, 10 independent experts were contracted by DG MARE to pre-screen all sections of the AR except 1E, 1F, 6A, 7A, 7B and 7C as well as all data transmission issues (DT issues) that had been reported prior to the meeting.

Pre-screener results, AR assessment templates and the DT issues stored in the Data Transmission platform - <https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/dcf/compliance> were available to EWG participants via a dedicated ftp site (<https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/ftp>) on 22 June 2018.

To undertake the pre-screening exercise the Commission provided the pre-screening experts with a new version of the evaluation template (EWG-18-10 – Doc 1 – AR_evaluation_template). The new evaluation template based on the Guidelines for the new AR Template includes a set of new questions and the regional dimension that was previously included has been removed.

The pre-screening output on the AR and DT issues were provided to the EWG in the evaluation template and in the Data Transmission platform, respectively.

2 EVALUATION OF MEMBER STATES ANNUAL REPORTS FOR 2017 IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 11 OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1004/2017

2.1 Setting the scene

2.1.1 Formation of subgroups and task allocation

The assessment of Annual Reports (AR) and Data Transmission Issues (DT issues) was undertaken by subgroups to which experts were allocated according to their expertise (Table 2). In each subgroup one expert was identified as group facilitator. Each subgroup was tasked with the assessment of different sections of the AR.

AR sections	Subgroup	Expertise	Subgroup facilitator
1A, 1C, 4A, 4C	Subgroup 1	Biology	Jens Ulleweit
1D, 1E, 1F, 1G, 1H	Subgroup 2	Biology	Harriet van Overzee
2A, 5A, 6A, 7A, 7B, 7C	Subgroup 3	Economics and Biology	Joël Vigneau
3A, 3B, 3C, 5B	Subgroup 4	Economics	Evelina Sabatella

Table 2 – Allocation of AR sections by subgroup and expertise.

The AR sections were reviewed by the EWG and an overview of the EWG findings by subgroups (Section 2.2) and by MS (Annex 3) as well as in the evaluation template in Excel (EWG-18-10 – E-Annex 1 Evaluation of ARs by MS) are provided.

During the EWG, the Commission contacted 12 Member States for clarification on various AR tables, which has led to the improvement and finalisation of assessments for Spain, the Netherlands, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Italy, Estonia, Finland, Croatia and partially for Cyprus.

2.1.2 Background Information

To carry out the evaluation, the EWG were provided with access to supporting information such as the results from the manual and automatic pre-screening, the newly developed AR evaluation template and an updated version of the Guidance document for the assessment of the AR (EWG 17-17), the ARs and NWP for all MS as well as the data transmission platform.

2.1.3 Tools and criteria for the assessment

In order for MS to be able to respond to the evaluation results, the comments from the EWG need to be clear and self-explanatory. In addition, it is necessary that the evaluation is carried out coherently across subgroups so that the results are comparable and transparent.

Annex 2 includes a first set of agreed rules/assessment criteria with the aim to increase consistency in the responses from different evaluators. The aim of the set of criteria is, in addition to the existing guidelines for evaluators, to provide guidance during the EWG as well as for pre-screeners and evaluators at future EWGs. The EWG did not have time to finalise the document and suggests that a final version is prepared before next year's evaluation of ARs.

For the evaluation of ARs referring to 2017, the Commission provided a new version of the evaluation template for pre-screeners and the EWG (Doc 1 – AR evaluation template). The new

evaluation template incorporates the evaluation questions from the Guidance document (EWG-18-10 – Doc 2 - DCF_AR-DT_eval_guidelines).

It was the first time this version of the evaluation template was used. The EWG encountered a variety of issues concerning the evaluation questions mainly related to:

- Repetition
- Unclear formulations
- Aspects not relevant for the evaluation.
- The need to reduce the number of questions (more than 200) to focus on the most pertinent issues

The EWG modified the evaluation template and conducted the evaluation on the basis of the modified evaluation template. All proposed changes are illustrated in the electronic annex (EWG-18-10 – E-Annex 2 - Modified AR evaluation template).

As in previous years, four main categories were used to judge AR achievements. These four categories are shown in Table 3:

Compliance class	Compliance level	Score
No	<10%	N
Partly	10-50%	P
Mostly	50-90%	M
Yes	>90%	Y

Table 3 –Performance levels for the assessment of Annual Reports.

In addition to evaluate the ARs, each subgroup had to consider and provide answers to five questions related to ARs. These questions to the subgroups were highlighted at the beginning of the meeting.

The questions are:

- Were there any persistent or recurring issues regarding the execution and reporting of the data collection referring to the relevant and previous year?
- Define cross-cutting issues that affect the region.
- Overall, what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation? How would you resolve these? Make recommendations.
- Experience and suggestions for improvements of the developed IT-tool for pre-screening of the AR.
- Suggestions for improvements to the guidance document, AR template and evaluation template.

2.2 Results

2.2.1 EU overview

The overall evaluation shown in Table 4 is the summary evaluation of each MS based on the traffic light system in Table 3 above. Each subgroup assessed the performance of their allocated sections while the overall evaluation by MS was agreed in plenary. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Austria and Slovakia submitted their AR for the first time in 2017. The level of achievement for the MS that have previously submitted ARs appears unchanged overall.

AR section	AUT	BEL	BGR	CZE	CYP	DEU	DNK	ESP	EST	FIN	FRA	GBR	GRC	HU	HRV	IRL	ITA	LTU	LVA	MLT	NLD	POL	PRT	ROU	SVK	SVN	SWE
Overall performance	Y	M	M	NA	M	Y	M	Y	M	M	M	Y	M	P	M	Y	M	M	M	M	M	Y	Y	P	NA	M	M
1A	NA	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	Y	Y
1C	NA	Y	M	NA	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	P	NA	M	Y	M	M	M	M	Y	Y	M	N	NA	M	Y
1D	NA	Y	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	M	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y	Y
1E	NA	Y	NA	NA	NA	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	NA	NA	Y
1F	NA	Y	M	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	M	NA	Y	Y
1G-1H	NA	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y
2A	NA	Y	Y	NA	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y
3A	NA	Y	Y	NA	M	Y	Y	P	Y	M	M	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	M
3B	NA	NA	Y	NA	NA	P	Y	Y	NA	Y	M	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	M	NA	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y
3C	NA	M	Y	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	NA	P	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	NA	Y	NA	Y	Y
4A	NA	M	P	NA	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M	NA	M	M	M	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	P	Y
4C	NA	M	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	NA	M	Y
5A	NA	M	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	M	Y	M	NA	P	Y	Y	P	P	P	Y	Y	Y	P	NA	Y	P
5B	NA	Y	Y	NA	M	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	M	Y
6A	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M	M	Y	Y	Y	NA	M	Y
7A	NA	Y	Y	NA	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	M	Y
7B	NA	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	M	Y	P	Y	M	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	M	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y
7C	NA	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y

Table 4 – Summary of the assessment of Member State' 2017 Annual Report of the Data Collection Framework.

Overview tables on the MS DCF performance for the years 2010-2016 can be found in the following STECF reports; STECF12-01²; STECF-OWP-12-05³; STECF13-14⁴; STECF14-13⁵, STECF15-13⁶, STECF16-12⁷ and STECF 17-07⁸.

² Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries. Analysis of the DCF Annual Reports for 2010 (STECF-12-01). 2012. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 25250 EN, JRC 69389, 251 pp.

³ Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries. Evaluation of MS Annual Reports for 2011 of the DCF (STECF-OWP-12-05). 2012. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 25450 EN, JRC 73248, 239 pp.

⁴ Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) – Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF (1) (STECF-13-07). 2013. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 26090 EN, JRC 83658, 183 pp.

⁵ Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) – Evaluation of 2013 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission (STECF-14-13) 2014. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 26811 EN, JRC 91550, 257 pp.

⁶ Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) Evaluation of 2014 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission (STECF-15-13). 2015. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 27410 EN, JRC 96975, 287 pp.

⁷ Reports of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) – Evaluation of DCF 2015 Annual Reports & Data Transmission to end users in 2015 Quality assurance procedures (STECF-16-12); Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg; EUR 27758 E; doi:10.2788/352294

⁸ Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) – Evaluation of DCF 2016 Annual Reports & Data Transmission to end users in 2016 & preparation for the new assessment of Annual Reports and Data transmission (STECF-17-10). Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2017, ISBN 978-92-79-67482-2, doi:10.2760/036445, JRC107502

In general, pre-screening has proved to play a key role when it comes to efficiency and effectiveness of the EWG work. The possibility to have issues identified in advance as well as proposed comments, allows the EWG to priorities their work. This year section 1E, 1F, 6 and 7 had not been pre-screened prior to the EWG which increased the workload considerably for these sections.

The detailed evaluation template for each Member State is presented in the electronic annex of this report (EWG-18-10 – E-Annex 1 Evaluation of ARs by MS).

2.2.2 Regional dimension

According to the ToRs the EWG was requested to provide an overall evaluation of the execution of the data collection, identify major issues and recurring issues across MS and highlight any deficiencies in data collection in relation to end-user needs on the regional level.

In previous years, the evaluation templates for the evaluation of ARs were divided into regions for those MS that are active in more than one geographical area. The EWG agrees that it was useful to present the results of the evaluation of AR by regions since MS that are present in more than one region might execute their data collection differently in the different regions.

According to the DCF, MS are required to report their AR and NWP by regions. However, in the new evaluation template that was presented to the EWG the regional dimension has been removed. For this reason, the EWG could not conduct the evaluation of the AR on the regional level during the given time frame of the EWG this year. The EWG agreed that the regional dimension of the evaluation template should be reintroduced for future AR evaluations.

The EWG addressed cross-cutting issues that affect the region in the section specific subgroups presented under 2.2.3 below.

2.2.3 Results by subgroups

2.2.3.1 Subgroup 1

Sections dealt with: 1A, 1C, 4A, 4C

Overall performance of Member States in your sections. Overview, of the 27 MS how many were Yes, Mostly, Partly, No?

Subgroup 1	Sections	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	NA	Sum
	1A	22			1	4	27
	1C	11	10	1	1	4	27
	4A	12	8	2	1	4	27
	4C	19	3		1	4	27

Overall, what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation? How would you resolve these? Make recommendations

- It is currently unclear how to evaluate additions to sampling plans which were added due to changing fishing behaviour after the adoption of the NWP. The subgroup would suggest that this should be considered acceptable, as fishing behaviour can change significantly within and between years.
- Defining a common naming convention for the pre-screening files would be very useful when reviewing files in the EWG. The subgroup suggests the following: e.g. GER_AR_evaluation_template_1A-1C.
- Overarching issue regarding the definition of regions for biological variables. Some guidance here would be useful as the guidelines currently refer to Table 5C, which provides region definitions for economic variables.
- Table 1C: MS are asked to copy and paste the whole comment in every row in Table 1C, rather than commenting "see comment as above"/ "see comment in row XX" in the column "AR comment".
- Table 1C: Fresh water species should be reported in Table 1E (Anadromous & catadromous) and not in Table 1C (as per AR guidelines).

Were there any persistent or recurring issues regarding the execution and reporting of the data collection referring to the relevant and previous year?

- Few persistent/recurring issues were noted. In one case one MS announced in their 2016 AR that they would begin sampling a certain stratum from January 2017, however the same MS had repeated this statement in their 2017 AR, saying they will begin sampling the stratum from January 2018.
- In case of another MS, the evaluation of the 2016 AR highlighted an on-going issue with under-sampling, which appears not to have been addressed by the MS in 2017, and has led to persistent under-sampling (<40%).
- A recurring issue is that many MS's have made mistakes in their NWP original submission, and as a result of the guidelines, these mistakes had to be copied over to the AR 2017 without the possibility to edit. Many MSs should take the opportunity to correct mistakes in their NWP 2019 resubmission in October 2018.

Define cross-cutting issues that affect the region

- No cross-cutting issues that affect the regions were noted. However, with the current layout of the NWP/AR based on the performance of individual MSs and in the absence of regional work plans, it is difficult to note cross-cutting issues.

Experience and suggestions for improvements of the developed IT-tool for pre-screening

- The subgroup appreciated the development of an IT-tool for the evaluation of the Annual Reports. However, due to inconsistent coding, which lead to an extensive list of irrelevant issues, the subgroup was not able to use the IT-tool during the EWG.

Suggestions for improvements to the guidance document, AR template and evaluation template

In order to resolve some of the issues subgroup 1 propose the following questions for sections 4A, 4B:

Evaluation questions	Problem and approach during EWG evaluation and suggestions for future evaluations
Are the numbers of achieved PSUs satisfactory? <i>If not, answer questions 1.1-1.4</i>	A clear definition / threshold for "satisfactory" is missing. EWG judgement is based on the averaged achievement rates and pre-screening / expert judgement.
<i>Were the planned number of PSU sufficiently large to avoid unsampled data?</i>	A clear definition / threshold for "sufficiently large" is missing. EWG judgement is based on pre-screening / expert judgement.
<i>Were the number of strata too numerous in relation to the planned number of PSU to avoid a low number of PSU?</i>	Positive "No". EWG judgement is based on pre-screening / expert judgement. Suggested question for future evaluations: "Are the number of proposed PSU's within each stratum, considered adequate to cover the stratum?"
<i>If the number of strata were too numerous, were the planned PSU not achieved due to an unexpectedly low number of PSU in the reporting year?</i>	Positive "No" and the meaning of this question is extremely unclear. However, EWG judgement was based on pre-screening / expert judgement. Suggested question for future evaluations: "If the number of strata is large and the number of planned PSUs is not achieved, is this explained in the deviations section?"
<i>Should the Member State merge strata so that the expected total of PSU is more robust to annual fluctuations?</i>	It is not possible for the EWG to provide an in-depth analysis on this issue. Therefore, this question was not assessed during EWG. SG1 recommends that this question is deleted.
Are all Member States participating in the sampling listed?	This is related to the already accepted NWP (white cells). <i>Therefore, this question was not assessed during EWG.</i> SG1 recommends that this question is deleted.
Are all Member States participating in the sampling listed in Table 7C?	This is related to already the accepted NWP (white cells). <i>Therefore, this question was not assessed during EWG.</i> SG1 recommends that this question is deleted.
Does the stratum ID code coincide with Table 4B?	ok
Does the comment to Table 4A provide justification for any deviations from the NWP?	This question is related to the guidelines and was included in question 1 of the reporting section during evaluation.
Are strata with no coverage being reported in Text Box 4A, if they are not reported in Table 4A?	ok

Does the Member State provide sufficient justification in Table 4A on deviations from the NWP?	This question was rephrased for EWG evaluation: "Does MS provide sufficient justification on deviations from NWP either in the table or text box 4a?"
Is the total number of length measurements equal or larger than individuals (length from data source commercial) in Table 1C?	The question is problematic as it allows only for a yes or no answer, which can lead to a very negative judgement even if there is only a typo or the difference is negligible. Suggested question for future evaluations: "Is the total number of length measurements in alignment with the number of individuals (length parameter from the commercial data source) in Table 1C?"

2.2.3.2 Subgroup 2

Sections dealt with: 1D, 1E, 1F, 1G, 1H

Overall performance of Member States in your sections. Overview, of the 27 MS how many were Yes, Mostly, Partly, No?

Subgroup 2	Sections	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	NA	Sum
	1D	19	2	0	6	0	27
	1E	14	1	2	10	0	27
	1F	19	4	0	4	0	27
	1G-H	21	2	0	4	0	27

Overall, what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation? How would you resolve these? Make recommendations

For all sections

- The subgroup noted some deficiencies in the collection of certain variables, mostly due to NWP design. Therefore, any shortcomings resulting from the NWP were not negatively assessed in the evaluation.

Anadromous, catadromous data collection in fresh water (Table 1E, Text Box 1E) and Incidental by-catch (Table 1F, Text Box 1F, Pilot study 2)

- These sections had not been pre-screened prior to the EWG, which resulted in time-consuming evaluation. These sections should be pre-screened prior to EWGs evaluating Annual Reports in future.
- The evaluation has shown that the guidelines in relation to columns P-T in Table 1F have resulted in Member States not being consistent in using the available codes (i.e. Y, N and NA). 'Y' can include zero by-catch as can 'N'. There even appears to be differences in interpretation between institutes within a Member State as to how these codes should be

applied. The way the codes are presented in the AR at present means that there is no clear way to identify zero by-catch. The guidelines for these fields need to be reviewed at some point, to ensure that coding is used uniformly over the Member States (see also section on suggested improvements to the guidelines below).

Surveys at sea (Table 1G, Text Box 1G, Table 1H)

- A difference of interpretation of 'Member State shall provide maps presenting the spatial distribution of the main sampling types obtained during the survey' has resulted in some Member States providing distribution maps by species instead of the sampling types pointed out in Table 1G.
- One Member State moved the AR survey text points 6-9 within Textbox 1G so that all points 6-9 are moved to the end of the section rather than being within each survey. This can lead to information being missed and it is time consuming to deal with.

Were there any persistent or recurring issues regarding the execution and reporting of the data collection referring to the relevant and previous year?

- No persistent issues arose for SG2 (Tables 1DEFGH). This was the first year that tables 1EF were reported in the AR. Therefore, no comparison could be made with previous years.

Define cross-cutting issues that affect the region

Table 1D

- Recreational fisheries are a national aspect of the programme and ICES WGRFS is the body with input that could help at the regional level and may be able to assist MS when setting up schemes for other RFMOs.

Table 1E

- The catadromous fish data collection (Table 1E) is mostly based on national data collection schemes related to the specific requirements of individual mathematical models. In the case of salmon, the studies are coordinated by the WGBAST and WGNAS groups.
- According to the Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2016/1701, and the Regulation (EU) 2017/1004 of The European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2017, Member States and the Commission shall coordinate their efforts and cooperate in order to further improve the quality, timeliness and coverage of data enabling further improvement of the reliability of scientific advice, the quality of the work plans and the working methods of the regional fisheries management organizations to which the Union is contracting party or observer and of international scientific bodies. Due to these requirements, the Diadromous Fish Sub Group (DSG) of the Baltic Regional Coordination Group (RCG Baltic) met in 2017. As part of the defining the aims and objectives, the DSG considered the merits of regional coordination of salmon, sea trout and eels in support of stock assessments. Regional coordination of especially salmon in the Baltic is well established, though not fully implemented for all stocks or sea trout. Outside the Baltic regional coordination for salmon and eel is less well established.

- There is a major problem in the monitoring and assessment of the eel in the Baltic: though most Member States collect basic data, a substantial number of Member States do not assess their part of the stock, their impacts and the effect of their protective actions. This omission not only hampers the evaluation of national actions, but also disables the evaluation of the interactions between Baltic Member States, and the integration at the pan-Baltic level. The work of the RCG expert group is expected to intensify in the coming years, however, at the moment agreement on RCG level has not been determined.

Table 1F

- For Table 1F the evaluation has shown that the guidelines in relation to columns P-T in Table 1F have resulted in Member States not being consistent in using the available codes (i.e. Y, N and NA). As long as coding is not consistent, no overview of the effect of fisheries on by-catch species can be given.

Tables 1G-H

- Within surveys the regional aspect has been taken care as they are internationally coordinated. The regional aspect in recreational fishery takes place by pilot survey design for common approach.

Experience and suggestions for improvements of the developed IT-tool for pre-screening

- The IT tool was experienced as helpful for Tables 1G-H. For Tables 1DEF the Subgroup made an effort to use the tool but as no pre-screening had taken place on the new tables 1E, 1F more emphasis was directed to gaining an overview of MS responses in order to obtain an even evaluation. It was the view of the subgroup that the impact of the IT tool is not as important at present when assessing the tables for these sections because they are being presented for the first time and the guidelines need clarification – or guidance from STECF on how to interpret them. The text boxes contain much information that the IT tool cannot help with and they are a major input to the evaluation.

Suggestions for improvements to the guidance document, AR template and evaluation template

- The evaluation has shown that the guidelines in relation to columns P-T in Table 1F have resulted in Member States not being consistent in using the available codes (i.e. Y, N and NA). 'Y' can include zero by-catch as can 'N'. There even appears to be differences in interpretation between institutes within a Member State as to how these codes should be applied. The way the codes are presented in the AR at present means that there is no clear way to identify zero by-catch. The guidelines for these fields need to be reviewed at some point, to ensure that coding is used uniformly over the Member States.

Table 1E

- Experts decided to reformulate a proposed set of questions to answer on overall execution of requirements of Paragraph 2 points (b) (c) of Chapter III of the Multiannual Union

Programme (Implementing Decision 1251/2016). Two new questions were formulated for Table 1E:

- (i) "Is the achieved number of samples of stock related variables and catch quantity by area/life stage corresponding to the planned number of samples in Table 1E?". This question refers to point (b) and is related to fisheries dependent data collection (F).
 - (ii) "Is the achieved number of samples of eel recruits, standing stock and silver eels, salmon parr, smolts and ascending adults by river basin or EMU corresponding to the planned number of samples in Table 1E". This question refers to point (c) and is related to independent data collection (I).
- The reformulation of questions was made in order to focus on fisheries dependent (F) and fisheries independent (I) data collection by area/life stage, speed up the process due to the lack of pre-screening and simultaneously not losing the main objectives of catadromous and anadromous fish data collection and stock assessment.

Table 1F

- Questions concerning Table 1F were revised. As the review process only takes data into account that relates to the current reporting period, the following new question was formulated: "Is a pilot study indicated for the current reporting year in Pilot study 2 text box". Furthermore, three questions were removed:
 - (i) "Is Table 1F reported in the right format?". This question duplicates the question "Is Table 1F consistent with AR guidelines?".
 - (ii) "Is information given under Pilot study 2 sufficient to evaluate quality of its implementation?". This should be answered by the following questions on Pilot study 2. The EWG can evaluate if guidelines / protocols / standard practices are followed but are not in a position to assess implementation.
 - (iii) "Other comments and recommendations on Pilot study 2". The EWG is not a position to make such recommendations.

Finally, three questions were reformulated:

- (i) "Have the planned strata been monitored for bycatch and match Table 4A". This enables the evaluator to link Table 1F to Table 4A.
- (ii) "Has additional biological data (Stomach contents) been identified in Table1H". This question reflects more clearly what is stated in the guidelines.
- (iii) "Are the conclusions for completed pilot studies in the reporting year presented". This enables the evaluator to assess if conclusions been presented. The soundness is thereafter judged by question "Is the follow-up suggested by the Member State in Pilot study 2 sufficient?".

2.2.3.3 Subgroup 3

Sections dealt with: 2A, 5A, 6A, 7A, 7B, 7C

Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview, of the 27 MS how many were Yes, Mostly, Partly, No?

Subgroup 3	Sections	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	NA	Sum
	2A	18	5	0	0	4	27
	5A	11	8	3	1	4	27
	6A	17	6	2	0	2	27
	7A	17	5	1	0	4	27
	7B	17	2	3	0	5	27
	7C	22	1	0	0	4	27

Overall, what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation? How would you resolve these? Make recommendations

- The subgroup experienced difficulties in assessing the progress made in table 5A since hyperlinks were sometimes not working or protected with access rights or the documents were only given in national languages. A dedicated discussion on QAF would be needed in a STECF forum, together with a revision of this section in the guidelines.
- Several MS did not respect their NWP list of meetings (7A) and informed only on those meetings where they participated. This raises the question on which are the relevant meetings? The same issue was encountered with availability of datasets (Table 6A) and list of meetings (table 7A). The SST tool for automatic pre-screening could alert more clearly on the discrepancies between tables of the NWP and AR.
- Several MS did not report achievements properly for complementary data collection (section 2A) and will need to resubmit, although a number of issues have been addressed directly in interaction with MS during the EWG.
- It is not always possible to assess which recommendations apply to which MS. This is a recurring issue, and a solution could be to use an online platform such as the data transmission platform.

Were there any persistent or recurring issues regarding the execution and reporting of the data collection referring to the relevant and previous year?

- The subgroup did not address this question.

Define cross-cutting issues that affect the region

- None

Experience and suggestions for improvements of the developed IT-tool for pre-screening

- Several MS did not respect their NWP list of meetings (Table 7A) and informed only on those meetings where they participated. This raises the question on which are the relevant meetings? The same issue was encountered with availability of datasets (Table 6A) and list of meetings (Table 7A). The SST tool for automatic pre-screening could alert more clearly on the discrepancies between tables of the NWP and AR.

Suggestions for improvements to the guidance document, AR template and evaluation template

- The overall section on Quality Assurance (QAF, section 5A) should be revised. A modification is expected on the relation to sampling frames in documenting the QAF, since several sampling frames may follow the same sampling procedures, storage and processing. Indeed, it would be clearer to refer to sampling schemes and region, and ask for these to be fully documented at the end of the 3-year program. Moreover, it is confusing for MS to follow a guideline referring to a non-existing header named 'sampling frames' in 4A and 4B.
- The guidance for the evaluators indicate that the Table and Text Box of this section are not intended to be evaluated in terms of achievement of conformity but to show current status and remark on any significant improvement done by MS. It is not clear on conformity as to which standards are referenced here, since the EWG screened the AR with conformity questions related to both the codification and also to the follow-up of the guidelines.
- It is stated in the guidelines on section 5A that in cases where documents are not publicly available, due to institutions internal policy, confidentiality or other reasons, this shall be indicated by the MS. This is in contradiction with the general principle of transparency in the quality of the data and the need for capacity building across countries on the development of a QAF. The EWG is of the opinion that issues relating to internal policy and confidentiality need to be resolved in the interest of transparency, and that non-sensitive documentation should be made available.

2.2.3.4 Subgroup 4

Sections dealt with: 3A, 3B, 3C, 5B

Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview, of the 27 MS how many were Yes, Mostly, Partly, No?

Subgroup	Sections	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	NA	Sum
4	3A	17	5	1	4	0	27
	3B	15	2	1	8	1	27
	3C	16	2	1	7	1	27
	5B	17	7	0	3	0	27

Overall, what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation? How would you resolve these? Make recommendations.

Fleet economic (3A)

- Methodological documentation is still under implementation for several MS and it is not yet available to end users. Some MS report the timing for producing such documentation but for some MS, the process is still vague.
- Although the guidelines are sufficiently clear, some MS have calculated quality indicators incorrectly (sample and response rates). The sub-group suggests that a specific training session is organized by the next PGECON to give insights on the interpretation and the calculation of such indicators.
- Several MS did not implement the pilot study on social variables in 2017. In several cases the information given on follow-up actions planned for 2018 to start the actual collection of social variables is very short and therefore it was not able to assess if MS will face problems in the future.
- Information on clustering is not reported homogenously by MS. Guidelines specify that cluster should be reported only if "clustering has taken place for data collection purposes". However, in some cases clusters are also reported for purposes of data transmission. The sub-group briefly discussed the issue and agreed to accept this method as it would be in line with, or the same as, the format for data transmission.
- Fleet segmentation is a dynamic process which depends on the number of vessels and the activity performed during the year (assessment of the prevalent fishing gear); however planned sample rates are requested to be reported in the WP and cannot be changed in AR. The sub-group considers that MS should receive guidelines on how to follow and report changes in fleet segmentation without necessarily amending the WP.

Aquaculture & Processing (3B & 3C)

- All the issues for the sections 3B and 3C which were raised during the meeting were minor.
- Concerning the evaluation of the AR in general, all MS implemented data collection according to their WP. No major issues or failure to implement data collection for 2017 has been observed.
- The data collection for land locked countries (Austria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia) is in process of implementation.

Quality Assurance Framework (5B)

- Some Member States completed the table incorrectly and omitted the sector name which made the evaluation difficult.
- Some Member States completed the table incorrectly and did not indicate a 'Yes', or a 'No' for the categories P3-P13 questions for each sector.

- One Member State included explanations in table 5B. Only a 'Y' or 'N' should be indicated in the cells for the quality framework and comments should be reserved for the column asking 'Where can documentation be found?' and the AR comments column and Text Box 5B.
- Some Member States who indicated a 'No' for one of the questions did not explain the main constraints and/ or the steps taken to fulfil this obligation in text box 5B. MS must provide explanations for 'No' and for future annual reports MS should demonstrate how they are improving their quality assurance framework.

Were there any persistent or recurring issues regarding the execution and reporting of the data collection referring to the relevant and previous year?

Fleet economic (3A)

- Some MS report low level of response rates in the case of census.
- Quality indicators wrongly calculated in some ARs.
- Some MS reported aggregated fleet segments and variables as a single category (all segments, all variables), but this is not allowed by guidelines.

Aquaculture & Processing (3B & 3C)

- Clarification for the type of the data collection was required from the MS.
- Some MS provided the low planned sample rate % in case of Census and also achieved rate.
- Some MS completed the table 3B and 3C incorrectly for the achievement variables and were asked to resubmit the tables or to clarify the Response rate % and Achievement rate %.
- Some MS are collecting social data on annual frequency instead of obligatory triennial data collection. The deviation is considered as improvement.
- Aggregation of all variables and all segments. The sub-group discussed the issue and suggests that further consideration be given as to whether the approach of using a category "all" could be implemented in the recommended database approach. Based on the outcome, guidelines might be adopted.
- Some MS reported aggregated fleet segments and variables as a single category (all segments, all variables), but this is not allowed by guidelines. The sub-group discussed the issue and suggests further analysis if the approach of using a category "all" could be implemented in the recommended database approach. Based on the outcome, appropriate guidelines could be prepared.

Quality Assurance Framework (table 5B)

- Table 5B is new so there are no recurring issues identifiable for this year's evaluation. Attention will need to be paid to next year's evaluation to see if MS have improved their quality assurance frameworks especially for those MS which have indicated that they will make improvements by 2019.

Define cross-cutting issues that affect the region

- The subgroup considers that identification of cross-cutting issues, that could eventually affect the regional analysis, should require a more qualitative assessment of the level of achievements, response rates and procedures applied to estimate variables. This kind of analysis cannot be performed by EWG on AR evaluation, but it could be more appropriate within the AER meetings where data and cv (coefficient of variations) are available to experts.

Experience and suggestions for improvements of the developed IT-tool for pre-screening

The IT-tool for automatic pre-screening was not used to evaluate AR for these sections. The main issues related to economic sections which prevent its utilization are:

- The short time available to test it
- The codification list used to assess conformity of WP and AR refers to EU Decision 93/2010 and not to the present one (EU Decision 2016/1251). This affected the actual check on list of variables and even segments (inactive segment is not present in the SST)
- The structure of table 3A is different in the AR compared to WP (column with cluster has been included in the AR)

The IT-tool is aimed at highlighting mainly errors on reporting (different codes, formats, misalignment with WP content) that are not really informative on the execution and quality of data that are the main objectives of evaluation.

- The subgroup also considers that the IT tool is used to assess the level of execution through ranges of deviations of achieved sample rate versus planned versus rate. However, this is not appropriate because:
 - according to guidelines, assessment of the execution rate is requested only for tables 1C and 1G (check if the range of discrepancy falls between <90% and >150%.)
 - for economic sections, STECF 17-17 agreed not setting any minimum requirements as it might be unachievable
- The subgroup considers that the tool could be useful for MS when submitting WP and AR. This could avoid that MS could submit data using inappropriate entries or formats. However, for the aim of evaluating the level of execution and the quality of data, a database approach would be much more appropriate.
- For table 5B automatic screening can only be useful in determining if a MS has indicated a Yes instead of a No for the many quality indicators. The move from a No to a 'Yes' is seen as an improvement.

Suggestions for improvements to the guidance document, AR template and evaluation template

- For all the economic sections, it is recommended to combine the questions "Are there deviations from the NWP..." and "Are deviations explained?" in the evaluations tables 3A, 3B and 3C into one question so that each of these questions are only asked once. These questions should then be used to indicate if there has been any deviation from the NWP. If

a deviation or multiple deviations are indicated, then they should be explained in the annual report text with justifications for the deviation. The text can be used to evaluate if the deviations have been explained and justified sufficiently.

- In the future it should be avoided to introduce new columns or change their name in the AR as compared to the WP template if that would have any influence on the comparability (e.g. by adding new lines or by requesting coding which is not compatible with the WP)

Fleet economic 3A

- The guidelines should allow to report clustering for transmission purpose and not only for statistical purposes, as this will be in line with reporting of data in the fleet economic data call.
- AR guidelines report that "Planned sample rate can be modified based on updated information on the total population (fleet register)". This is appropriate but then the related cells should be reported in grey, otherwise no change is accepted (because white cells mean: "Copy directly from the WP").
- Evaluation of pilot studies for social variables is reported under the section "Fleet socio-economic (Table 3A, Text Box 3A, Pilot study 3)", but this is not appropriate. Pilot studies should be reported in a separate section because the pilot studies do not cover only fleet but also processing and aquaculture data. Furthermore, questions on pilot studies (31 to 35) should be completely revised for 2018 AR evaluation because social data will be collected under systematic survey and not under pilot studies.

The subgroup suggests the following changes in the evaluation excel template:

Rows to be deleted in the evaluation form	Justification
Are all the required variables listed based on Table 5a of the EU-MAP described and justified concisely in Text Box 3A?	The description and justification of variables is not requested by the guidelines. Therefore, this question is asking something that MS are not requested to report
Are deviations justified?	This question is linked to the previous one
Are the sampling frames and allocation schemes described and justified where applicable?	The question is not clear
Are the explanations sufficient?	This question relates to the data validation tools and methodologies to detect errors. Guidelines requires to report a very short text and to make a reference to methodological documents, therefore the question is not appropriate for text evaluation
Does the sampling design for Pilot study 3 (and 4) and follow internationally agreed protocols?	In case of pilot study, the question is not appropriate
Are the conclusions drawn from Pilot study 3 (and 4) sound?	Conclusion are not actually available to EWG therefore they cannot be assessed

Aquaculture & Processing (3B & 3C)

The common approach for the AR sections 3B and 3C evaluation was discussed during the meeting and the following judgment applied:

- The general evaluation "NA" for 3B was applied when the data collection according to WP was not planned or started. For some MS the opportunity to collect the data will be examined during the Pilot Studies. The Pilot Studies are ongoing or will be started in 2018.
- The general evaluation "NA" for 3C was applied when no data collection is carried out by MS.
- The proposed common evaluation for some questions are provided below:

	EWG comment	EWG judgment	EWG action needed
Section 3B			
If there are differences between data collection for techniques and species, are enterprises segmented correctly?	Not able to assess due to unclear question	NA	NA
Is thresholds are used, has the type of threshold been indicated?	NA*	NA*	NA*
Has the planned sampling been achieved?		Y	MS should improve the sampling strategy to avoid low achieved sampled rate.
Are the explanations sufficient?	Not able to assess due to unclear question	NA	NA
Does the sampling design for Pilot study 4 follow internationally agreed protocols?	Not able to assess due to the irrelevance of the question for PS4	NA	NA
Are the conclusions drawn from Pilot study 4 sound?	Not able to assess due to the irrelevance of the question for PS4	NA	NA
Section 3C			
Are the sampling frames and allocation schemes described and justified where applicable?	not able to assess due to unclear question	NA	NA

*in cases when the thresholds were not applied

The subgroup proposes that the following unclear or irrelevant questions be deleted from Section 3B of the AR template:

- Question "If there are differences between data collection for techniques and species, are enterprises segmented correctly?"
- Question "Are the explanations sufficient?"
- Question "Does the sampling design for Pilot study 4 follow internationally agreed protocols?"
- Question "Are the conclusions drawn from Pilot study 4 sound?"

- To delete unclear question for the evaluation in the section 3C:
- Question "Are the sampling frames and allocation schemes described and justified where applicable?"

Quality Assurance Framework (5B)

The usefulness of Table 5B is questionable in its current format. MS must be trusted that a 'Yes' is truthful as it is difficult for evaluators to determine if a 'Yes' is in fact correct. While many MS have provided links to methodological document it is beyond the remit and time allowance of the evaluators to review these documents. These documents are also often in multiple languages making evaluation more difficult or cannot be provided due to institutions internal policy, confidentiality.

The EWG considers that this table could eventually be completely removed if each MS provides a methodological document, as requested by several STECF meetings and by PGECON. This approach is also reported in STECF 17-11 on DCF quality issues: PGECON has considered quality issues with respect to both the procedures and the results. For the fleet economic data collection procedural aspects have been improved over the years. However, a systematic and comprehensive reporting has not yet been implemented, neither in the work plans nor in the annual reports. Therefore it has been repeatedly suggested to include a methodological report as part of the work plan (SGECA 09-02, 2009, annex I). PGECON 2017 (Anon 2017) followed up on this recommendation and proposed a structure for a methodological report (Anon., 2017 Annex 8). This methodological report would address amongst others survey planning, design and strategy, estimation design and error checks. This would also cover some of the issues which are requested under table 5b of the National Work Plan template (COM decision 1701/2016, section 5). The methodological report would have to be evaluated once and then remain valid until major changes are applied.

3 EVALUATION OF MEMBER STATES TRANSMISSION OF DCF DATA TO END USERS IN 2017 BASED ON INFORMATION FROM END USERS AND MEMBER STATES' CLARIFICATIONS & EXPLANATIONS IN RESPONSE TO THE END-USER FEEDBACK.

3.1 Setting the scene

Under ToR2, the EWG was requested to report its findings regarding the apparent data transmission issues (DT issues) reported by end-users for data calls launched during 2017. The EWG based the evaluation on information from end-users and MS' clarifications & explanations in response to the end user feedback reported in the in the online data transmission platform: <https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/dcf/compliance>. The evaluation was carried out online and the results from the evaluation is available in the data transmission platform.

There were 292 DT issues from 8 different end-users addressed to the EWG for evaluation (Table 5). The EWG was requested to evaluate each DT issue individually, and provide an overall evaluation of MS performance of DT issues per end user and evaluate the feedback/explanation from the MS. Each DT issue response was finally judged to be either satisfactory, unsatisfactory or unknown.

The EWG was requested to flag unclear comments from MS or end-users to the Commission so that they could be contacted for clarification during the meeting. Additional information or feedback received up until 28 of June were to be considered in the evaluation.

End User	Data Call	DT issues in 2017
GFCM	GFCM	1
ICES	AFWG	3
	HAWG	2
	WGBFAS	1
	WGNSSK	1
	WGSFD	1
	WGWIDE	1
IOTC	IOTC	21
RCG NORTH ATLANTIC	RCM NA	1
RCG NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC	RCM NS & EA	3
RCM BALTIC	RCM BALTIC	2
RCM North Atlantic	RCM NA	2
STECF	FDI	2
	Fleet economics	21
	Med and BS	128
	Processing	102
Sum		292

Table 5- DT issues per end user and data call.

The assessment of the DT issues was carried out in subgroups, related to the expertise in the group. As for the Annual Reports, the DT issues underwent a pre-screening assessment prior to the EWG. The pre-screeners were requested to run a first assessment of the issues, propose draft comments to be adopted by the EWG and highlight DT issues with unclear feedback to the Commission so that further clarifications could be sought.

3.1.1 Tools and criteria for the assessment

The data transmission assessment was carried out directly using the online data transmission platform provided by the JRC on the DCF website. As in previous years, the data transmission platform has proved to be an important tool to facilitate the work of the experts. However, there is still scope for further improvement which will require only minor adjustments to the online display (further detail on the improvements is given in section 3.2.2 below).

In order to ensure comparable and coherent assessments of DT issues raised, the EWG agreed to use the assessment criteria developed during EWG 17-07 (Table 6).

Issue	EWG Assessment and associated comments
Unclear MS comment in reply to the issue flagged by the end-user.	Unknown
The DT issue identified by an end-user is not clearly and explicitly described (End-user must always provide a self-sufficient comment/feedback to the EWG.)	Unknown + a comment: "The end-user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies"
Information provided by end-users and MS is contradictory and there is no evidence to allow the EWG to give an assessment.	Unknown
MS mistaken on data transmission.	Unsatisfactory
The issue raised relates to lack of data collection and not data transmission. Hence, data will not be	Unsatisfactory A standard comment must be included. "Failure concerning data

Issue	EWG Assessment and associated comments
available but situation must be flagged.	collection and not data transmission"
Data exists but MS fails to submit.	Unsatisfactory
When the issue raised is related to lack of punctuality on data transmission:	
1. If flagged by the End-user with "HIGH" or "Impact on the WG".	Unsatisfactory
2. If flagged by the End-user with LOW/MEDIUM severity and it proves to be a repetitive issue from past years.	Unsatisfactory
3. If flagged by the End-user with LOW/MEDIUM severity and it proves not to be a repetitive issue from past years.	Expert should judge according to the MS justification. (no fixed rules agreed)
If MS according to the agreed NP, plans to collect additional data beyond DCF requirements and does not transmit these data in response to a data call (this additional collection must be however clearly stated in the NP)).	Unsatisfactory
If the issue relates to data collected and called for in the past and data transmission has previously been evaluated.	Unknown. The Standard comment "Issue is assumed to be closed since it relates to the past and data transmission has previously been evaluated."

Table 6 – Assessment criteria for DT issues.

DG MARE requested the EWG to identify whether the DT issues were recurrent issues. The EWG agreed that the column 'EWG comment' should therefore include a statement of whether the issues was recurrent. Since the data transmission platform does not indicate if a DT issue have occurred previously it was difficult to find information on whether the issue was recurrent or not. The EWG therefore agreed to only highlight recurrent issues referring to 2016.

Furthermore, the EWG was also requested to specify in the column 'STECF comment' whether DT issues classified as unsatisfactory were due to:

1. Data/variables not collected
2. Data/variables not transmitted at all or not transmitted according to deadlines
3. Incomplete coverage of the fleet
4. Poor data quality assessed on the basis of robust statistical analysis (average parameters, time series consistency, etc.)

3.2 Results

In summary, the evaluation of the 292 transmission issues concluded that 150 issues were justified as satisfactory, 64 unsatisfactory and for 78 the EWG was not able to make an assessment (or the issue was considered closed), therefore these were classified with unknown.

The issues marked as unsatisfactory were raised by ICES (9) STECF (51), RCG North Atlantic (1), RCG North Sea and East Atlantic (1), and IOTC (1) as end users. The unsatisfactory issues were mainly related to the Mediterranean and Black Sea (25), Processing (21) and Fleet Economic (5) data calls. The number of DT issues have increased substantially from last year AR evaluation (from 184 to 292). The increase is mostly due to the data call for processing 2017 that generated 102 DT issues (data for processing was not called for 2016).

The complete list of the issues for each MS, together with EWG comments and assessment can be viewed by the relevant MS in the data transmission platform:

<https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/dcf/compliance>.

3.2.1 General comments on DT issues

The EWG agrees that the reporting of DT issues by end-users is of paramount importance to evaluate MS performance of data collection. It matters not what a MS collects or reports as having collected in their AR if such data are not transmitted. However, the process in which DT issues are evaluated today is considered somewhat inefficient, overly detailed and subjective.

Many issues raised by end-users are diverse and in some cases unclear which means that Member States were unable to directly address the issue and provide an explicit explanation as to why the issue had arisen. In many cases, even if an issue is clearly explained by end-users, the comments from Member States do not directly address the issue or are unclear. In such cases, it was extremely difficult for the EWG 18-10 to evaluate whether the issues have been adequately addressed by the Member States.

The EWG considers that there is a need to have a concerted attempt to educate end-users of the importance of data issues they discover in the course of using the data provided by MSs. A clear description of the issues raised is fundamental to the ability of MSs to understand and comment on such issues. Similarly, the MS comments need to address each issue directly and provide a suitable response. It is equally crucial that the STECF and other end-users comments to issues raised and the associated MS responses are sufficiently clear and informative to allow DG MARE to judge whether the issue can be considered a failure or warrants further clarification from the MS before such a judgement is made.

Apart from the guidance document that provides guidance to the evaluators on which issues/question to address there is currently no agreed procedural document that ensures that all experts allocate the same evaluation classification (unsatisfactory, satisfactory etc.) etc. to the same type of DT issue. This coupled with the fact that the EWG are asked to spend a lot of time on DT issues of minor importance and that the ToRs leaves little or no time for assessing that the evaluation is performed consistently across subgroups, risk resulting in inconsistencies in the EWG evaluation.

The EWG considers that agreed rules/assessment criteria to guide future evaluators and to increase consistency in the responses from different evaluators should be developed prior to next year's EWG on evaluation of ARs and DT issues. This year's agreed criteria are provided in Annex 2. The aim of the set of criteria in Annex 2 is to, in addition to the existing guidelines for evaluators, provide guidance during the EWG as well as for pre-screeners and evaluators at future EWGs.

Furthermore, the EWG considers it crucial that future EWGs are given sufficient time to assessing consistency of the evaluation results (DT issues and ARs).

3.2.2 Data transmission platform

This year DG MARE had requested Member States to respond to the issues raised on-line and despite a few minor issues associated with the migration of the on-line tool to a new software environment, the comments from all Member States were successfully incorporated on-line. The process proved to be a more efficient process than that used in previous years, in that all parties involved (pre-screener, Member States and the EWG 18-10) became actively engaged with the process. Similarly, comments and assessments from pre-screener and the EWG participants were successfully incorporated on-line.

However, the tool was developed as a pilot exercise by the JRC and has not been developed to its full potential and the processes that have been used to date to upload and download of excel templates is inefficient for a number of reasons.

There is potential to develop the online tool further to make the process more efficient and fit for purpose. A suggested way forward is given below for consideration. Note that the proposals change both the content of the online tool and the access right. Furthermore, the effectiveness of the tool requires that all players in the process use it on-line.

Id	Year	Country	End User	Data Call	Data requested	Issue	Issue type	Severity	Recurring Issue?	MS Comment	End user Comment	End user Assessment	STECF Comment	STECF Assessment	DG MARE Comment/ action	DG MARE Decision
3088	2017	Member State 1	STECF	Processing	National totals for companies whose main activity is NOT fish processing	Belgium reported the number of enterprises for all years, but not the turnover	COVERAGE	UNKNOWN	NO			[NOT ASSESSED]		[NOT ASSESSED]		UNKNOWN
3089	2017	Member State 2	ICES	WGNSSK	Discards of plaice	No discard data provided for Beam trawlers > 24m LOA for 2017	COVERAGE	HIGH	NO			[NOT ASSESSED]		[NOT ASSESSED]		UNKNOWN

ID	Automati- cally generate d													
Year	Insert year data call relates to	Manual input						MS input						
								End-user input						
Country	Select from list							STECF input						
								DG MARE input						
End user	Select from list													
	Read access: relevant MS and end-user STECF and DG MARE													
Data call	Select from list													
	Read access: relevant MS and end-user STECF and DG MARE													
Data requested	Manual input by end-user .	State the variable type(s) to which the issue relates e.g. landings, revenue, discards, fuel costs												
	Read access: relevant MS and end-user STECF and DG MARE													
Issue	Manual input			The text should be stand-alone and contain explicit detail to be self-										

	identifying the issue.	explanatory e.g. discard weight of plaice for beam trawlers of LOA>24m operating in ICES sub-area IV not reported by the MS; fuel costs for pelagic trawlers of LOA >40m not reported for FAO region 27.		
	Raccess: relevant MS and end-user STECF and DG MARE			
Issue type	Select from list (coverage, quality, timeliness - DO NOT include an option UNKNOWN)			
	Read access: relevant MS and end-user STECF and DG MARE			
Severity	Select from list (High, medium, low, UNKNOWN). Category unknown will be appropriate only in cases where the impact of the data issue is genuinely unknown.			
	Read access: relevant MS and end-user STECF and DG MARE			
Recurring Issue?	Select from list (yes, NO, UNKNOWN). Mark yes if it is an issue that was raised previously BUT do not raise it if for example, if the issue had been satisfactorily addressed previously. Do not report for example that MS 'A' did not provide data for 2008-2010 if the data transmission issue relates to a data call in 2017 and which did not request data for the years 2008-2010.			
	Read access: relevant MS and end-user STECF and DG MARE			
MS Comment	Manual input by MS. MS should provide sufficient detail to allow the end-user to assess whether the issue has been adequately addressed or whether it should remain as a candidate data failure.			
	Edit access: relevant MS only, Read access: end-user that raised the issue, STECF and DG MARE			
End-user comment	Manual input. Insert any appropriate comment that justifies the end-user assessment and suggested follow-up action. Note that in some cases end user and STECF will be one and the same.			
	Read access: relevant MS, STECF and DG MARE. Edit access: Relevant end-user			
End user Assessment	Select from list (NOT ASSESSED, SATISFACTORY, UNSATISFACTORY)			
	Read access to relevant MS and end user, STECF and DG MARE. EDIT access to relevant end-user only			
STECF Comment/proposed action	Manual input. Insert any appropriate comment that justifies the STECF assessment and suggested follow-up action			
	Read access: relevant MS, STECF and DG MARE. Edit access: STECF			
STECF Assessment	Select from list (NOT ASSESSED, SATISFACTORY, UNSATISFACTORY)			
	Read access: relevant MS, STECF and DG MARE. Edit access: STECF			
DG MARE Comment/action	Manual input. Insert any appropriate comment that justifies the DG MARE assessment and follow-up action			
	Read access: DG MARE. EDIT access: DG MARE			
DG MARE Decision	Select from list (Not a DT Failure, Failure)			
	Read access: DG MARE. Relevant MS and end-user, STECF. EDIT access: DG MARE			

Table 7. Proposed content, instructions and access rights for the online Data Transmission Monitoring Tool (DTMT).

4 CONTACT DETAILS OF EWG-18-10 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	Address ¹	Telephone no.	Email
Jenny NORD	Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management		jenny.nord@havochvatten.se
Evelina Carmen SABATELLA	NISEA, Via Irno, 11, 84135 Salerno, Italy	TEL.: +39 089795775	e.sabatella@nisea.eu

Invited experts			
Name	Address	Telephone no.	Email
Armesto, Angeles	Instituto Espanol de Oceanografia, VIGO. Spain	+34 986 492 111	angeles.armesto@ieo.es
BELL, Margaret	Marine Scotland Science, ABERDEEN. United Kingdom	+44 1224 876 544	m.bell@marlab.ac.uk
Jörg BERKENHAGEN	Thuenen Institute of Sea Fisheries, HAMBURG. Germany	+49 040 38905-206	joerg.berkenhagen@thuenen.de
Irina DAVIDJUKA	Institute of Food Safety- Animal Health and Environment - BIOR, RIGA. Latvia	+37 129 811 703	irina.davidjuka@bior.lv
Henrik DEGEL	DTU-Aqua, ROSKILDE. Denmark	+45 213 14 880	hd@aqua.dtu.dk
Maria Teresa FACCHINI	COISPA		facchini@coispa.it
Hazel FARRUGIA	Fisheries Resource Unit - Department of Fisheries &		Fisheries Resource Unit - Department of Fisheries & Aquaculture

	Aquaculture		
Susana GODINHO	DGRM - Direção-Geral de Recursos Naturais- Segurança e Serviços Marítimos		sgodinho@dgrm.mam.gov.pt
Zeynep HEKIM	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences		zeynep.pekcan.hekim@slu.se
Emmet JACKSON	Bord Iascaigh Mhara		Emmet.jackson@bim.ie
Edvardas KAZLAUSKAS	Agricultural information and Rural Business Center, VILNIUS. Lithuania	+37 037 397 087	edvardas.kazlauskas@vic.lt
Manos KOUTRAKIS	NAGREF_Fisheries Research Institute. Nea Peramos. 64007 Kavala Greece	+302 594 029 037	manosk@inale.gr
Angelos LIONTAKIS			aliontakis@agreri.gr
Tomasz NERMER	National Marine Fisheries Research Institute, GDYNIA. Poland	+48 587 356 211	nermer@mir.gdynia.pl
Grainne NI CHONCHUIR	The Marine Institute, CO. GALWAY. Ireland	+35 391 387 200	grainne.nichonchuir@marine.ie
Marina PANAYOTOVA	Institute of Oceanology - BAS		mpanayotova@io-bas.bg
Gheorghe RADU	National Institute for Marine Research and Development Grigore Antipa, CONSTANTA. Romania	+40 241 543 288	gradu@alpha.rmri.ro
Dália REIS			dalia.cc.reis@uac.pt
Jens ULLEWEIT	Thünen Institute of Seafisheries, HAMBURG. Germany		jens.ulleweit@thuenen.de
Harriet VAN OVERSEE	Wageningen Marine Research		harriet.vanoverzee@wur.nl
Sofie VANDEMAELE	Institute for agricultural and fisheries research. Ankerstraat 1. Oostende. Belgium.	+32 59 569 883	sofie.vandemaele@ilvo.vlaanderen.be
Joël VIGNEAU	Ifremer		jvigneau@ifremer.fr

Stephen WARNES	Self-employed, NORWICH. United Kingdom	+44 1603 447 734	steviewarnes44@gmail.com
Ireneusz WOJCIK	National Marine Fisheries Research Institute, GDYNIA. Poland	+48 587-356- 232	iwojcik@mir.gdynia.pl
Kolyo ZHELEV	Executive Agency for Fisheries and Aquaculture		kolyo.zhelev@iara.government .bg

JRC experts			
Name	Address	Telephone no.	<u>Email</u>
John Casey	JRC Ispra, Unit D.02, Via E. Fermi 2749, 21027 Ispra (VA), Italy	+39 0332 783 936	john.casey@ec.europa.eu

European Commission			
Name	Address	Telephone no.	<u>Email</u>
Oana Surdu	European Commission, DG MARE C3, Rue Joseph II 79, 1000 Brussels	+(32) 2 2967343	oana.surdu@ec.europa.eu
John Casey	DG Joint Research Centre JRC, STECF secretariat		Stecf- secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu

Observers			
Name	Address	Telephone no.	<u>Email</u>
Lotte WORSØE CLAUSEN	ICES, H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46 1553 Copenhagen V Denmark	+45 33386721	lotte.worsoe.clausen@ices.dk

Laurent.dubroca			laurent.dubroca@gmail.com Laurent.Dubroca@gfcmonline.org
-----------------	--	--	---

5 LIST OF ELECTRONIC ANNEXES

The following electronic annexes are published on the meeting's web site on:

<http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/stecf/ewg18-10>

EWG-18-10 – E-Annex 1 Evaluation of ARs by MS

EWG-18-10 – E-Annex 2 Modified AR evaluation template

6 LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

The following background documents are published on the meeting's web site on:
<http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/stecf/ewg18-10>

EWG-18-10 – Doc 1 – AR_evaluation_template

EWG-18-10 – Doc 2 - DCF_AR-DT_eval_guidelines

EWG-18-10 - Declarations of invited and JRC experts (see also section 4 of this report – List of participants)

ANNEX 1: AGENDA

Draft Agenda

Attendance

Chair: Jenny Nord

DG MARE: Joost Paardekooper and Jaana Mettala (Mon morning), Oana Surdu (Mon-Fri)

JRC: John Casey (STECF focal point)

Experts: 27 independent experts

Observers: Lotte Worsøe Clausen (ICES), TBC (GFCM)

Daily timetable

Morning session: 9h – 13h (Mon, Tue, Wed, Thu and Fri)

Afternoon Session: 14h – 18h (Mon, Tue, Wed, and Thu)

Breaks: 10h45 and 15:45h

Rooms: Centre Conferences Albert Borschette (Conference Room 3A and, for work in subgroups, meeting room 3.10) all week, except for Tuesday 26/06 (DG MARE J-99 room 00/53). Please check CCAB rooms on the days of the meeting at the entrance.

Monday, 25 June (Venue: CCAB, check at entrance)

Morning Session:

1. Welcome and housekeeping; introduction of participants and observers; agenda presentation (Chair)
2. Introduction from JRC on STECF rules and FTP access
3. Introduction to the ToRs from the Commission (Joost Paardekooper and Oana Surdu)
4. Subgroup formation
5. Introduction of **ToR 3** by the Commission. Presentation from the Contractor on the IT Tool for automatic evaluation of AR and suggestions for improvement.

Afternoon Session:

6. Working methods (data transmission issues).
 - o Presentation from ICES on data failures 2017 (Lotte Worsøe Clausen)
 - o Presentation from DG Mare and the JRC
7. Perform a joint assessment of a chosen AR and data transmission issues. Objective: set a common assessment ground, calibration of criteria and principles across subgroups.
8. Subgroup work: **ToR 2**

17h30 – 18h00: daily wrap-up in Plenary

Tuesday, 26 June (Venue: DG MARE, J-99 00/53)

Morning Session:

1. Subgroup work: **ToR 2** (cont.)

Afternoon Session:

2. Subgroup work: **ToR 2** (cont.)

17h30-18h: daily wrap up in plenary

Wednesday, 27 June (Venue: CCAB, check at entrance)

Morning Session:

1. Subgroup work: **ToR 2** (cont.) and **ToR 1**

Afternoon Session:

2. Plenary session **ToR 1 & 2**: MS final overview and collation of Subgroup outputs (individual work of experts on the assigned MS).

Thursday, 28 June (Venue: CCAB, check at entrance)

Morning Session:

1. Presentation from GFCM (Laurent Dubroca) on the Data Collection Reference Framework
2. **ToR 4** following input from experts and evaluation of AR work

Afternoon session:

3. Assessment of data transmission issues which are for information only and EWG conclusion on what should be further explained/pursued as a data transmission failure in a future EWG

Friday, 29 June (Venue: CCAB, check at entrance)

Morning session (9h-13h)

1. Plenary: Conclusions on **ToR3**
2. Draft Report

ANNEX 2: ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Introduction

The evaluation of ARs and DT issues are conducted by experts with knowledge and expertise from all areas of the DCF. To efficiently address the large amount of information to be evaluated, the work during the EWG is carried out in sub-groups based on the expertise of the evaluators.

In order to ensure that the results from different evaluators are comparable and transparent, the EWG considers that there is a need to adopt a consistent approach to for evaluation of Annual Reports and data transmission issues.

A proposal of a first set of rules/assessment criteria to guide future evaluators and to increase consistency in the responses from different evaluators is provided. The aim of the set of criteria is to, in addition to the existing guidelines for evaluators, provide guidance to the pre-screeners and evaluators at future EWGs and should not have legal status.

The agreed criteria are based on assessment criteria agreed during the EWG and during last year's EWG on evaluation of ARs and DT issues (EWG 17-07).

The EWG did not have sufficient time to finalise the documents and it is still far from complete. The EWG therefor considers that more efforts should be put in to completing the document before next year's EWG on evaluation of ARs and DT issues.

General

In order for DGMARE to be able to judge whether further clarification or action is required from MS or end-users, all EWG comments need to be clear, self-explanatory and consistent.

Evaluation of Annual Reports (AR)

- For each AR section assess whether the MS executed the data collection in accordance with the NWP in the provided evaluation template in Excel. The results from the manual pre-screening is included in the evaluation template. If the issue has not been marked as Y, the pre-screeners have identified whether the issues is considered minor or major. If minor, the pre-screener have provided a proposed final comment from the pre-screener. The EWG are requested to make a final judgement and provide a comment and a potential action needed.
- Complete the assessment of the relevant sections of the AR in the assessment template in Excel. The assessment results from the EWG should be filled in the below columns:

EWG comment	EWG judgement	EWG: Action needed?
-------------	---------------	---------------------

- Assess issues flagged by the pre-screeners as minor and major. If pre-screeners have put Y (in the column "manual pre-screening") fill the below cells accordingly:

EWG comment	EWG judgement	EWG: Action needed?
No comment	Yes	No action needed

- No cells should be left empty. If the section is not relevant for the MS fill the cells accordingly:

EWG comment	EWG judgement	EWG: Action needed?
NA	NA	NA

- Concerning the question: Are there any deviations? Answer from MS: No, fill the cells accordingly:

EWG comment	EWG judgement	EWG: Action needed?
No deviations	Yes	No action needed

- Concerning the question: Are there any deviations? Answer from MS: Yes, fill the cells accordingly:

EWG comment	EWG judgement	EWG: Action needed?
Deviations exist	No, mostly, partly	Action needed

- If the question is unclear and cannot be assessed fill the cells accordingly:

EWG comment	EWG judgement	EWG: Action needed?
Not able to assess due to unclear question in the evaluation template	NA	NA

Assessment of Data transmission issues (DT issues)

- For each DT issue raised in the data transmission tool assess the performance and response from MS as Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Unknown. The DT issues have been manually pre-screened and proposed STECF assessment is included at the start of the EWG. In the on-line data transmission platform insert a comment and assessment results in the below columns:

STECF Comment	STECF Assessment
	Unknown Satisfactory Unsatisfactory

- The below assessment criteria should be used to ensure comparable and coherent assessment of DT issues:

Issue	EWG Assessment and associated comments
Unclear MS comment in reply to the issue flagged by the end-user.	Unknown
The DT issue identified by an end-user is not clearly and explicitly described (End-user must always provide a self-sufficient comment/feedback to the EWG.)	Unknown + a comment: "The end-user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies"
Information provided by end-users and MS is contradictory and there is no evidence to allow the EWG to give an assessment.	Unknown
MS mistaken on data transmission.	Unsatisfactory
The issue raised relates to lack of data collection and not data transmission. Hence, data will not be available but situation must be flagged.	Unsatisfactory A standard comment must be included. "Failure concerning data collection and not data transmission"
Data exists but MS fails to submit.	Unsatisfactory
When the issue raised is related to lack of punctuality on data transmission:	
1. If flagged by the End-user with "HIGH" or "Impact on the WG".	Unsatisfactory
2. If flagged by the End-user with LOW/MEDIUM severity and it proves to be a repetitive issue from past years.	Unsatisfactory
3. If flagged by the End-user with LOW/MEDIUM severity and it proves not to be a repetitive issue from past years.	Expert should judge according to the MS justification. (no fixed rules agreed)
If MS according to the agreed NP, plans to collect additional data beyond DCF requirements and does not transmit these data in response to a data call (this additional collection must be however clearly stated in the NP)).	Unsatisfactory
If the issue relates to data collected and called for in the past and data transmission has previously been evaluated.	Unknown. The Standard comment "Issue is assumed to be closed since it relates to the past and data transmission has previously been evaluated."

- If the DT issue is assessed as 'Unsatisfactory'. Include information in the STECF Comment whether the DT issue is due to:
 - Data coverage (data not reported)
 - Data quality (the agreed collection procedures were not adhered to or the planned number of samples not achieved)
 - Timeliness of submission (legal and/or operational deadlines were not met)
 - The EWG cannot assess the issue before more information is provided by the MS.

ANNEX 3: MS OVERVIEW

Member state: Austria

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

The overall performance for the reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP for Austria (based only on table 6A) was very good.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

Austria is a landlocked MS and data collection on fleet-economic data is not applicable.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

Taking into account that Austria has recently initiated the DCF, the information provided is considered sufficient.

The data collection on aquaculture has not started, but the WP states that it will be examined in the " pilot Study 1a: Data collection of whitefish stocks in three Austrian alpine lakes" with duration 2017-2019. No collection of economic and social data for the processing industry is planned during 2017-2019.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

Not applicable.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

Not applicable.

- **Data collection on by-catch and environment**

Not applicable.

- **Surveys-at-sea**

Not applicable.

- **Data transmission to end-users, including recurrent issues**

Not applicable.

Member state: Belgium

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

The overall performance was good without any major issues.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

For this section some issues were risen by the evaluation. Referring to 3A (Fleet socio-economic): Belgium should improve the sampling strategy to avoid under sampling for some segments/variables.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

Referring to 3C (Socio-economic for processing industry): Belgium should take any actions needed to distribute the questionnaire and improve the achievements and should rise the sampling rates. Regarding the quality assurance (5B) Belgium shall indicate data availability of all pilot studies in future AR submissions.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

The AR for this section was performed properly. Mostly only minor comments were made in the evaluation. However, the MS should give explanations on deviations in future ARs with reference to table 1C.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

The AR for these sections were performed properly.

- **Surveys-at-sea**

One comments regarding the filling of table 1G (surveys).

- **Data transmission to end-users**

For Belgium two data transmission issue were brought forward to the EWG regarding the processing industry.

Member state: Bulgaria

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

The overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP was good without any major issues.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

This section was performed properly and no issue were identified.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

These sections were performed properly.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

MS to clarify whether the samples were taken or not; if they were taken, the number should be reflected in the Table.

For the future, the MS should ensure that the sampling from commercial fishery occurs in an appropriate time period that will allow the estimation of sex ratio and maturity for anchovy.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

All species are included but it is mentioned that these species are not present in the area, so not survey is needed. MS should include in future submission of AR scientific reference to justify that species mentioned in Table 3 are not present in the area.

- **Surveys-at-sea**

The surveys were performed properly and no issues were identified.

- **Data transmission to end-users**

There were no data transmission issues reported for Bulgaria in 2017 but, with the observation that for some species even though landings in weight were reported, no information on length structure were provided.

Member state: Czech Republic

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

The EWG was not able to evaluate the overall performance for the Czech Republic because it is a landlocked country and most sections are not applicable for the MS.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

Not applicable for Czech Republic.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

MS stated that at the end of 2017 the project "Analysis of data collection for aquaculture in the CR" started, therefore no results were available in the 2017 AR. The aim of the project is a composition of the methodology of future data collection and to obtain scientific preliminary data for the aquaculture sector in the Czech Republic, which will be used as a basis for the data collection itself.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

Not applicable for Czech Republic.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

Not applicable for Czech Republic.

- **Surveys-at-sea**

Not applicable for Czech Republic.

- **Data transmission to end-users**

Not applicable for Czech Republic in 2017.

Member state: Cyprus

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017**

Cyprus had good overall performance in 2017 with an overall evaluation of Mostly.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

Achieved coverage of data collected under complementary data collection and response rate are not correctly reported for some segments.

Data source for complementary data collection is not reported for some segments.

For complementary data collection, achievement is indicated as 'NA' in the case when it was planned in the NWP. This part of the AR should not be filled with 'NA' and respective achievements on data collection should be provided.

The MS should describe any adjustments in type of data collection, planned sample rate and data source if they have been changed compared to NWP.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

No implementation took place for aquaculture for 2017 due to that the production volume and value of the Cyprus aquaculture is below the relevant threshold.

No implementation took place for processing industry for 2017.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

No issues.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

No issues

- **Surveys-at-sea**

No issues

- **Data transmission to end-users**

No data transmission issues.

Member state: Germany

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

Overall the AR was very well achieved, however attention must be paid to fleet economic data collection where a major issue was identified as described below.

- **Fleet economic data collection**

Major issues detected as MS needs to report information on data collection in "other regions" (3 vessels are operating in CECAF area according to table 4C). According to EUMAP, data should be collected even if not transmitted for confidentiality reasons. MS should justify why vessels operated in "other regions" are not reported.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

Major issues were detected and MS is asked to resubmit the table according to AR guidelines. The achieved sample/planned sample should have contained an automatic calculation instead of text and the whole table 3B should be resubmitted according to the AR guidelines. The achieved rate and response rate not reported for most of the rows.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

No significant issues identified, and no action required.

- **Recreational Fishery sampling**

No significant issues identified, and no action required.

- **Surveys-at-sea**
Minor issues were identified. Two of the surveys cancelled due to technical problems, however, no action required.
- **Data transmission to end-users**
Germany had 7 data transmission issues.

Member state: Denmark

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**
Overall the performance was very good.
- **Fleet-economic data collection**
Only one issue related to fleet-economic data collection was identified. Concerning Pilot study 3, MS should take action to ensure that social data will be collected in 2018 according to EUMAP.
- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**
No issues
- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**
No issues
- **Recreational fisheries sampling**
No issues
- **Data collection on by-catch and environment**
No issues
- **Surveys-at-sea**
Only one important issue related to surveys-at-sea was highlighted for Denmark. The MS is asked to review the textbox 1G according to the AR guidelines and correct the issues mentioned.
- **Data transmission to end-users**
6 Data Transmission issues were listed for Denmark.

Member state: Spain

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**
Spain had very good overall performance in 2017 with an overall evaluation of 'Yes'. One area for attention is Fleet socio-economic (Table 3A, Text Box 3A, Pilot study 3), where the MS must either resubmit Table 3A with the missing variables, or provide a detailed explanation on why they were not collected.
- **Fleet-economic data collection**
Fleet socio-economic (Table 3A, Text Box 3A, Pilot study 3). Minor issue as several variables (transversal) are listed in the NWP, but not in AR (variable groups fleet, effort,

number of enterprises, production v.). Spain is asked to provide an explanation on why these variables are absent or resubmit Table 3A including missing variables.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

No major issues.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

No major issues.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

No major issues.

- **Surveys-at-sea**

No major issues.

- **Data transmission to end-users**

20 data transmission failures were identified for 2017.

Member state: Estonia

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

Estonia had good overall performance in 2017 with an overall evaluation of 'Mostly'. Some problems with quality assurance framework occurred, both for biological and socioeconomic data.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

Although data was mostly collected, the quality appears to be insufficient. MS should implement best practises and validated data before transmission to end-users.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

Not collected by MS under the EU-MAP.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

Partial achievement of biological variables sampling resulted mostly from change in fisheries patterns and catch volume, therefore justified. Quality assurance framework for biological data is under elaboration.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

No major issues.

- **Surveys-at-sea**

No major issues.

- **Data transmission to end-users**

Estonia had two DT issues related to processing industry.

Member state: Finland

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

The overall performance for Finland was assessed as a 'Mostly'.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

Overall, this module was performed properly. However, for future submission guidelines should be followed.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

Some issues were reported for this section. The MS should resubmit Table 3B, see detailed comments in the evaluation sheet. For future submissions the EWG encourages the MS to use the "AR comments" field to explain and justify deviations/missing data.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

This module was performed correctly. Deviations were explained in the AR. For future submission MS should follow the guidelines.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

This module was performed properly. MS should follow the guidelines for species list and missing variables in future submission.

- **Surveys-at-sea**

This module was performed properly.

- **Data transmission to end-users**

Two data transmission failures were highlighted for Finland.

Member state: France

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

The overall performance of the AR 2017 was assessed to compliance class 'Mostly'.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

A number of variables are missing for some segments.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

Guidelines not followed for a number of variables.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

There are still some issues to resolve but the changes made have assisted the assessment process. Good progress on providing links to data and QA reports is being made.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

There are still missing information for some Mediterranean species and the description of the pilot study is missing.

- **Surveys-at-sea**

No major issues.

- **Data transmission to end-users**

In 2017 France had 44 data transmissions issues to end-users.

Member state: United Kingdom

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

Overall performance was very good with overall the overall assessment class `Yes`.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

According to table 5A of EUMAP variables should be 31, while only 21 to 27 variables are reported depending on the segment. MS should clarify why there are missing variables and list all the variables according to EUMAP. MS should specify if information in text box refers to all regions. MS should clarify why two fishing segments are not reported in the AR.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

No issues

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

No issues

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

MS has to include ICAAT species in Table 1D in the next WP submission

- **Surveys-at-sea**

MS should solve staffing issues for acoustic surveys

- **Fishing activity variables**

7 DT issues were reported for the UK.

- **Data transmission to end-users**

Only one data transmission issue has been assessed as unsatisfactory and it refers to the STECF data call for the processing sector.

Member state: Greece

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

The DCF programme was not fully operational until late in 2017. This impacted the overall performance of the activities somewhat.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**
Administrative constraints due to the late start of the new Operational Programme (OP) delayed the start of Data collection to December 2017, and in some segments, no questionnaires were collected.
- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**
No major issues.
- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**
Administrative constraints due to the late start of the new Operational Programme (OP) delayed the start of 2017 WP or even cancelled some actions.

The concession contract between the MRDF and HAO-DEMETER was signed until the end of 2019 so it is expected that data collection will be carried out without any foreseen complications for the remaining period for the years 2018 and 2019.
- **Recreational fisheries sampling**
The issues are related with the late start of the Operational Programme (OP) and Data collection.
- **Surveys-at-sea**
MEDITS survey was not carried out and MEDIAS survey was only partly executed due to the late start of the Operational Programme (OP) caused by administrative and funding constraints.
- **Data transmission to end-users**
The DT issues were mainly related with the fact that the data collection was not fully implemented due to the administrative and funding constraints.

Member state: Hungary

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**
Hungary performs data collection partly due to delayed start of data collection programme.
- **Fleet-economic data collection**
Hungary suspended all commercial fisheries on its natural waters since 01.01.2016 and economic data are not available.
- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**
MS indicated that survey on socio-economic data on aquaculture started later than planned due to complicated and prolonged procurement procedure and data collection was not completed in 2017. Planed sampling was not achieved and the questionnaire is expected to be received in the middle of 2018.
- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**
Not applicable for Hungary.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**
Not applicable for Hungary.
- **Surveys-at-sea**
Not applicable for Hungary.
- **Data transmission to end-users**
There were no data transmission issues for Hungary

Member state: Croatia

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**
The overall performance for Croatia is assessed as 'Mostly', as in previous year evaluation. The main issues are found in Tables 1C, 4A and 5a and are related to biological sampling. Overall, MS submit a well-structured report. However, there are still some issues in the biological sections to be solved.
- **Fleet-economic data collection**
There are few issues regarding this section.
MS should avoid miscalculations in the future regarding Table 3A (Achieved Sample Rate and Response Rate) as well as wrong cluster naming. There is low achieved sample rates in few cases, but justification is given. Finally, there are deviations in methodology used compared to the NWP, however these deviations are fully justified and, in fact, they ensure (over)achievement.
- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**
There were no issues within these sections. Major improvement has been made relative to previous year AR where the EWG advised resubmission.
- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**
There are some execution issues for the MS. More specifically, there are some deviations in the achieved sample relative to the planned sample. Some of these deviations are not justified in the AR. Additionally, MS should clarify if the species whose variables were planned to be collected in the MEDITS survey were caught or not. Finally, MS should propose actions to avoid deviations.
- **Recreational fisheries sampling**
Some minor issues were identified, however, no action is needed.
- **Surveys-at-sea**
One issue was identified. MS did not provide explanation for not submitting SoleMon data to Atris database

- **Data transmission to end-users**
11 data transmission issues were raised.

Member state: Ireland

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**
No major issues were revealed in the Irish sampling AR.
- **Fleet-economic data collection.**
Some planned sampling levels were not achieved, but most often valid explanations were provided by the MS.
- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**
For some processing industry sampling schemes the sampling rates are significant below 100% although it is stated in the NWP that the data are consensus data. The Member State is requested to clarify this.
- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**
No major issues.
- **Recreational fisheries sampling**
No issues.
- **Data collection on by-catch and environment**
No issues.
- **Surveys-at-sea**
No issues
- **Data transmission to end-users**
One DT issue was raised.

Member state: Italy

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**
Italy had a performance in 2017 with an overall evaluation of 'Mostly'. The principal problems were found in the tables:

Table 1C: Sampling intensity for biological variables

Table 4A: Sampling plan description for biological data

Table 7B: Follow-up of recommendations and agreements

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

No major issues.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

No major issues.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

After consultation with Italy, it has become clear that they have adopted a different approach than other Member States. They appear to define "sample" as the PSU and not the traditional definition commonly understood by the majority of other MS's. Other countries operating in the Med, appear to have adopted the common understanding of "sample" and "PSU". Italy should raise the issue of sampling methodologies at the next RCG Med/BS. If changes have to be made in the sampling strategy, these changes should be reflected in the NWP revision in October 2018.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

No major issues, but MS should provide more information on released catch estimates on recreational fisheries.

- **Surveys-at-sea**

No major issues besides some administrative constraints in the execution of MEDITS and fully implementation DRESS in all districts.

- **Data transmission to end-users**

Italy had 35 DT issues, the majority related with coverage (32).

Member state: Lithuania

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

The overall performance and compliance for Lithuania was classified as 'Mostly'.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

No essential issues were noticed by the EWG and all modules in this section are classified with Compliance class 'Yes'.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

No essential comments have been made by the EWG regarding the section on processing industry. The aquaculture section is not applicable for LTU.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

MS should pay more attention to process of planning sampling of biological variables of fish stock in order to make it realistic and to avoid inclusion in the NWP the variables for stock for which data collection is very difficult or not possible. MS should also make an effort to implement and document Quality Assurance regarding biological data capture and processing.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

No essential comments have been made by the EWG.

- **Data collection on by-catch and environment**
No essential comments have been made by the EWG
- **Surveys-at-sea**
No essential comments have been made by the EWG
- **Data transmission to end-users**
Nine data transmission issues were raised.

Member state: Latvia

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

The overall performance for Latvia is 'Mostly'. The main issues are related with the sampling intensity for biological variables (Table 1C) and Quality assurance framework for biological data – Table 5A. Also, during the evaluation meeting MS was invited to resubmit Table 1E and the compliance level of the resubmitted Table was good, so no additional actions are needed.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**
There were no issues within this section.
- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**
There were no issues within this section. Only a remark that codifications does not follow table 9 of the Multiannual Union Programme for the segmentation and that next year MS can add more lines in Annual Report to provide more detailed information, according with Q&A document v4.
- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**
The AR for this section was performed properly. Mostly only minor comments but MS should give detailed explanations on deviations in future ARs with reference to table 1C.
- **Recreational fisheries sampling**
There were no issues within this section, only a comment asking for, in future submission, MS to include information on annual percentage of released catch estimates.
- **Surveys-at-sea**
There were no issues within this section.
- **Data transmission to end-users**
3 data transmission issues were raised.

Member state: Malta

- **Overall Reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

The overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP was assessed as “Mostly”.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

Cluster names are missing.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

No major issues.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

There were a few minor issues relating to incorrect coding in the NWP. MS to ensure annual sampling of biological parameters such as length in future programmes, and strive to increase sample sizes for species with low sample sizes.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

There were no issues within this section, only a comment asking for, in future submission, MS to include information on annual percentage of released catch estimates.

- **Surveys-at-sea**

No issues.

- **Data transmission to end-users**

Three data transmission issue raised by end users were brought forward to the EWG; two arising from the 2017 fish processing data call and a third in relation to the 2017 fleet economics data call.

Member state: The Netherlands

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

The programme was well realised overall, with only minor deviations from the plan. It remains some points of progress related to Quality Assurance Framework and reporting notably on data availability. The EWG graded the overall evaluation as ‘Mostly’.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

The program is fully realised with some very low response rates and some deviations which would need to be improved.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

For economic data collection on aquaculture, the program was fully realised without deviations. Some clarification would be needed for the next AR.

No data collection is planned for the processing industry.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

The program was fully realised, but deviations reported on biological data collection due to limited access to vessels. In the future submissions MS shall indicate data availability of missing data sets mentioned in the EWG comment.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

No significant issues identified, and no action required.

- **Data collection on by-catch and environment**

No significant issues identified, and no action required.

- **Surveys-at-sea**

Several surveys were reported to have been hampered by technical issues or bad weather conditions.

- **Data transmission to end-users, including recurrent issues**

The 14 DT issues were mainly related to non-transmission of data for the processing industry.

Member state: Poland

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

Poland had very good overall performance and compliance in 2017 with an overall evaluation of 'Yes'. One improvement for the future, under Table 6A, would be for the MS to indicate data availability for all types of data reported. MS should pay attention to proper naming codifications.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

No major issues.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

No major issues.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

No major issues.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

No major issues.

- **Surveys-at-sea**

No major issues.

- **Data transmission**

There were 6 DT issues.

Member state: Portugal

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

Portugal had very good overall performance in 2017 with an overall evaluation of 'Yes'.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

MS to note that the Variable kWdays, GTdays is missing and should be included in future ARs. No action needed

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**
MS should improve its sampling strategy to avoid low achieved sample rates
- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks.**
MS has improved but has some editorial issues. MS should follow the guidelines.
- **Recreational fisheries sampling**
No issues.
- **Surveys-at-sea**
The late start of the DEPM resulted in a decrease in the planned transects being surveyed.
- **Data transmission to end-users, including recurrent issues**
Portugal had 10 Data Transmission issues listed.

Member state: Romania

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**
Romania had an overall evaluation of 'Partly' in 2017.
There were problems with AR format and guidelines, thus MS should resubmit the AR 2017 text in the right format and with the appropriate content, according to the AR Guidelines.
- **Fleet-economic data collection**
No major issues.
- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**
No major issues.
- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**
Text Box 1C is missing from the AR; on the "AR comments" column, there is only reference to the change made in the WP 2018-2019. Also the numbers used by the MS refer to the numbers submitted in the WP 2018-2019, instead of ones submitted in WP 2017.

Tables 4A, 4C could not be assessed. MS has used the format and the text of WP 2018-2019 instead of the provided AR 2017 format and the appropriate text.
MS should submit all the text boxes (including Text Box 1C) according to the AR Guidelines. Also MS should resubmit the AR 2017 tables having in white cells the tables of WP 2017-2019.
- **Recreational fisheries sampling**
No issues.
- **Surveys-at-sea**
No issues, apart minor issues such as no links to relevant coordination group reports.

- **Data transmission to end-users**

There were 6 DT issues raised.

Member state: Slovakia

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

The EWG was not able to evaluate the overall performance for the Czech Republic because most sections are not applicable for the MS.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

Not applicable

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

Evaluation on economic data collection on aquaculture is not possible because data collection is still being internally discussed by the MS and this may potentially lead to changes in the Work Plan.

Evaluation on data collection on fish processing is not possible because data collection is part of a pilot study. Some changes are planned in the future Work Plan.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**

Not applicable.

- **Recreational fisheries sampling**

Not applicable.

- **Surveys-at-sea**

Not applicable.

- **Data transmission to end-users**

No DT issues were raised.

Member state: Slovenia

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**

Slovenia had good overall performance in 2017.

- **Fleet-economic data collection**

No major issues.

- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**

No major issues.

- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**
Major failures occurred on onboard sampling; none of the 8 onboard trips planned with PS was realized; for métiers GTR and OTB the achieved onboard trips were less than 40% of the planned.
- **Recreational fisheries sampling**
No issues.
- **Surveys-at-sea**
No issues.
- **Data transmission to end-users**
No major data transmission failures.

Member state: Sweden

- **Overall reporting and execution of the 2017 NWP**
Sweden had good overall performance in 2017 with an overall evaluation of 'Mostly'. Some deficiencies were observed in the fleet economic part, being related to the display of segmentation and clustering information rather than to actual collection performance. Achievements on quality assurance of biological data collection leave some space for further improvement.
- **Fleet-economic data collection**
Display of fleet segmentation and clustering should be amended.
- **Economic data collection on aquaculture and processing industry**
No major issues
- **Biological sampling of commercial fisheries and stocks**
No major issues.
- **Recreational fisheries sampling**
No major issues
- **Surveys-at-sea**
No major issues
- **Data transmission to end-users**
9 data transmission issues were reported.

ANNEX 4: PRESENTATIONS BY OBSERVERS

PRESENTATION BY ICES 25 JUNE 2018



Data calls (using the new SID module)

- No more excel spreadsheets for the data needs (data entered directly into SID by stock-assessors)
- Only designated people will be able to update the data needs (stock assessors, coordinators and chairs)
- Data providers will be able to see months in advance the data needs for each of the WG.
- Data providers will be able to flag issues in the SID regarding any data being asked.

Data transmission issues – with new SID

- Likely to be reduced substantially as data providers will have more time to prepare and will be contributing partners in the data calls.
- Issues due to non-fishing, bilateral agreements on sampling can be flagged in advanced.
- All information kept in one place making it easy to make updates.
- Stock coordinators' feed back on data received will be done in SID.
- ICES collates these and address with data providers to check for reasons

Data transmission – end-user evaluation

Data transmission feedback from end-users:

- Submission in time
- Submission late (no further impact)
- Submission late (major impact)
- Submission late (serious impact)
- Issue with data quality (please describe)
- Data missing although in the data call (please explain)
- Wish for extra data (give details on what data is needed)

Data transmission issues - 2017

- ICES Secretariat filter the issues based on feedback from data providers:
 - No/very minor catches
 - Too low quality of data (e.g. discards)
 - No sampling scheme in place (discards)
 - Reasons for late submissions
 - Bilateral agreements regarding sampling
- Resulted in a total of 10 data transmission failures reported out of 184

Data transmission feedback – 2018?

- ICES feed back to DGMARE on transmission failures with a grading of severity (need to align the category with EWG standards) – is this something to develop?
- Data transmission failures are not identical to 'these data we'd like to have' or 'better survey needed'
- These issues will be addressed in benchmarks – RCGs (and other channels for non-EU data) will be involved here.

PRESENTATION BY GFCM 28 JUNE 2018



Fisheries data collection of the GFCM, including the implementation of the DCRF and the progress on data quality indicators

GFCM Secretariat

THE ROLE OF THE GFCM

General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM)
RFMO established in 1949 under the provisions of Article XIV of the FAO Constitution

OBJECTIVE

- Ensure the conservation and sustainable use, at the biological, social, economic and environmental level, of living marine resources
- Ensure the sustainable development of aquaculture

MEMBERSHIP

- 24 Contracting Parties:** 9 Mediterranean states, 3 Black Sea states, European Union and Japan
- 4 Cooperating non-Contracting Parties:** Bosnia & Herzegovina, Georgia, Moldova & Ukraine

KEY FUNCTIONS

- Adopt binding Recs for fisheries and aquaculture governance
- Contribute to marine spatial planning and level playing field

AREA OF APPLICATION: The Mediterranean Sea and the Black Sea

GFCM - COLLECTION OF DATA IN SUPPORT OF ADVICE

IMPORTANCE OF THE FISHERIES DATA

A strong and well established collection and submission of fisheries data in the GFCM area of application allows to provide comprehensive, reliable and timely information in support of the GFCM decision making process, based on scientific advice as formulated by its relevant subsidiary bodies.


GFCM receives data from Mediterranean and Black Sea states through different channels:

- In reply to existing GFCM Recommendations (compulsory)
- Through national reports to the Scientific Advisory Committee on Fisheries (SAC) and the Working Group of the Black Sea (WGBS)
- Through Stock Assessment Forms (SAFs)

DATA COLLECTION REFERENCE FRAMEWORK (DCRF)

Sound data collection for scientific-based management

A new, comprehensive framework for the collection and submission of fisheries-related data, the GFCM Data Collection Reference Framework (DCRF), collecting data on: Catch, Incidental catch of vulnerable species, Fishing fleet, Fishing effort, Socio-economics, Biological information



The DCRF manual (English and French) in support of the Contracting Parties and Cooperating non-contracting Parties (CPCs) of the GFCM to comply with existing data requirements through the provisions of indications

DCRF ONLINE PLATFORM

The DCRF online platform for the data reporting of CPCs to the GFCM in line with the requirements of the following GFCM decisions:

- Rec. GFCM/41/2017/6 (submission of data on fishing activities)
- Rec. GFCM/33/2009/5 (Fleet register)
- Rec. GFCM/33/2009/6 (Authorized vessels)
- Rec. GFCM/30/2006/2 (Dolphin fish fisheries)
- Rec. GFCM/36/2012/1 (Red coral)

The related transmission tools for the data as requested by other GFCM decisions will be progressively put at the disposal of CPCs on the DCRF online platform

GFCM ASSESSMENT OF COMPLIANCE

As an RFMO, the process of assessing compliance with existing recommendation is very formal and complex. To this end a dedicated **Compliance Committee (CoC)** works on annual basis. Non-compliance have implications at the level of national administrations: letter of identification submitted to national authorities. Countries request to have some time – Compliance is only assessed two years after recommendations are adopted

Before DCRF, compliance on data submission difficult to assess, also process slow and not useful in the context of provision of advice in support of management.


In 2016, as a part of the process to implement the DCRF, the introduction of tentative **data quality indicators** was agreed by the CoC; once consolidated, these will allow to have a **comprehensive assessment of yearly submitted data**

In 2017, the 41st session of the **GFCM Commission** agreed to apply **conformity, stability and consistency** indicators for quality checks (with preliminary thresholds) to the data as communicated in 2017 by those CPCs that chose to comply with the temporary Recommendation GFCM/40/2016/2 on the progressive implementation of data submission in line with the DCRF

DATA ON FISHING ACTIVITIES: IMPLEMENTATION OF QUALITY INDICATORS


In 2017 some preliminary quality controls (completeness and conformity) were directly embedded in the **Excel data reporting forms** on the **DCRF online platform** which were used by those CPCs that selected to comply with **Rec. GFCM/40/2016/2** on the progressive implementation of data submission in line with the DCRF.

At the beginning of 2018, a **pilot phase** on the tentative application of fisheries quality indicators such as **timeliness, completeness, conformity** (with preliminary thresholds for different data variables), **stability** (with preliminary threshold equals to 50%) and **consistency** was initiated by the GFCM Secretariat directly on the **DCRF online platform** by leveraging **specific R packages**.



DATA ON FISHING ACTIVITIES: IMPLEMENTATION OF QUALITY INDICATORS

Structure of the summary table on preliminary quality assessments
of national data submitted to the GFCM



NEXT STEPS

The **20th Session of the Scientific Advisory Committee on Fisheries (SAC)**, 26-29 June 2018, is currently discussing, among are relevant topics, the result of the pilot study on the application of data quality indicators, including the **overall process of quality assessment of the data** as transmitted by CPCs through the DCRF online platform as well as the list of thresholds for conformity and stability quality checks.

The **12th Session of the Compliance Committee (CoC)**, 5-6 July 2018, will discuss, among are relevant topics, about the result on the data quality process arising from the 20th Session of the SAC.

The **42th Session of the Commission (GFCM)**, 22-26 October 2018, will take a decision about the next steps to be undertaken on the data quality process with the DCRF online platform.

ANNEX 5: PRESENTATION ON THE IT-TOOL FOR AUTOMATIC PRE-SCREENING

SST
Screening Support Tool


Background and demonstration

Henrik Degel (DTU Aqua)
Maria Teresa Facchini (COISPA)

Outline

- Background (task given, ambition, problems, timeframe)
- Basic structure (UI, reference lists)
- Useful working tricks using standard Excel functionality
 - Filters
 - Identifying discrepancies among a long list of parameters
 - Identifying hidden spaces
 - Pivot tables
- Description of the process, workflow and checks
- Improvements
- Run SST on your computer

- Basic structure
- SST user interface




Background for developing SST

- **Task:** Develop Annual Report *data/input validation/control mechanisms available in MS Excel using functionalities such as macros.*
- **Our intention:** To develop a tool which,
 - Support a more efficient evaluation process
 - Quality assure the evaluation process
 - Document the evaluation process
 - Support a more streamlined AR and WP reporting procedure
 - Establishing an intermediate platform for the development of a more complete DChap data collection management system.
- **Supporting material:**
 - Outcome of the EWG 17_17 part 1 and 2 (Compilation of the new DChF Annual Report template STEC-17-17)
 - Draft Guidance AR template
 - Implementing Decision EU 16_1701 and Implementing Decision EU 16_1251
- **Programming tools:** Excel formula functionalities and Virtual Basic for Applications (VBA)
- **The timeframe:** 2 X 10 days (including 5 MsS check run, manual and dropdown runned automatic AR)


Challenges

- Neither are the WP nor the AR codified before submission
- Not a single MS actually has made a strait copy of the WP into the AR
- Footnotes and headings was added to the WP/AR templates
- The templates was not structural consistent (one to more-than-one-relationship between table lines)
- AR template not identical to the template used by the MSs

Basic structure
WP upload




Basic structure
AR upload



Basic structure

Tabs



Basic structure

Tabs – Codification lists (1)

Basic structure

Tabs – Codification lists (1)

Trisopterus spp.
Umbrina canariensis
Urophycis tenuis
Veneridae
Xiphias gladius
Zeus faber

Basic structure

Tabs

UK	2013-2015	Argentina sq North Sea x ICES	IV	N	123	0.89	0.35	Y	(Stenoidarter)
UK	2013-2015	Aggrosome North Atlant ICES	all areas	N	-	-	-	-	
UK	2013-2015	Aspirtigla cv North Sea x ICES	IIa	N	-	-	-	-	
UK	2013-2015	Aspirtigla cv North Atlant ICES	all areas	N	-	-	-	-	
UK	2013-2015	Berys spp North Atlant ICES	all areas, excluding X or N	N	-	-	-	-	
UK	2013-2015	Berys spp North Atlant ICES	IIa and X	N	-	-	-	-	



Basic structure

Tabs – Checks report (2)

Row number	Type of check	Description	Check result	Priority	Date
1	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
2	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
3	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
4	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
5	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
6	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
7	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
8	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
9	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
10	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
11	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
12	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
13	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
14	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
15	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
16	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
17	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
18	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
19	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
20	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
21	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
22	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
23	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
24	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
25	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
26	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
27	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
28	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
29	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26
30	Conformity	Check against the Reference list	value not allowed	Warning	15-05-2016 10:58:26

Basic structure

Tabs

UK	2013-2015	Argentina sq North Sea x ICES	IV	N	123	0.89	0.35	Y	(Stenoidarter)
UK	2013-2015	Aggrosome North Atlant ICES	all areas	N	-	-	-	-	
UK	2013-2015	Aspirtigla cv North Sea x ICES	IIa	N	-	-	-	-	
UK	2013-2015	Aspirtigla cv North Atlant ICES	all areas	N	-	-	-	-	
UK	2013-2015	Berys spp North Atlant ICES	all areas, excluding X or N	N	-	-	-	-	
UK	2013-2015	Berys spp North Atlant ICES	IIa and X	N	-	-	-	-	



Basic structure

Tabs – Settings (3)

Sampling year	2017
WP years	2017 2018 2019
Country	GRG
Used in Table	
Percentage range for acceptance	
Maximum	150
Minimum	95
Separator for multiple-values	;
Set if in table 2A of WP is reported variable group (VG) or variable (V)	VG

Basic structure Tabs

UK	2013-2015	Argentina sq North Sea a ICES	IV	N	123	0.89	0.35	Y	(Strømssider)
UK	2013-2015	Arggrosom North Atlanti ICES	all areas	N	-	-	-	-	
UK	2013-2015	Aspingla cc North Sea a ICES	IIa areas	N	-	-	-	-	
UK	2013-2015	Aspingla cc North Atlanti ICES	all areas	N	-	-	-	-	
UK	2013-2015	Denap spp North Atlanti ICES	all areas, excluding X or N	-	-	-	-	-	
UK	2013-2015	Bersa spp North Atlanti ICES	IIa and X	N	-	-	-	-	



Basic structure Tabs – Performed (4)

A	B	C	D	E
1	VPAR	Table	Type of check	Description
2	VPAR	all tables	Conformity	Check consistency of tables structure
3	VPAR	all tables	Check structure	Check the structure of the table used is consistent with the template
4	VPAR	all tables	Check codification	Check field values are in the codification lists
5	VPAR	1A	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
6	VPAR	1C	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
7	VPAR	1D	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
8	VPAR	1E	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
9	VPAR	1F	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
10	VPAR	1G	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
11	VPAR	1H	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
12	VPAR	1I	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
13	VPAR	1J	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
14	VPAR	1K	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
15	VPAR	1L	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
16	VPAR	1M	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
17	VPAR	1N	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
18	VPAR	1O	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
19	VPAR	1P	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
20	VPAR	1Q	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
21	VPAR	1R	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
22	VPAR	1S	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
23	VPAR	1T	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
24	VPAR	1U	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
25	VPAR	1V	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
26	VPAR	1W	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
27	VPAR	1X	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
28	VPAR	1Y	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
29	VPAR	1Z	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
30	VPAR	1A	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
31	VPAR	1B	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
32	VPAR	1C	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
33	VPAR	1D	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values
34	VPAR	1E	Conformity	Check inconsistencies in not Key-field values

Pivot tables based on Checks report (example 1)


Tips and tricks

- All standard Excel functionalities are available
 - Freezing of panels are useful for all tables
 - Filters is useful for all tables (Do not forget to neutralized the filters before activating any process in SST)
 - Split window is useful in some cases (– confusing in others)
 - Pivot tables based on Check list is always useful.

Pivot tables based on Checks report (example 2)

Pivot tables based on Checks report (example 3)

Tips and tricks (Tailing hidden)



Description of the process (2)


```

graph TD
    WP[WORK PLAN] --> WPT[WORK PLAN TEMPLATES]
    AR[ANNUAL REPORT] --> SST[Screening Support Tool SST]
    WPT --> SST
    CL[CODIFICATION LISTS] --> SST
    SST --> CR[CHECK REPORT]
    CR --> COT[CODIFICATION REPORT]
  
```

- INPUT
- WP and AR workbooks
 - WP and AR templates (built in the SST workbook)
 - Codification lists (built in the SST workbook)
 - General settings (i.e. Sampling year, ...)

- tabular automatic report with details on the inconsistencies found (names of table, column, check description, row number, checks result)
- visual warnings reported directly on the tables with colors (generally green indicates correct values and red not allowed values)
- additional columns directly on the tables reporting formulas used for conformity checks and compliance

Workflow (2)



List of checks

Type of check	Table	WP	AR	Description
Conformity	all the tables individually	x	x	Check if the structure of the table used is consistent with the template
	all the tables individually	x	x	Check values against reference lists
	all the tables individually	x	x	Check if the structure of the table used is consistent with the template
	all the tables individually except for 1A, 4B, 4D (not applicable for AR)	x	x	Check values against reference lists
Inter-table consistency	all the tables individually except for 1A, 4B, 4D (not applicable for AR)	x	x	Check if all the rows present in the WP are reported in AR
	all the tables individually except for 1A, 4B, 4D (not applicable for AR)	x	x	Check inconsistencies in not-key field values
	1B, 1C	x	x	Check if length, age, weight, sex ratio, sexual maturity and fecundity record in 1B selected for sampling are reported in 1C
	1C, 7C	x	x	Check if Bi- and multilateral agreement related to MSs participating in sampling is reported in 7C
Compliance	1D, 5A	x	x	Check if Name of sampling scheme is reported in 5A
	1F, 4A	x	x	Check if Scheme/stratum ID in 1F is reported in 4A
	4A, 4B	x	x	Check if Stratum ID code in 4A is reported in 4B and viceversa
	tables 3C, 3E individually	x	x	Check in comment reason for under/over-sampling
Compliance	tables 3C, 3E, 3A, 3B, 3C, 4A individually	x	x	Set level of compliance: NO, Partly, Mostly or YES
	1D	x	x	Check in comment reason for not sampling
	1F	x	x	Check database information in comments
	tables 1G, 1H individually	x	x	Check information concerning temporal and spatial coverage in comments
Compliance	1G	x	x	Check information concerning effort achieved in comments
	2A	x	x	Check information concerning Complementary data collection
	tables 3A, 3B, 3C individually	x	x	Check information concerning fraction sampled in comments
	4A	x	x	Check information concerning (columns) in comments
Compliance	5A	x	x	Check information concerning documentation in comments

Improvements in SST and compilation of WP/AR

Essential improvements (1)

There might be cases in which the tools could not work properly due to some drawbacks of implementing the system in Excel, for examples:

- the use of special characters as * (having special meaning in VBA language) in strings relevant for the merging of the tables (i.e. values in key-field)
- texts in the cells exceed the string size limit in VBA

In the current version the SST skips the check when it is not possible to perform it.

In future this situation could be avoided, if more strict rules to be followed when compiling tables will be defined, especially for free text field.

Improvements in SST and compilation of WP/AR

Essential improvements (2)

The codification lists used as references are based on:

- the Implementation documents and guidelines provided with the contract
- the experience of the developers concerning e.g. survey names, survey abbreviations etc.

In some cases no complete lists of acceptable parameter values exists and therefore it has to be put together by pieces from the values in the available WPs and ARs (e.g. for surveys names and abbreviations).

Complete and consistent reference lists covering all acceptable options are essential and therefore further work to harmonize reference codes and increment the codification lists will be needed.

Improvements in SST and compilation of WP/AR

Essential improvements (3)

A different aggregation level in WP and AR for the table 2A and 3A prevent the copy-and-paste of exact rows from WP to AR and the consequent automatic conformity checks row by row through the SST tool.

One-to-many relationships between the WP and AR are present in:

- Table 2A**, when for a given row, indicating a given Group variable, in WP more than one row, one for each Variable, is reported in the AR
- Table 3A**, when for a given row, indicating a given MS-Supra region-Fishing technique-Length class-Type of variables (E/S)-Variable-Data Source, in WP more than one row, one for each Cluster name, is reported in the AR

This issue could be solved introducing structural changes to homogenize the level of aggregation of data in WP and AR for tables 2A and 3A.

Improvements in SST and compilation of WP/AR

“Nice to have” improvements (2)

In the current version the calculation of the percentages distribution for the compliance grouping in the tables is done manually.

Table	% of row with No compliance	% of row with Partial compliance	% of row with Most compliance	% of row with Complete compliance
1C	58%	18%	12%	13%
1B	100%	0%	0%	0%
3A	10%	43%	16%	22%
3B	0%	1%	17%	81%
3C	25%	0%	43%	33%
4A	42%	37%	11%	11%

The software would gain, if the procedure was included in the software and automatically reported.

Improvements in SST and compilation of WP/AR

“Nice to have” improvements (1)

There might be cases in which the tool could not work properly when MSs, having a national organization of the data collection program which includes sub-national grouping (not in agreement with the normal stratification of the sampling schemes) report the sub-nationality in comments.

This issue could be solved introducing structural changes in the tables adding an extra column for sub-nationality.

Improvements in SST and compilation of WP/AR

“Nice to have” improvements (3)


- Automatic check report automatically produced to the extent that only MS specific non-tabular texts were to be added manually
- Codification sheet made more structured to improve the overview and make it easier to update the lists
- Using the SST involves repeating clearing of WP and AR from SST, correction in the WP/AR original files and then upload WP and AR again in SST. This process could be significant easier if the corrections are done in the SST version of the WP/AR and then, when corrections finalized, downloaded from SST the corrected version of WP/AR.

• Others?

Run SST on your computer

1. Customize the ribbon

Open SST workbook and customize the ribbon in the Excel option adding the button to run the main SST macro: **Run_Automatic_checks**



Run SST on your computer

2. Fill basic settings


Some basic fields in "settings" sheet in order to give some parameters needed to run the checks

Sampling year	2017
WP years	2017 2018 2019
Country	GRC
Used In Table:	
Percentage range for acceptance	
Maximum	150
Minimum	95
Separator for multiple-values	,
Set if in table 2A of WP is reported variable group (VG) or variable (V)	VG

Run SST on your computer

3. SST user interface

Click the created button in the ribbon to show the Control panel and start with automatic checks



(WP and AR from Greece for demonstration purpose)

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: <http://europa.eu/contact>

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: <http://europa.eu/contact>

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: <http://europa.eu>

EU publications

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

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.

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

