

JRC SCIENTIFIC AND POLICY REPORTS

Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF (1) (STECF-13-14)

Edited by Michael W. Ebeling & Cristina Castro Ribeiro

This report was reviewed by the STECF during its 43rd plenary meeting held from 8 to 12 July 2013 in Copenhagen, Denmark

Joint Research Centre European Commission

Joint Research Centre

Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Contact information STECF secretariat

Address: TP 051, 21027 Ispra (VA), Italy E-mail: steef-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu

Tel.: 0039 0332 789343 Fax: 0039 0332 789658

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

Legal Notice

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of this publication.

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

Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers to your questions about the European Union Freephone number (*): $00\,800\,6\,7\,8\,9\,10\,11$

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

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

JRC 83568

EUR 26090 EN

ISBN 978-92-79-32524-3

ISSN 1831-9424

doi:10.2788/95695

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2013

© European Union, 2013

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

How to cite this report:

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.

Printed in Italy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Evalu	nation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF (1) (STECF-13-14)	4
Back	ground	4
Requ	est to the STECF	4
Obse	rvations of the STECF	4
Conc	lusions of the STECF	4
Advi	ce and recommendations of the STECF	5
Expe	rt Working Group EWG-13-07 report	6
1	Executive summary	7
2	Introduction	10
2.1	Terms of Reference for EWG-13-07	11
3	Evaluation by Country	13
4	EWG-13-07 List of Participants.	181
5	List of Background Documents	183

SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF)

Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF (1) (STECF-13-14

THIS REPORT WAS REVIEWED DURING THE PLENARY MEETING HELD IN COPENHAGEN, DENMARK, 8-12 JULY 2013

Background

STECF-EWG-13-07 took place 1-5 July 2013 in Brussels mainly to conduct the evaluation of MS 2012 Annual Reports for Data Collection to be presented to the STECF July 2013 plenary. Results of the other ToRs the EWG dealt with will be dealt in a separate report for STECF review by written procedure by 27 September 2013.

Request to the STECF

STECF is requested to review the MS evaluation-grids for the 2012 data collection Annual Reports conducted by EWG-13-07 evaluate the findings and make any appropriate comments and recommendations.

Observations of the STECF

STECF acknowledges the intensive and thorough work performed by EWG 13-07. The Annual Reports for 2012 were reviewed in relation to Member States National programmes for 2012. Additionally, tables with information from end users on data transmission in 2012 provided by DG Mare were also used to review the MS Annual Reports 2012.

STECF notes that the pre-screening of Annual Reports by ad-hoc contracted experts again worked smoothly and speeded up the review process substantially. While overall MS compliance with the requirements of the DCF and National Programmes was good, compliance by some Member States decreased with respect to the submissions for the year 2011.

The EWG 13-07 evaluation tables include comments on 2012 data transmissions prepared and provided by DG MARE. STECF notes that information sources provided in these tables were labeled as ICES, GFCM and JRC/DG MARE. JRC/DG MARE information was based on the JRC coverage reports providing an overview of the timeliness and contents of the MS' data submissions to JRC. JRC's evaluations of Member States' data submissions are based on data specifications defined in the DCF data calls (no cross-checks with MS National programmes) issued by DG MARE. In addition, the Coverage Reports summarise findings regarding major data omissions and data deficiencies detected by JRC and by Expert Working Groups convened under the STECF. JRC data coverage reports are

available on: http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage. The data transmission tables including the STECF comments are meant to be sent by DG MARE to the relevant Member State for comments and explanations on any data transmission deficiencies indicated.

Conclusions of the STECF

Data transmission

STECF concludes that EWG 13-07 did its best in supporting the Commission in identifying relevant data transmission failures. Nevertheless, due to the complexity of the task, it should not be assumed that the EWG has detected all data transmission failures and deficiencies. Furthermore in some cases, it is possible that deficiencies may have been wrongly indicated, e.g. where Member States were not obliged to collect data. Such a situation can arise because the end-users did not have access to information to explicitly determine what Member States' obligations had been.

STECF concludes that future reviews of data transmission would be further improved if DG MARE would provide information on what the data transmission tables are based on, clear definitions of headings, and any MS derogations accompanying the data transmission tables.

MS Annual Reports

The EWG 13-07 part 1 report provides sufficient information to identify cases of non-compliance in relation to the review of the MS Annual Reports and the National programmes.

REPORT TO THE STECF

EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF (1) (EWG-13-07)

Brussels, Belgium, 1-5 July 2013

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

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The EWG 13-07 took place from the 1st to the 5th of July 2013 in Brussels. This part of the report contains only the finding concerning TOR 1 and TOR 2, meaning the evaluation tables per Member State on the Annual Report evaluation and the Evaluation and Remarks made by EWG 1307 on the end-user feedback on data submission failures provided by DG MARE. All other TORS and suggestions, reflections, comments and remarks are dealt with in the following separate second part of this report. The group was supported by a pre-screening exercise as in the previous last three years and again this exercise turned out to be helpful. The expert group worked through a series of Sub Groups, presentations and plenary discussions.

The European Commission considered this an important meeting in the DCF process as itevaluates Members States compliance with the DCF guidelines on submission of theAnnual Reports. The Commission is relying on the outcome of this work for theassessment of DCF implementation in the 22 Member States carrying out fishingactivities, to check for the correct implementation of EU policies and to assure asustainable management of biological resources.

EWG 13-07 would like to acknowledge the work that has been carried out by Member States in compiling their 2012 Annual Reports.

In general the overall compliance of the Member States with their data collection obligations under the Data Collection Framework shows a mixed picture. While some countries have improved and Greece has started to implement the DCF, other countries decreased in their overall compliance with the DCF requirements. So as an overall figure 3 countries received a yes judgement, 12 a mostly, 5 a partly and 2 countries were found to not comply with the DCF obligations. In 2012 one country did not deliver an Annual Report, 3 complied partly, 17 mostly and no country was found to fully comply with the requirements. Reasons for this have been discussed and will be reported in the second part of the report. A specific trend cannot be observed, as the changes are in both directions, but the trend in former years to always increasing quality is at least for this reporting year not longer valid.

The evaluation of the data transmission turned out to be problematically for several reasons:

Firstly, the provided compilation table showed some misunderstandable wording, secondly, the information provided has not been exact in some cases and as a general comment, EWG 13-07 agreed on the conclusion:

Data submission failure evaluation

Each data call defines a set of variables which should be submitted to an end user. These variables should be submitted for a number of strata depending of the various fisheries (métiers) conducted by the individual MS and the spatial and temporal distribution of those fisheries. For most countries this already creates a rather complicated task list because most countries are fishing in several regions and sometimes have a seasonal element involved as well. On top of that, national derogations provide an exemption for sampling of certain variables. The derogations often are only valid in some of the strata connected to the data call.

In order to be able to make a complete qualified judgment of the compliance of the data submissions with the requirements in the data calls, one have to combine the country specific task list for all relevant countries and for all the data calls and combine this matrix with the data submissions actually made by the MS. To be able to overview such a complex of interactions it is necessary to have a significant amount of background knowledge which covers all regions, all MS and all derogations. The knowledge need to be up to date because the fishing pattern and the derogations changes from year to year. Very few people (if any) have this overview for all areas, all MS and all data calls.

The material provided to support the evaluation consists of a list of data "non-submissions" for each MS and each call provided by the end users. This list does not express to which extent the MS comply to the data call but just which data have not been submitted. This leaves the responsibility to the member of the EWG to decide on if the MS fulfill the data call or not. Even if pre-screener comments are available the big overview is necessary in order to assure the pre-screener comments are valid (that the pre-screeners have similar problems are evident from the comments provided for the EWG).

Due to the complexity and the time constringe during the meeting, the EWG find it difficult to fulfill the task of evaluation of the data submission.

EWG 13-07 is pleased to report to STECF that overall, the timelines in relation to the prescreening exercise were followed and that the exercise led to a more efficient and effective review of the DCF Annual Reports.

In order to conduct the evaluation of the Annual Reports at EWG 13-07, four SubGroups were formed (Addressing TOR 1). As last year, these Sub Groups carried out the evaluations on a Module basis (i.e. not by country). In the past, SGRN has carried outthe Annual Report evaluations on a country by country basis and this has caused majorconsistency problems for the Commission. Evaluation by modules removed this inconsistency to a large extent.

The first Sub Group dealt with the economic modules (Module IIIB, and IV), the second Sub Group dealt with Modules I (General Framework), II (National Data Collection Organisations), IIIA (General description of the fishing sector), IIIC (Biological Metier Related Variables), IIID (Recreational Fisheries). Sub Group 3 dealt with Modules IIIE (Stock Variables) and IIIF (Transversal Variables) while Sub Group 4 considered Module IIIG (Research Vessels), VI (Data Management), VII (Follow up STECF Recommendations). The remaining Modules (VIII, IX, X and XI) were considered well covered by the prescreening exercise.

The aim of the separation of the reporting for this EWG meeting is to have the Compliance evaluation already approved by STCEF plenary in summer, in order to quickly inform Member States. The overall compliance is summarized in the following table, where the first line contains the overall compliance with the DCF requirements by Member State, the other lines specify it by module. The traffic light system means:

- Red "N" for no or almost no compliance,
- Yellow "P" meaning partly for up to 50% compliance,
- Light Green "M" indicating a mostly compliance (more than 50%) and
- Dark Green "Y" for yes indicating full or almost full compliance.

Module	BEL	BUL	СҮР	DEN	EST	FIN	RFR	GER	GRE	IRL	ITA	LAT	LIT	MAL	NLD	POL	POR	ROM	SLO	SPA	SWE	UK
OVERALL COMPLIANCE	Р	N	M	M	P	Υ	Р	Υ	N	М	М	M	М	М	M	Υ_	Р	M	P	М	M	M
Module I	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	Y	М	M	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	N	Υ	Υ	N	N	Υ	Υ	N
Module II	Р	М	M	Υ	М	Y	Υ	M	M	Υ	Υ	Р	М	М	Υ	M	M	Υ	P	М	Р	Р
Module III.A&III.B	M	Р	М	Υ	N	М	Р	Υ	N	М	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	M	Υ	M	Р	M	М	Υ	М
IIIC	M	N	M	M	М	М	Р	Υ	N	M	М	М	Υ	М	Р	M	M	М	P	M	М	М
IIID	Р	М	М	M	M	Y	M	M	M	Υ	М	M	Υ	М	M	Υ	P	M	Р	Υ	М	М
IIIE	Р	N	М	M	М	Y	Р	М	N	Υ	М	М	М	М	P	Υ	M	М	P	Υ	М	м
IIIF	M	Υ	Р	M	М	Υ	Р	Υ	N	Р	M	Υ	Р	М	М	Υ	Р	Р	Υ	Р	Υ	М
IIIG	M	Р	Υ	Υ_	М	M	Υ	Υ	P	М	M	Υ	M	М	Υ	M	Р	М	Υ	Υ	М	M
Module IV.A	N	P	Р	Υ	N	У	М	Υ		Υ	Р	NA	NA	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	M	Υ	М	М	Р
Module IV.B	M	M	M	M	N	Υ	Υ	Υ	M	Υ	M	M	Y	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	M	M
Module V	M	M	P	M	P	M	M	Υ	P	M	Υ	Υ	M	Υ	M	Υ_	M	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Y
Module VI	M	P	M	Υ	M	Y	Υ	Υ	P	Υ	Υ	Υ	Р	Р	Υ	Υ	M	M	M	Υ	Υ	M
Module VII	N	N	Υ	Υ	Р	Y	Υ	Υ	M	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	M	Υ	M	Υ	Υ	P	Υ	Υ	М

2 Introduction

As this part of the report only contains the evaluation of Member States Annual Reports for 2012, meaning that Member States have reported how they have executed their National Programme in 2012, no further introduction or explanation are necessary.

The evaluation by country has two parts, one reflecting the evaluation of the Annual Report, one the end-user feedback on data transmission. Both evaluations have been supported by work of 6 prescreeners work on ad-hoc contract basis. In Section 3, all countries are listed in alphabetical order. For each country two evaluation sheets are provided, one on AR 2013 (AR evaluation table) and one on data transmission end-user feedback (Data transmission evaluation table).

2.1 Terms of Reference for EWG-13-07

The reader might be remembered that only the TOR 1 and 2 are addressed within this report.

Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries Expert Working Group EWG 13-07

Evaluation of MS 2012 Annual Reports for Data Collection Monday 1st July to Friday 5th July 2013 Brussels, Belgium

Terms of Reference (Version 1 July)

Note that for items 1 and 2 below, a pre-screening exercise will take place to facilitate the work of the EWG.

- 1. Evaluate Member States Annual Reports for 2012 in accordance with Article 7.2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008, taking into account;
 - a. The execution of the National Programmesfor 2012
 - b. The quality of the data collected by the Member States
 - c. Information from end users on data transmission in 2012 (covered by ToR 2 in greater detail)
- 2. Review information from end users on data transmission in 2012 in comparison with the MS Annual Reports for 2012. This TOR will require experts to review the apparent data transmission failures and deficiencies in delivered data identified by end-users in order to allow the Commission to enforce MS obligations in a clear and transparent manner. Particular attention will be paid to:
 - a. Response by MS to calls for data launched by the Commission in order to feed into scientific advice provided by STECF:
 - Aquaculture data call,
 - Annual Effort data call,
 - Fleet economic data call,
 - Mediterranean & Black Sea data call.
 - b. Data transmission to end-users in 2012 with a focus on feedback on data availability, quality, gaps and the data used in the scientific advisory process provided by ICES, GFCM, IOTC and WPCFC;

The EWG should produce for every Member State a file with a) an evaluation of the annual report b) an evaluation of the data transmission to end users. In this file, the EWG should identify the comments that require a reaction by the MS (resubmission of the annual report or clarification to the Commission) and those that are 'for information' only.

- 3. Evaluate how the EWG's work on items 1 and 2 above could be improved in future, including through electronic pre-screening of the annual reports.
- 4. Evaluate the use of Annual Reports in their current format, as well as the data transmission evaluation exercise, in evaluating MS' implementation of their National programme.
- 5. Review the comments made by STECF at the Spring Plenary (April 2013).

End

3 EVALUATION BY COUNTRY

Member State: Belgium Judgement levels Reference year Compliance class Compliance level 2012 AR_2013_version 2_4 june Version of the AR reviewed No 2011-2013 Version of the NP proposal Partly 10-50% EWG Answe 50-90% Mostly Yes Overall compliance >90% NA not applicable General framework **EWG COMMENTS** National data collection organisation **EWG** iudgement **EWG** National correspondent and participating institutes Action needed? Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles Yes well described? Is there an overview and description of contents of national No Yes coordination meetings? Are derogations listed? Yes No If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines? Regional and International coordination Attendance of international meetings Not clear what '?' means. MS should MS to clarify the meaning of follow the guidelines for completing Is Table II.B.1 complete? the '?' in the table II.B.1 MS to provide text on nonattendance to planned Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained? meeting No B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations MS provided recommendations from 2012 RCMs. However, MS should MS to provide list the LM recommendations from recommendations from 2011 Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed? 2011 RCMs / LM. RCMs / LM No MS to provide also Are the responsive actions described? responsive actions Are the responsive actions acceptable? SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector General description of the fishing sector Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described? Yes no Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? Economic variables MS need to change and justify the name of segment according tothe length classes indicated in regulation 93/2010. The cluster name needs to be changed according to guidelines version (2013) whre it is higkightedvthat the bimportance of bfleet segments should be assessed in trems of Length calsses in clustered landings .value and volume segment is not corresponding to DCF and or effort) . MS needs to regulation. Inactive vessels are not resubmit table concerning Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? included in III B 1 mostly missing data. length class missing, DTS asterisk missing; clusters still seem to be MS needs to provide length quite small; NP provided is empty, calasses according to Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? no comparison possible mostly regulation 93/2010 number of fishing enterprises MS is required to explain why missing; data should be indicated for unclustered, not for clustered reference year is different, segments; reference year should no resubmit table III.B.3 with a number of fishing enterprise be 2010 (lines 28-30): "NA" for data and also identify correct source should not have response Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? rates (e.g. lines 74-80) Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal R1 MS do not clearly explain what Need to provide an method do they apply for capital explanation to the addopted Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? value estimation methodology. mostly Are the deviations explained? NA no Are the deviations justified? R2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? yes Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified? ŇΑ No NA Nο ВЗ Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? No NA No Are the responsive actions acceptable? No B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? NA Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? NO NA Region North Sea & East Arctic Biological metier related variables Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes Yes no CVs not calculated for the vast majority of stocks for both landed and discarded species. Lophius stocks not presented separately. Some inconsistencies between Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? fishing grounds and regions MS to provide missing CVs

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Atlantic

Biological metier related variables

Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal
Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?

Derogation request not to sample metier TBB_CRU_16-31_0_0 not granted. MS has an obligation to sample. It appears that only TAC species were sampled at sea.	Mostly Mostly	MS to clarify whether concurrent sampling was actually carried out at sea, in which case, additional data on species sampled needs to be added to table
	Yes	no
	Mostly	Commission to clarify derogation for the Belgian brown shrimp fishery. Fishery is selected in NP ranking, however no planned sampling targets were provided in the NP for this metier. NP was accepted, but the obligation to sample still remains.
	Partly	MS to provide missing CVs MS to clarify the 0.00
	No	avhieved CVs

	Partly	MS to provide missing CVs
	No	MS to clarify the 0.00 avhieved CVs
No explanation for not reaching all targets.	Partly	MS to provide explanations for not reaching targets.
	No	No
•		

Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
	MS to update response for
Mostly	M_02 recommendation
	Yes Yes

	MS to provide action planned
	to calculate the CVs
	requested in time for next
Mostly	year's Annual Report
Yes	No

Yes There is an error in the intro text		
(reference to 2011 instead of 2012.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
CVs not calculated for the vast		

majority of stocks for both landed and discarded species. Lophius

stocks not presented separately.		
Some columns of the table were		
hidden.	Partly	MS to provide missing CVs
Lophius and Rajidae stocks not		
represented separately	Mostly	No
Sampling ashore consequently undersampled. Realtively few samples but a lot of fish measured (in excess of plan)- OTB_MCD_70-99_0_0, VIIfg; MS claims it is not part of NP (derogation). It is though included in NP tables. In the NP text is OTB_MCD_70-99_0_0, VIIe included but this metier does not appear in the tables	Mostly	Yes, MS to explain if the metier OTB_MCD_70-99_0_0, VIlfg is an error in the table and what has happened with the metier in VIIe
Comparison between planned and		
achieved number of fich measured	1	

achieved number of fish measured was not possible since most spaecies do not have a planned target in the NP. To calrify re the case of OTB_MCD_70-99_0_0	Mostly	No
Mostly only for the deviations explained (some explanations for other deviations were missing). The justification for "mixed species" should not be a problem in harbour sampling of metiers. It seems to be a consistent problem with the harbour sampling that needs to be		
better described.	Mostly	No

	Partly	MS to provide missing CVs
	No	MS to clarify the 0.00 achieved CVs
No explanation for not reaching all targets.	Partly	MS to provide explanations for not reaching targets.
	No	No
	Yes	No

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls C4

> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Sea & Eastern Arctic

Recreational fisheries

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal D2

Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?

Region North Atlantic

Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?
Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

to e.g EU were they do not need to		
take action	Yes	No
		MS to provide action for LM
	Mostly	42
	Yes	No
MS have a plan on how to avoid shortfalls in the sea-sampling prorgamme. MS seems to have a problem with the harbour sampling (all metiers undersampled) which is		
not mentioned. No actions mentioned to improve CV		MC to undate (see
mentioned to improve CV calculations issue	Double	MS to update (see comments)
For at sea sampling only	Partly Yes	No No
or at oou ournpming ormy	1.00	Į. to
In the NP, MS reported that rec	ı	
fishery is only in the North Sea &		
eastern Arctic	Yes	No
Even if in the NP is mentioned that there is no rec fishery for sharks, MS should demonstrate (i.e. through appropriate references or eventually carrying out a pilot study) that Sharks are not target species for recreational fishermen. MS states that they carried out an inventory of cod recreational fisheries in 2011. The 2 tables provided are a copy and paste from the 2011 AR.	Partly NA	MS to provide references or pilot study data for sharks recreational fishery. MS to provide detailed informatior data from recreational cod fishery sampling in 2011.
	NA	No
	NA	No
	No	MS to provide info on this.
	NA	No
No actions to avoid shortfalls were pr	No	MS to clarify
	NA	No
	Mostly	MS should report actions clearly divided for the respective regions
Should be yes instead of partly because only one species are missing. MS refers a derogation that not appear in NP or AR section I. Only small information in 2011 NP june adjustement appear in a table.	Yes	MS should provided the approval of derogation for Lophius. There is nothing about this derogation in NP proposal or AR section I.
Mostly (most stocks oversampled only a few undersampled)	Mostly	No
More consistency between texts and tables is needed. Text is confusing. E. g text says that turbot is undersampled for age but that is not appearent in the table (30 achieved vs. 25 planned). Haddock are to be undersampled in the table but this is not picked up in the text. Text is sloppy eg. references to annex XII and XIII instead of VII, text on lemon sole which is not included in NP	Mostly	More consistency between texts and tables is needed.
	Mostly	No
No	No	MS to calculate CVs
NA, no CVs provided	No	MS to calculate CVs
Should be NO instead of partly. Explanations for sampling levels but no information on why CVs are missing	No	Ms to provide explanations about quality deviations if any.
Should be NO instead of partly. Justified for the ones that are explained	No	Ms to provide explanations about quality deviations if any.

derogation exists it should be included in the list of

derogations in section I.

Any reference to a derogation mentioned in texts.

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls E4

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Sea & East Arctic

Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal E2

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

> Were the relevant derogations listed?
> Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

F1 Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

F2 Effort

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

> Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

Only on how to avoid oversampling		MS to provide background
(but only few stocks are	Mostly	material for estimating data
undersampled)		quality (cv, etc,)
-	Yes	No

		MS should only report the
Table III.E.3 in AR not completely	Mostly	species planned in NP
consistent with NP.		Proposal. MS should take it
Consistent with the .		into account for 2013 AR
		preparation
		MS should only report the
Mostly (most stocks oversampled		species planned in NP
only a few undersampled)	Mostly	Proposal. MS should take it
,		into account for 2013 AR
		preparation
More consistency between texts and		
tables is needed. Text is confusing.		
E.g text says that brill is		
undersampled for age but that is not	Mostly	More consistency between
appearent in the table. Cod		texts and tables is needed.
(weight@age) are to be		
undersampled in the table but this is		
not picked up in the text.		
-	Mostly	No

No	No	MS to calculate CVs
NA, no CVs provided	No	MS to calculate CVs
Should be NO instead of partly. Explanations for sampling levels but no information on why CVs are missing	No	Ms to provide explanations about quality deviations if any.
Should be NO instead of partly. Justified for the ones that are explained	No	MS to provide explanations about quality deviations if any.

In the NP it seems to be a derogation for Lemon sole which is not included in the derogation table in section 1	Mostly	MS should prove the granted of derogation and if a derogation exists it should be included in the list of derogations in section I.
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

	Mostly	MS to provide background material for estimating data quality (cv, etc,)
-	Yes	No

	MS should fill the table
	correctly following the
	guidelines. Segment column
	incomplete (however,
	evident that blank cells
	means "all"), 100% coverage
	should have no CV,
	reference year should be
	2011; each line should
Yes	contain one variable only

-	Yes	No	
-	Yes	No	
-	Yes	No	
,	•		
-	Yes	No	

	Mostly	MS shall further explain why some effort variables prices are missing.
Should be NA/-/-	Yes	No
Should be NA/-/-	Yes	No

There is no need to provide CV for census data. Conversely MS should provide CV for variables for which the sample rate is of 40%.	Yes	MS shall complete the table with cv data.
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

-	Yes	No	
-	Yes	No	
-	Yes	No	
-	Yes	No	
-	Yes	No	

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?
Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?

Region North Atlantic

Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations E3

> Were the relevant derogations listed?
> Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Sea & East Arctic

Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal E2

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

	1	Table 1
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
		MS should report actions
	Mostly	clearly divided for the
		respective regions

Should be yes instead of partly because only one species are missing. MS refers a derogation that not appear in NP or AR section I. Only small information in 2011 NP june adjustement appear in a table.	Yes	MS should provided the approval of derogation for Lophius. There is nothing about this derogation in NP proposal or AR section I.
Mostly (most stocks oversampled only a few undersampled)	Mostly	No
More consistency between texts and tables is needed. Text is confusing. E.g text says that turbot is undersampled for age but that is not appearent in the table (30 achieved vs. 25 planned). Haddock are to be undersampled in the table but this is not picked up in the text. Text is sloppy eg. references to annex XII and XIII instead of VII, text on lemon sole which is not included in NP		More consistency between texts and tables is needed.
-	Mostly	No
No	No	MS to calculate CVs
NA, no CVs provided	No	MS to calculate CVs
Should be NO instead of partly. Explanations for sampling levels but no information on why CVs are	No	Ms to provide explanations about quality deviations if any.

No	No	MS to calculate CVs
NA, no CVs provided	No	MS to calculate CVs
Should be NO instead of partly. Explanations for sampling levels but no information on why CVs are missing	No	Ms to provide explanations about quality deviations if any.
Should be NO instead of partly. Justified for the ones that are explained	No	Ms to provide explanations about quality deviations if any.

Should be Mostly instead of Yes. Any reference to a derogation mentioned in texts.	Mostly	MS should prove the granted of derogation and if a derogation exists it should be included in the list of derogations in section I.
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

Only on how to avoid oversampling		MS to provide background
,		material for estimating data
undersampled)	*	quality (cv, etc,)
-	Yes	No

Table III.E.3 in AR not completely consistent with NP.	Mostly	MS should only report the species planned in NP Proposal
Mostly (most stocks oversampled only a few undersampled)	Mostly	MS should only report the species planned in NP Proposal
More consistency between texts and tables is needed. Text is confusing. E.g text says that brill is undersampled for age but that is not appearent in the table. Cod (weight@age) are to be undersampled in the table but this is not picked up in the text.	Mostly	More consistency between texts and tables is needed.
-	Mostly	No

No	No	MS to calculate CVs
NA, no CVs provided	No	MS to calculate CVs
Should be NO instead of partly. Explanations for sampling levels but no information on why CVs are missing	No	Ms to provide explanations about quality deviations if any.
Should be NO instead of partly. Justified for the ones that are explained	No	MS to provide explanations about quality deviations if any.

	Fellows at Boston day day of the control of			
E3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			MS about prove the greatest
		In the NP it seems to be a derogation for Lemon sole which is not included in the derogation table in section 1	Mostly	MS should prove the granted of derogation and if a derogation exists it should be included in the list of
	Were the relevant derogations listed?			derogations in section I.
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	-	Yes Yes	No No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	-	Yes	No
E4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			MO to more ide to extreme and
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Mostly	MS to provide background material for estimating data quality (cv, etc,)
Trans	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? sversal variables	-	Yes	No
· · · · · ·	oversul variables			
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Yes	MS should fill the table correctly following the guidelines. Segment column incomplete (however, evident that blank cells means "all"), 100% coverage should have no CV, each line should contain one variable only
F1	Capacity			,
	F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	[-	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	-	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	-	Yes	No
	F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	-	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	-	Yes	No
F2	Effort			
	F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			MS shall further explain why
				some effort variables prices
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Mostly	are missing.
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Should be NA/-/- Should be NA/-/-	Yes Yes	No No
	F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Citodia 50 1474 /	1.00	1.10
		There is no need to provide CV for census data. Conversely MS should		
	to account the data and the telegraphic allows	provide CV for variables for which	.,	MS shall complete the table
	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	the sample rate is of 40%.	Yes Yes	with cv data.
	Are the deviations justified?	-	Yes	No
	F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		lv	INI-
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	-	Yes Yes	No No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	-	Yes	No
	F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls		W	Thi -
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	-	Yes Yes	No No
F3	Landings			
	F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	-	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	-	Yes	No
	F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	I_	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	-	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	-	Yes	No
	F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	-	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?	-	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls	-	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	-	Yes	No
_	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	-	Yes	No
G1	earch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Mostly	
	F-F			
		Data from North Sea Beam		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Trawl Survey (BTS) is not uploaded to DATRAS even though it's says Y in the table . Number of days and stations mentioned in text and tables are not consistent.	Mostly Yes	MS to explain state of the art concerning uploading to the International database. Table to be updated.
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	to DATRAS even though it's says Y in the table . Number of days and stations mentioned in text and tables	Mostly Yes	the art concerning uploading to the International database.
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	to DATRAS even though it's says Y in the table. Number of days and stations mentioned in text and tables are not consistent. For the North Sea Beam Trawl Survey (BTS) MS well explained the problems encountered and why they	Yes Yes	the art concerning uploading to the International database. Table to be updated. No No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	to DATRAS even though it's says Y in the table. Number of days and stations mentioned in text and tables are not consistent. For the North Sea Beam Trawl Survey (BTS) MS well explained the problems encountered and why they couldn't achieved all the planned	Yes Yes Yes	the art concerning uploading to the International database. Table to be updated. No No No
G2	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	to DATRAS even though it's says Y in the table. Number of days and stations mentioned in text and tables are not consistent. For the North Sea Beam Trawl Survey (BTS) MS well explained the problems encountered and why they couldn't achieved all the planned	Yes Yes	the art concerning uploading to the International database. Table to be updated. No No
G2	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change)	to DATRAS even though it's says Y in the table. Number of days and stations mentioned in text and tables are not consistent. For the North Sea Beam Trawl Survey (BTS) MS well explained the problems encountered and why they couldn't achieved all the planned	Yes Yes Yes Yes	the art concerning uploading to the International database. Table to be updated. No No No No No No
G2	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	to DATRAS even though it's says Y in the table. Number of days and stations mentioned in text and tables are not consistent. For the North Sea Beam Trawl Survey (BTS) MS well explained the problems encountered and why they couldn't achieved all the planned	Yes Yes Yes	the art concerning uploading to the International database. Table to be updated. No No No
G2	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	to DATRAS even though it's says Y in the table. Number of days and stations mentioned in text and tables are not consistent. For the North Sea Beam Trawl Survey (BTS) MS well explained the problems encountered and why they couldn't achieved all the planned	Yes Yes Yes Yes	the art concerning uploading to the International database. Table to be updated. No No No No No No

G

			No recommendation from		
			the LM. MS followed the input		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	derived from the WGBEAM for the BTS survey	Vaa	No
		Are the responsive actions described?	B13 Survey	Yes NA	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
	G4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
IV		f the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing inc ction of data concerning the aquaculture	lustry		
	A Colle	ction of data concerning the aquaculture			
					MS is required to explain
		Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?		No	why data was not submitted.
					MS is required to explain
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		No	why data was not submitted.
					MS is required to explain
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		No	why data was not submitted.
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		1	,
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		NA	No
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?		NA	No
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
	A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			<u> </u>
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	No
	A4	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls		NA	No
	A4	Todono lo avolu silvittalis			MS should solve the
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		No	derogation with EC
					MS should solve the
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No	derogation with EC
	B Colle	ction of data concerning the processing industry		I	,
			Obviously a Census was planned,		
			this should be abbreviated by A, as		
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	used in table IV.B.2	Yes	No
					CV value is questionable
			More information are needed if		and value of response rate is
			Census has a response rate lower		requirable. MS should
			than 70%. CV of 5% for all variables seem implausible, also CV shall be		resubmit table with achieved sample rate, response rate
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	reported in absolute figures	Partly	and recalculated CV.
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	reported in absolute rigures	I artiy	and recalculated 6 v.
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	-	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		T	
			CV seems to be implausible as it is		MS need to justify the
		Is respective data quality information given?	exactly the same for all variables	Partly	questionable CV value.
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	В3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		Inte	Ta :
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	No No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
	В4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		1	1
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
٧		evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
	1 Achie	evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			<u> </u>
					MS should better clarify
				Mostly	why maturity is not sampled
				, i	and follow the outcome of
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	The explanation why maturityis not sa		the international WK.
		Are the relevant derogations listed?		NA	
	2 Action	ns to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortians in the fatale described?			Action to avoid shortfall
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	In NP 2012 the MS state that they w	Partly	to be clarified
VI		or management and use of the data		Mostly	
		vements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			T
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	See general text, evaluation AR-EWG 13-07, SG 3	Voc	No
		ριοροδαι:	Module diagram un-readable,	Yes	No
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	but is a minor comment	Yes	No
		Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)			
		?	section or in section II.A	No	To be clarified
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	2 A adi-	Are the deviations justified?	L	NA	No
	∠ ACTION	ns to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
VII	Follow-up	of STECF recommendations		No	
			The recommenadtion should		A text table should be
		Are the relevant CTEOE assessment data. If the IO	be listed in a text table according to	D- with a	comiled according to the
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	the AR guidelines.	Partly	guidelines.

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

IX IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?

X X. References

Is there a complete list of references?

XI XI. Annexes

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?

The recommendation listed are not relevant for the MS.	No	Prepare a table with relevant recommendations
are not relevant for the MS.	INO	relevant recommendations
		Dranara a table with
		Prepare a table with
		relevant recommendations
The recommendation listed		and description of the action
are not relevant for the MS.	No	taken
		<u>.</u>
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
		1
	Yes	No

STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment			
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		Action needed by MS, please specify task
JRC/DG MARE	Fishing effort		No information submitted for vessels under 10m in legth - A_CATCH. Minor issues in the submitted data set were identified in 103 records with missing mesh size information for gear types such as trammels, dredges and gillnets. - B_EFFORT: Minor issues identified were 35 records submitted with no mesh size information for trammels, gillnet and dredges. - C_SPECIFIC EFFORT: Minor issues identified were 50 records with missing mesh size information for gears such as trammels, gillnets and dredges. - LANDINGS: Minor issues identified were 1874 records with missing mesh size information for gear types such as trammels, dredges and gillnets.		MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not submitted
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: - Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital & investment - Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings - Recreational catches: catches	 Recreational catch data not submitted Clustering of fleet segments not always consistent over the time series and variables, making interpretation of the data sometimes difficult. 	recreational catch data were not mandatory, keeping clustering scheme constant over years is just a recommenation, but no obligation MS need to change the name of segment according to the length classes indicated in regulation 93/2010. The cluster name needs to be changed according to guidelines version.	MS is asked to follow regulation 93/2010 regarding segmentation in future.
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: Income, • Personal costs, • Energy costs, • Raw materia costs, • Other operational costs, • Capital costs, • Extraordinary costs, • Capital value, • Net investments, • Debt, • Raw material volume, • Total volu	- No data submitted for 2008, 2009 and 2010. Derogation requested for 2012 and 2013.	MS did not execute aquaculture data collection, derogation was accepted for the beginning of DCF. Currently small obume of aquaculture in Belgium, maybe derogation for 2012 and 2013 justified. But at least production volume and number of enterprises should be reported, as aquaculture statistic regulation 762/2008 requieres this as well. Employment maybe also possible by national employment agency?	MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not submitted
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock in Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are no fishing in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (130-5) 'master stock table' indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.	
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock in Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are no fishing in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13-05) "master stock table" indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norvegian law.	
ICES	Plaice in Divisions VIIf,g (Celtic Sea)		Commercial Fleets Surveys at Sea	Partly applicable. CPUE data should have been transmitted. MS not involved in survey in the area	MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not submitted
ICES	Demersal elasmobranchs in the North Sea, Skagerrak and eastern English Channel		Discards Age	Not applicable. Age determination of elasmobranchs not included in NP (due to no agreed method for age determination)	None
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius budegassa) in Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b		Landings Length Landings Weight Discards Length Discards Weight Commercial Fleets	Applicable. The problem seems to be that the MS do a lot of length sampling on Lophius spp. MS say in NP that they routinely partition landings of lophius spp into species but they do not seem to process or report data taking this into account (neither in AR or to ICES)	
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius) in Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b		Landings Length Landings Weight Discard's Length Discard's Weight Commercial Fleets	Applicable. The problem seems to be that the MS do a lot of length sampling on Lophius spp. MS say in NP that they routinely partition landings of lophius spp into species but they do not seem to process or report data taking this into account (neither in AR or to ICES)	
ICES	Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)		Landings Length	(Probably) Not applicable. Age based assessment, all MS involved in fishery have got the same comment. WG probably have not asked for the data.	MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not submitted

 $[\]ensuremath{^*}$ For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

	Meml	ber State:	Bulgaria	1	Jude	Judgement levels	
			Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level	
			Version of the AR reviewed	5/31/2013	No	<10%	
			Version of the NP proposal		Partly	10-50%	
			Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%	
			Overall compliance	***	Yes NA	>90% not applicable	
G	eneral fi	ramework				1	
N			on organisation ondent and participating institutes	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?	
			Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?		Yes	No	
			Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?		No	Yes, MS should provide details of National Coordination meeting.	
			Are derogations listed?		Yes	No	
			If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?		Yes	No	
Е	Regio B1		ernational coordination e of international meetings				
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?	MS included only meetings they attended	Partly	Yes, MS to update table wi all eligible meetings	
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Not possible to check whether all planned meetings were attended	NA	No	
	B2	Follow-up	of regional and international recommendations Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?		NA	No	
			Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	No	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No	
			terranean and Black Sea				
			ion of the fishing sector on of the fishing sector				
-			Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?		Yes	No	
			Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	yes	Yes	No	
В	B Econ	nomic variab	es				
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Reference year should be 2011. Clustered segments are not marked. No. of vessels in in IIIB2, IIIB1(NP), in IIIB1 (AR) don't match. No inactive vessels listed	Partly	Yes, MS need to clarify who segments have been clustered, to put asterix or cluster segment, change the reference year to 2011, clar the number of vessels by resubmitting table.	
			Is Table III B 2 complete and consistent with AP guidelines?	Reference year should be 2011, fleet segments which were clustered are only described by length, not gear; one cluster contains segments with 10 or more vessels each (usually not to be clustered)	partly	Yes, MS need to change the reference year and to clarify why the fleet segment with more than 10 vessels have been clustered. MS need that add gear code in the the cluster becuase at momen is labeled only by lenght.	
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Reference year should be 2011; fleet segment nomenclature does not correspond with IIIB1 . Capital value should not be reported (see footnote); there should be no entry for census & response rate >70%	mostly	Yes, MS should use correr reference year. Fleet segmentation should mato in tables IIIB1 and IIIB2. Capital value is not require	
	B1	Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Mostly	Yes, MS should explain methodology applied to	
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Mostly	calculate capital costs.	
			Are the deviations explained?		No	Yes, MS needs to explain	
			Are the deviations justified?		NA	deviations No	
	B2	Data qualit	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
			Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No	
			Are the deviations explained?		NA NA	No No	
	В3	Follow-up	Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations	L	NA	No	
	23	. Show-up (Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No	
			Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No	
	B4	Actions to a	avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA NA	No	
			NEAN & BLACK SEA				
			rolated variables				
F			related variables Are information on III C 1-4 given for each region?	MS operates in only one region	NA	No	
		ogical metier	related variables Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal	MS operates in only one region	NA	No	
	Biolo	ogical metier	Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	MS operates in only one region Table filled except column N (number of trips by metier). But no quantitative information provided in AR reporting columns.	NA No	Yes, MS to discuss possibl actions and solutions with the	
	Biolo	ogical metier	Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Table filled except column N (number of trips by metier). But no quantitative information provided in AR reporting		Yes, MS to discuss possibl actions and solutions with the EU Commission regarding	
	Biolo	ogical metier	Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table filled except column N (number of trips by metier). But no quantitative information provided in AR reporting columns. Table filled but no quantitative information provided in AR reporting	No	Yes, MS to discuss possibl actions and solutions with the EU Commission regarding Financial issues	
	Biolo	ogical metier	Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table filled except column N (number of trips by metier). But no quantitative information provided in AR reporting columns. Table filled but no quantitative information provided in AR reporting columns. Table filled but without real	No No	Yes, MS to discuss possibl actions and solutions with the EU Commission regarding Financial issues	

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations СЗ

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable? C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Mediterranean and Black Sea

Recreational fisheries

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal D2

Were data quality targets provide Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region? REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA

Biological stock-related variables Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal E2

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

	Yes	No
Commission to decide and fellowup	??	Yes, MS to follow up with the
Commission to decide and follow up	"	EU Commission
<u> </u>		
	No	No
	No	No
	Yes	No
	No	No
	NA	No
	NA NA	No No
	NA NA	No
	NA NA	No
LL_	INA	140
	Partly	No
	No	No
		•
	NA	No
Rec fishery is not relevant due to the absence of the target species (Bluefin tuna and Eels) in the area. However, Appendix IV of the EU Decision 93/2010 reported also sharks as target group for Recreational Fishery. MS should demonstrate if all Sharks species are not present in the area or eventually are not target species for recreational fishermen (i.e. through appropriate references or eventually carrying out a pilot study).	Mostly	Yes, MS should provide supporting information as regards the Sharks
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
ı	NA	No
	NA NA	No No
	NA NA	No
	NA NA	No
l l		
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

MS should mention if there was an agreement on national level with Romania for the collection of samples and calculation of coefficient of variation (CV). According to appendix VII of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU, the correct latin name of turbot in Black Sea Area is "Psetta maxima". Both countries (Bulgaria and Romania) should clarify the exact latin name of turbot.	Mostly	Yes, MS should take into account EWG comments and modify report. The MS is requested to follow the appendix VII of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU, when it comes to species names - MS to amend table.
MS should clarify the discrepancy between "the planned minimum number of turbot individuals to be measured at a national level" and "the achieved number of turbot individuals"	Partty	Yes, MS should check the EWG comments
No fundings available for biological sampling ashore or at sea	Yes	Yes, MS should try to avoid such difficulties in the future
No	No	Yes, MS should justify the deviation in the text
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•
MS should try to report the CV achieved at national and regional level	No	Yes, MS should take into account EWG comments.
It's impossible to answer because no CV was not reported	No	Yes, MS should report the CV achieved at National or Regional level.
In 2012, data for the CV for turbot was not estimated due to very low number of individuals	No	No
No	No	Yes, MS should jusitfy deviations.
No relevant derogation listed in section 1	NA	No

Yes

No

MS operates in only one region

			<u></u>		
			No specific LM and RCM Med&BS	.,	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	recommendation was provided in	Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described ?	2011 for section E. NA	NA	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No
	E4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	No	No
-	T	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No	No
F	Trans	sversal variables Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	F1	Capacity		100	110
		F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
		F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
	F2	Effort			
		F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		V	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
		F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	No No
		F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	LL	165	INO
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
	F3	Landings			
		F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		.,	<u> </u>
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?		Yes Yes	No No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
		F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			119
		Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
		F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		Yes	No
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
		F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
G		arch surveys at sea			
	G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		partly	
			MS should report the relevant international planning group for the demersal surevy (i.e. Medits WG). / Max eligble days are not consistent	mostly	Yes, MS to resubmit the table according to the guidelines and consistent with the agreements with Romania
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	with other survey participant. Only the demersal survey has been conducted. Problems have been	Partly	No
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	encountered for the acoustic ones.	•	
		Are the deviations explained?	MS explained that the main problems are related to financials issues. A table, not very clear, with the requested derogations is presented at the beginning of the AR.	Mostly	Yes, MS is requested to clarify if derogations for surveys have been presented and accepted.
		Are the deviations justified?		Partly	No
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?		Yes	No
	G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	The quality of the acoustic survey in		Yes, MS should take into
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	the Black sea area could be compromised by the absence of the Bulgarian data	No	account the EWG comment and clarify if the survey was compromised
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	No No
	G3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	L	INA	INO
	•	. Olon up of Noglonal and International Postimionalistic	MO state of the state are a second		
		And the reduced as a series of the affine form LNA lists 40	MS stated that there are no relevant recommendations for the Black Sea	NA	No
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	No
	G4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	1		.,,,
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
		f the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing indus- ction of data concerning the aquaculture	stry		
			Species named, but not clear to which	Vee	Yes, MS should put the respective letter behind the
		Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	cell it is related.	Yes	cell corresponding to species Latin name.
			Sample rate and the other necessary information are missing. Reference year is not correct.	No	Yes, Reference year must be changed and all columns must be completed by resubmitting data
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	i l		roouprinturiy data

			Data collection strategy differs from		I
			IV.A.2. Response rate and achieved		Yes, In case of sample survey
			sample rate can not be the same with	Partly	only CV should be reported
				Faitty	as other measures of
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	trategy "B". Reference year is not		variability are not required.
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	correct.		
	AI	Achievements. Results and deviation from NF proposal			
			In AD total MO and to see the second of		Yes, MS should clarify the
			In AR text MS only mentions part of	Mostly	methology used to collect all
		A 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	the variables to be collected,	•	variables listed in table IV.A.3
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
			Unclear if applicable, see cell before	No	Yes, MS needs to explain
		Are the deviations explained?	Choicai ii applicable, see celi belele		deviations
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Collection strategy is not consistent		Yes. Clarification of collection
			with indicators reported	Partly	strategy required
		Is respective data quality information given?	with indicators reported		strategy required
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
	A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
	A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
	B Collec	ction of data concerning the processing industry	<u> </u>		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Yes, MS should use the
			Reference year should be 2011	Mostly	correct reference year - MS to
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,	change table.
		The second secon	+		Yes, MS should clarify how
					the number of enterprises is
			Number of enterprises from	Mostly	determined as by
			questionnaires	iviostry	
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			questionnaires or by business
	D4				register.
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Total in the Nethern Dec. 1		
			Text in the Nationa Report speaks		Vee MS should at 27.1
			only about aquaculture. It's not clear if	Mostly	Yes, MS should clarify how
			data are collected from SBS or/and	,	data are collected
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	another survey		
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	В3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
	B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	•		•
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
٧	Module of	f evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
	1 Achie	evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Mostly	
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	data on indicator 8 are missing	Mostly	No
		Are the relevant derogations listed?		NA	No
	2 Action	ns to avoid shortfalls			
					V 110 1 11
				No	Yes, MS should propose
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			actions regarding indicator 8
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No	see above
VI	Module fo	or management and use of the data		•	
-		evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Partly	
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		yes	No
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP		•	
		proposal?	see general comment SG3	Yes	No
					Yes, MS to provide
			Information on the storage of data is		information on the
			missing. Information on progress is	Partly	development of the national
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	scarce.		database
			MS stated that there will be a website		
		Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?	from April 2013	No	No
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?	+	Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified?	+	Yes	No
	2 Action	ns to avoid shortfalls	<u> </u>	100	140
	001	and the second s	T		Yes, MS to provide detailed
			No details and no time frame are		information on the
				Partly	development of the national
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	given		'
				NA	database
1/11	Follow	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			No
VII	rollow-up	o of STECF recommendations		No	Voc MC to provide the tiet of
					Yes, MS to provide the list of
				No	recommendations with
					relevant actions according to
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?			AR guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	Only general remarks	Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
VIII	List of acr	ronyms and abbreviations			
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?		Yes	No
IX	IX. Commo	ents, suggestions and reflections			
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?		Yes	No
	X. Referen				
Х		Is there a complete list of references?		Yes	No
		·			
	XI. Annexe	·			

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support		
statements made in the main text?		

STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment			
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		Action needed by MS, please specify task
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: • Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital & investment • Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings • Recreational catches: catches	Recreational catch data missing (blank template) - Significant amount of missing data at the segment level - Discrepancies between national and fleet segment totals. National level capacity data (number of vessels, GT, SW) significantly lower than at fleet segment level - Landings value data lower than Eurostat statistics, particularly for 2009 - insufficient dustering information. Incomplete information on approach to clustering across time series and variables; reasons for cutsering unclear due to large number of vessels. Missing variables by fleet segment cannot be confirmed due to insufficient data on fleet clusters.	no evident explanation for failure; recreational catch data were not mandatory	MS needs to explain missing DCF data
JRC/DG MARE	Mediterranean & Black Sea	Fisheries' specific landings and discards by species, fishing effort and surveys' data for the years 2008-2012	- Table C - Discards data: JRC did not receive any data on discards from Bulgaria - Table D - The number of fisheries covered indicates that the quantitative information is scarce - Table M - The specified length frequencies data of sports and rutbor twas submitted inappropriately for the period from 2006 to 2011 and arranged age groups (instead of length classes)	PS-1_: in the NP is reported that MS will collect discards information. The metiers planned for discard sampling are OTM and GNS. The two other metiers part of Bulgarian DCF – LLS and FPN catch only occasionally discarded species. As reported in the NP and in the AR, for biological sampling have been selected only 4 metiers: OTM_SPF_13-20_0_0; GNS_DEF_400_0; FPO_SPF_12-16_0_0; LLS_DEF_>0_0_0. Those are the fisheries that should be covered by MS and for which data should be available PS_2-18 includers as moline of fundings and discards. on MS artino reported for 2012 MS stated in AR 2011: "All the equaculture farms are included in the data collection. The data is	MS needs to explain missing DCF data
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: • Income, • Personal costs, • Energy costs, • Raw materia costs, • Other operational costs, • Capital costs, • Extraordinary costs, • Capital value, • Net investments, • Debt, • Raw material volume, • Total volume, • Employment, • Number of enterprises	Only a few variables (turnover, livestock costs (2008), livestock volume and total sales volume) were disaggregated at the segment level. -The turnover and sales volume by specie were only partially reported by DCF segment.	MS stated in AR 2011: "All the aquaculture farms are included in the data collection. The data is collected, processed and aggregated. Collecting information about Number of farms, Total produced tons of fish, Total revenue for species, Operating expenses, Capital, Volume of sales by species. There is information for the period 2008-2011." So data should have been available, as not shortfalls are reported!	MS needs to explain missing DCF data
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.1	Segment: - Fleet segment - Vessel number - Capacity (measure, value) GSA-Segment: - Geographical Sub-Area - Fleet segment - Vessel number	All Task 1.1 data - not provided		MS needs to explain missing DCF data
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.2	Capacity (measure, value) GSA-Segment-Geardas-SpeciesGroup: Fishing gear class Group target species Vessel number GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: Fishing period month (start-end) Fishing gear class Vessel number	All Task 1.2 data - not provided		MS needs to explain missing DCF data
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.3	Segment: Segment: Engine power Employment Salary share % Landing weight Landing yalue Vessel value of total fleet Working days/year per vessel Working bours/days per vessel Variable costs of shing/days per vessel % of V.C. from fuel costs 'Yearly fixed costs per vessel	All Task 1.3 data - not provided		MS needs to explain missing DCF data
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.4	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: • Effort measure • Catch or Landing • CPUE/EPUE • Discard • Bycatch GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: • Catch or Landing • CPUE/EPUE	All Task 1.4 data - not provided	Biological sampling of landings and discards : no MS action reported for 2012. Data collection programme not carried out in 2012.	MS needs to explain missing DCF data
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.5	GSA-Segment-Gearclass-Species/Group-Period-Gear-Species: - Length range of captured species - Length average - Sex - Maturity	All Task 1.5 data - not provided	Biological sampling of landings and discards : no MS action reported for 2012. Data collection programme not carried out in 2012.	MS needs to explain missing DCF data

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

Member State:	Cyprus		Judgeme	ent levels
	Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
	Version of the AR reviewed	31/05/2013	No	<10%
	Version of the NP proposal		Partly	10-50%
		EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
	Overall compliance	XXX	Yes	>90%
			NA	not applicable

I General framework

Na A			on organisation ondent and participating institutes	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
			Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?		Yes	No
			Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?		Yes	No MS to provide list of
			Are derogations listed?		No	derogations
В	Regio		If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines? ernational coordination		NA	No
	B1	Attendanc	e of international meetings	MS included only meetings they		MS to update table with all
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?	attended Not possible to check whether all	Partly	eligible meetings
	В2	Follow-up	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained? of regional and international recommendations	planned meetings were attended	NA	No
	D2	1 Ollow up	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?		NA	No
			Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	No No
			iterranean and Black Sea		INA	140
M A			tion of the fishing sector ion of the fishing sector			
			Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?		Yes	No
_	_		Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?		Yes	No
В	Econ	omic variab	ies	Supraregion name is incomplete.		
				Reference year should be 2011. Clusters are not marked. No		MS should provide all
				information about new categories of passive gears. No information about		information requested by resubmiting table or justify
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	inactive vessels. Supraregion name is incomplete.	Mostly	why the information is missir
				Reference year should be 2011.		
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Clusters are not marked.	Mostly	MS should follow the guidline
				Supraregion name incomplete, reference year should be 2011, length class should be displayed in column provided, CV missing, income from leasing out quota not mentioned, several segments should not be displayed together in the same line, on the other hand there are two lines for the same segment (e.g. lines 10 and 11), capital value data should not		MS should provide all information requested by resubmiting table or justify
	В1	Achieveme	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal	be displayed in the table	Partly	why the information is missir
		7101110101110	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	No No
	B2	Data qualit	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	В3	Follow-up	Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations		NA	No
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
			Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	No No
	B4	Actions to a	avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA NA	No No
RI C			NEAN & BLACK SEA related variables			
Ŭ	C1	_	Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal	MS operates in only one region	NA	No
			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table complete. Only data concerning 2012 have to be reported.	Yes	No
			Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table complete but only data concerning 2012 have to be reported. Some discrepancies between tables IIII.C.3 and III.C.4 concerning numbers of trips really achieved for metiers LLD_LPF_SWO, LLD_DEF, GTR_DEF.	Mostly To clarify if inconsistencies between tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 is the result of considering small scales fisheries as a domain for sampling.	MS to clarify inconsistencies between tables III.C.3 and III.C.4
			Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly filled. But nothing about the multilateral agreement on LPF in colum B and footnote (5) to update.	Yes	MS to update table accordingly
			Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	apaate.	Yes	No

C2	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	Design and achievements rates are consistent with the NP proposal, in terms of numbers of trips sampled. Concerning fish measurements, only Blue fin tuna (BFT) and G3 Cypriot species appears as undersampled. Some species were oversampled in 2012 but without effect on NP expenses. MS should try to sample more BFT When sample sizes permitted to provide CVs	Mostly Yes Mostly Yes Partly	No No No No No
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	No No
C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		No	MS to provide list of derogations
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Relevant recommendation of RCM Med&BS 2011 on metiers variables for LPF not listed.	Mostly	MS to update
	Are the responsive actions described?	TOT ET 1 HOU HOUGH.	Mostly	MS to update
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Mostly	MS to update
C4	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
	editerranean and Black Sea			
D Recr	eational fisheries Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	MS operates in only 1 region	NA	No
D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	WS operates in only 1 region	INA	140
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Appendix IV of the EU Decision 93/2010 reported also sharks as target group for Recreational Fishery. MS should demonstrate (i.e. through appropriate references or eventually carrying out a pilot study) that Sharks are not target species for recreational fishermen. Regarding BFT MS should clarify if a pilot study on Rec Fishery has been conducted in 2011. Moreover, following the sentence "Since in 2012 the recreational catches of BFT were prohibited", MS should report the National legislation or any references	Mostly	MS to provide any supporting information on sharks recreational fishery. MS to provide more information on the BFT pilot study
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?		No	MS should provide an updated list of derogations
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	No No
D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		INA	NO
	Were data quality targets provided?		NA	No
	Were data quality targets met?		NA NA	No
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	No No
D3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		107	NO
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		No	MS should provide an updated list of derogations
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	No
D4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		NA .	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
REGION	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA		NA	No
	gical stock-related variables			
	Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	MS operates in only one region	Yes	No
E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes. Descrepancy exists in the sampling year mentioned in the table	Yes	MS should take into account EWG comments
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	(2011 should be 2012) Targets in numbers of fish sampled are rarely achievied except for M. barbatus. All other species arre	Partly	No
		undersampled.		
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes In general lack of avaiibility of samples due to low landings: MS reports that M. surmuletus is caught rarely during the Medits survey, therefore it is not possible to obtain samples from the survey as well. The main reason for the under sampling of B. boops and S. smaris, was the unexpected lower frequencies of these two species in the total catch of each fishing trip and the small number of individuals caught, which did not allow the collection of adequate samples for laboratory analysis.	Yes	No No

		CVs provided for less than 50% of the		
	Marco OV antiquates associated 10	stocks. Otoliths are colllected but not	D	N-
	Were CV estimates provided?	readen by lack of stereomicroscopes.	Partly	No
		So ALKs could not be calculated.		
	Were CV targets met?		Partly	No
	were CV targets met?	Yes. Lack of samples for some	Faitiy	140
	Are the deviations explained?	species. Lack of specific equipments	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained:	for ALKs.	163	140
	Are the deviations justified?	TOT YIELDS	No	No
E3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
LJ	· · · · ·	No description listed in section 4	NA	Ne
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation listed in section 1 One general recommendation listed.	NA NA	No
		No specific RCM Med&BS		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	recommendation was provided in	Yes	No
		2011.		
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA	No
E4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Actions to avoid shortians			1
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes. By improvement of the sampling	Yes	No
		protocoles for most of species.		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No
Tran	sversal variables			•
				Incomplete data for the quality
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	assessment.
F1	Capacity			
-	F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Т	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	 	Yes	No
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		162	IVU
	F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls		V	NI.
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No No
_	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	<u>[</u>	Yes	No
F2	Effort			
	F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	·		,
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			_
				Missing CV must be
	Is respective data quality information given?		Partly	calculated and provided.
	Are the deviations explained?		Partly	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?		No	Yes
	F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	r		,
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
	F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls	r		1
				MS should clarify what type of
				effort is needed in order to
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Mostly	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Mostly Mostly	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due
F3				effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time.
F3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time.
F3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings			effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time.
F3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Mostly	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No
F3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Mostly Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No
F3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?		Mostly Yes Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No
F3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Mostly Yes Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No
F3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Mostly Yes Yes Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No
F3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?		Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No
F3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?		Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No
F3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No
F3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
F3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
F3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes And Yes Yes Yes Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
F3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes And Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
F3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes ANA NA NA Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations iustified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes And Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
à Rese	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes ANA NA NA Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
à Rese	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	MS should refer to the most updated	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes ANA NA NA Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
i Rese	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS should refer to the most updated version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
i Rese	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
i Rese	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
à Rese	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
i Rese	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
à Rese	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
Rese G1	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in	version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
Rese G1	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
Rese G1	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained?	version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
Rese G1	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?	version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
Rese G1	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation syptimed? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations syptained? Are the deviations pustified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
G2	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Is the quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the deviations explained? Are the deviation systified? Is the quality of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified?	version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
G2	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described?	version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
G2 G3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is there a map of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described?	version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
Rese G1 G2	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described?	version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
G2 G3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is there a map of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described?	version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N
G2 G3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is the quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Foltow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls	version of the Medits Manual (i.e.	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time. No No No No No No No No No N

IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry

A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

G

Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?

Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

A3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are the relevant derogations listed?

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Module for management and use of the data

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP

Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?

No data on Tuna have been provided	Mostly	MS should provide information requested by resubmiting table or justify why the information is missing. Table should be filler out correct.
Tuna reporting is totally missing. Reference year is uncorrect	Partly	MS should provide information requested by resubmiting table or justify why the information is missing
Tuna reporting is totally missing. Reference year is uncorrect	Partly	MS should provide information requested by resubmiting table or justify why the information is missing
No Tuna aquaculture data collection is		MS should clarify why
reported, but mentioned in NP and table IV.A.1.	Mostly	information on tuna has not been provided
	No	MS needs to explain deviations
	No	MS needs to justify deviations
AR: "The achieved sample numbers do not differ for the estimation of the parameters." MS is asked to clarify this sentence as rate is 100% - which estimation is meant then!	Partly	MS need to clarify the estimation of parameters MS is asked to explain
	Partly	deviations
	Partly	MS needs to justify deviations
	Yes	No
	NA NA	No No
	INA	140
	No	MS is asked to provide all shortfalls
	No	MS is asked tojustify shortfall
Reference year is uncorrect.	Yes	No MS should clarify why for
Reference year is uncorrect.	Yes	some variables data sources are estimation
No information why some variables are collected using estimation and not questionnaires or financial accounts	Mostly Yes	MS should clarify why for some variables data sources are estimation
I	Yes	No
Finanical accounts are not data source if data are asked by questionnnaire or face to face interview.	Mostly	MS should clarify on data sources
MS is invited to read the respective comments for clarification on fish processing activities.	Mostly	MS should clarify on data sources
	No	MS needs to justify deviations
T	NA	No
	NA NA	No
	NA	No
T	NIA	No
	NA NA	No No
		1
MS should update the table with the		

MS should update the table with the indicators from 1 to 4 (following the last version of the AR Guidelines 2013). MS should calculate the indicator number 9. The explanation given in the text is not feasible, polyvalent activity for small scale fishery is quite common in all mediterranean countries.	Partly	MS to resubmt the table
no derogations requested	NA	No
	Partly	MS to present actions for the estimation of indicator 9
no shortfalls present	NA	No

	Yes	No
see General comment EWG SG3	Yes	No
Very little has happened in 2012	Mostly	Progress to be clarified by MS.

	Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A	MS claims that all relevant national staff have access to data. However, a website also provides information for the external user.	No	MS to provide information on the status of establishing a national DCF website
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
VII	Follow-up of STECF recommendations			
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
VIII	I List of acronyms and abbreviations			
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?		Yes	No
IX	IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections	-	•	•
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?		No	No
Х	X. References			
	Is there a complete list of references?		Yes	No
ΧI	XI. Annexes			
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		Yes	No

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

CYPRUS

STECF & DG MARE - Comments					
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*	EWG comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: • Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital & investment • Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings • Recreational catches: catches	- Significant amount of information not reported for many fleet segments - Landings Value and weight for total and fleet segment level) and effort data for 2011 not provided - Landings income data for 2011 not submitted - Landings income data for 2011 not submitted - Average age of vessels not submitted for all years at national level - Discrepancies between national and fleet segment totals: fleet segment level capacity data (number of vessels, GT, kW) lower than at the national level - Incomplete information on approach to clustering across time series and variables; reasons for dustering unclear due to large number of vessels. Missing variables by fleet segment cannot be confirmed due to insufficient data on fleet clusters - Forecast figures for 2011 had to be based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, as the later was not provided during the data call	no evident explanation for failure;	
JRC/DG MARE	Mediterranean & Black Sea	Fisheries' specific landings and discards by species, fishing effort and surveys' data for the years 2008-2012	Table D - Fishing First data: The number of fisheries covered indicates that the quantitative information is scarce. Only two fisheries were reported and correspond to large pelagic fish (PP) and demersal species (EMSP). The effort data indicates that the two fisheries efforts distribute among & GSAs (Appendix I). Tables MEDTIS and other surveys data: JRC did not receive any information on abundance and biomass from other surveys than MEDITS data.		
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: Income. *Personal costs. *Energy costs. *Raw materia costs. *Other operational costs. *Capital costs. *Extraordinary costs. *Capital value. *Net investments. *Debt. *Raw material volume. *Total volume. *Employment. *Number of enterprises	 Due to a low number of firms only turnover and sales volume by specie were provided by segments. 	There are only 6 sea bass and sea bream on growing enterprises and 3 sea bass and bream hatcheries/nurreis and 1 tuna one growing, 50 it seems plausible that dar en or reported by segment. Maybe some further explanation for the 6 enterprises segment is needed, is there a dominat player?	
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.1	Segment: • Fleet segment • Vessel number • Capacity (measure, value) GSA-Segment: • Geographical Sub-Area • Fleet segment • Vessel number • Capacity (measure, value)	All Task 1.1 data - not provided		
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.2	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup: - Fishing gear class - Group target species - Vessel number GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: - Fishing period month (start-end) - Fishing gear class - Vessel number - Species - Vessel number	All Task 1.2 data - not provided		
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.3	Segment: • Engine power • Engloymen % • Salary share % • Landing weight • Landing value • Vessel value of total fleet • Working days/year per vessel • Working days/year yer vessel • Working hours/days per vessel • Variable costs of fishing/days per vessel • Variable costs of fishing/days per vessel • Yariable costs of fishing/days per vessel • Yearly fixed costs per vessel	All Task 1.3 data - not provided		

Evaluation o	f 2012 Data	Transmission
--------------	-------------	--------------

CYPRUS

		STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment	
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*	ENG Comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task
GFCM		GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: - Effort measure - Catch or Landing - CPUE/LPUE - Discard - Bycatch - Bycatch - GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: - Catch or Landing	·	Biological sampling of landings and discards: length distributions shoud be available for 4 or 5 metiers according to MS ability for raising sampling data to the metier/fleet level. Some data collected on discards shown that discards are low, and so could be of negligible interest for stock assessment issues.	MS to provide tal 1.4 data available
GFCM		GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: - Length range of captured species - Length average - Sex - Maturity		Biological sampling of landings and discards: length distributions shoud be available for 4 or 5 metiers according to MS ability for raising sampling data to the metier/fleet level.	MS to provide tal 1.5 data available

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

Reference year Version of the AR reviewed Copenhagen 31th of May 2013 <10% Version of the NP proposal Partly 10-50% EWG Answei Overall compliance Yes >90% NA not applicable General framework EWG COMMENTS National data collection organisation EWG judgement EWG National correspondent and participating institutes Action needed? Are the par nvolved in the national data collection and their roles MS to clarify contents of MS to clarify contents of national national coordination Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings? oordination meetings Mostly meetings Are derogations listed?
If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines? В Regional and International coordination Attendance of international meetings Is Table II.B.1 complete No B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations Are the general recommendations from Liaison Me Are the responsive actions described ? Yes No Are the responsive actions acceptable? Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector General description of the fishing sector Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described? Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? B Economic variables Number of vessels in Annual Report and Table IIIB1 don't match. inactive MS is asked to provide ressels should be listed. Clustered clarification on why the vessel number in AR and in table egments should be marked with Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? asterisk Mostly IIIB1 don't match. ustered segments should be marked Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal ith asterisk MS does not apply PIM for capital value estimation: therefore figures as requested in guidelines (e.g. PCU, price index, lifetimes) are not provided; as it is in line with the NP. the approach on capital value Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? stimation are regarded accep Are the deviations explained? NA NA No No Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal MS applies non-probability sampling. but does not describe nor provide "other variability indicators" as equested in the guidelines. However the sampling design as described in the NP looks more like probability sampling. Moreover, the request of "other variabilty indicators" is not very Is respective data quality information given? oracticable Ms to clarify /lostly Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? **B3** Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described? NA Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? No Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Region Baltic Biological metier related variables Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? MS have added rows in AR with stocks (eg turbot, flounder) that are not present in the NP (including targe evels). Species merged across fishing grounds (this is though the case in the NP as well). Sampling ear is sometimes 2011, Last column Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? not fully completed. To be updated by MS Mostly Metier LLD ANA 0 0 0 appears on Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? able III.C.3 but not in table III.C.6 To be updated by MS Most metiers undersampled on-shore Most stocks over and under sampled For some stocks Planned minimum no. of fish to be measured/aged at national level cannot be found in the Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? NP but appears in AR. To be clarified by MS Ms to clarify on-shore metier Ms to clarify on-shore metier important under sampling Mostly mportant under sampling Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? C2 Were CV targets met?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified? Mostly C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? NA No

Judgement levels

Member State

Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable? C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Yes MS to describe actions for on-shore Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic Biological metier related variables C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Table not consistent with NP Some species merged across fishing grounds (this is though the case in the NP as well). Achieved no of fish measured at national level column not Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? ompleted. /lostly Some metier appear on table III.C.3 Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? but not in table III.C.6. /lostly lost metiers undersampled on-shore Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Most stocks over sampled. Parth Are the deviations explained? MS to clarify reason for overall shortcomings in shore sampling Mostly Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided' Were CV targets met? Mostly Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Yes Mostly C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Yes Are the responsive actions described ? onsive actions acceptab C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? MS to describe actions for on-shore Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? /lostly Biological metier related variables Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Inconsistencies between NP and AR. one metier is missing in AR. MS sampled 49 out of 25 performed Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? fishing trips (??). Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? MS don't provide Achieved no of fish measured at national level (last Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? olumn). Mostly Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? MS sampled 49 out of 25 performed Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? fishing trips (??). Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? 'es Mostly C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided'
Were CV targets met? Yes Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? NΔ NΑ C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? NΑ Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Yes C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? es/ ion Baltic Se Recreational fisheries MS reports information only for the Baltic Region Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal In the report is mentioned only the refishery for salmon, no information for cod and eel is reported. For sharks, Appendix IV of the EU Decision 93/2010 reports also sharks as target Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? roup for Recreational Fishery. MS should report the approved derogation or demonstrate (i.e. through appropriate references or eventually carrying out a pilot study) that Sharks are not target species for recreational fishermen (or that the quota is very low). Mostly No derogation reported. MS should eport it in order to justify the absence Are obtained derogations mentioned? of recreational fishery for other pecies in the AR Are the deviations explained? NΑ

MS to describe actions for on-

Table to be updated by MS

To be clarified by MS

MS to clarify reason for

sampling

No

overall shortcomings in shore

MS to describe actions for on-

To be claified and table to

Table to be updated by MS

To be clarified and text to be

To be clarified by MS

updated

No

Yes

To be clarified by MS

No

No

ne updated by MS

To be claified and table to

be updated by MS

shore sampling

shore sampling.

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal
Were data quality targets provided?
Were data quality targets met?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?
Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Sea & Eastern Arctic D Recreational fisheries

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?
Were data quality targets met?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

Region Baltic

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? on North Sea and Eastern Arctic

Biological stock-related variables
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

MS to clarify shortfalls for the other		MS to clarify shortfalls for the
species than salmon	Mostly	other species than salmon
Since MS has to clarify shortfalls for		
the other species than salmon it's		
difficualt to judge	Mostly	No

they have added dab and flounder which are already included in NP. All herring stocks are combined in the table. Should be separated in future NPs. New species added. Oversamling in few species sampled during surveys. Oversampling of salmon. Dab and sole undersampled. Mostly Mostly No Specify if the salmon sampling up to 600 % oversampling) coused additionall cost. What was the reason to increase sampling (mostly justified, except for 600%			
NA NO NO NA NO NA NO NO Recommendation arises from NS&EA 2009. MS to clarify why there's no overview available. NO	93/2010 reports sharks cod and eels as target species for Recreational Fishery in the Region. However in the NP MS stated that "No recreational fishery takes place in the North Sea." In the AR, for the Region North Sea & Eastern Arctic, the situation of teh recreational fishery is not clear and not		
NA		NA	No
NA NA NO NA NA NO NA NA NO NA		NA	No
NA		NA	No
NA No NA No NA No Yes No Yes No Recommendation arises from NS&EA 2009. MS to clarify why there's no overview available. NO To be clarified by MS No			
NA No Yes No Recommendation arises from NS&EA 2008. MS to clarify why there's no overview available. No To be clarified by MS No			
Yes No Yes No No To be clarified by MS No No No No No No No N		1101	ji to
Yes			
Recommendation arises from NS&EA 2009. MS to calrify why there's no overview available. No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS No			
No	Recommendation arises from NS&EA	100	110
Yes		Partly	To be clarified by MS
Yes		No	To be clarified by MS
Some information is missing. Small inconsistencies between NP and AR. Untrot and Brill added in AR. MS say they have added dab and flounder which are already included in NP. All herring stocks are combined in the table. Should be separated in future NPs. New species added. Oversamling in few species sampled during surveys. Oversampling of salmon. Dab and sole undersampled. Yes No No No Specify if the salmon sampling (up to 600 % oversampling of salmon wariables, and for sole ware reason to increase sampling (effor? MS must explain how will ensure in future collection of sole data Mostly justified, except for 600% oversampling of salmon variables, and for sole Mostly except for maturity at age and sex ratio No No No Yes No No No No No Yes No No No No No No No No No N			
Some information is missing. Small inconsistencies between NP and AR. Untrot and Brill added in AR. MS say they have added dab and flounder which are already included in NP. All herring stocks are combined in the table. Should be separated in future NPs. New species added. Oversamling in few species sampled during surveys. Oversampling of salmon. Dab and sole undersampled. Yes No No No Specify if the salmon sampling (up to 600 % oversampling of salmon wariables, and for sole ware reason to increase sampling (effor? MS must explain how will ensure in future collection of sole data Mostly justified, except for 600% oversampling of salmon variables, and for sole Mostly except for maturity at age and sex ratio No No No Yes No No No No No Yes No No No No No No No No No N	Vas	Ves	No
inconsistencies between NP and AR. Turbot and Brill added in AR. MS say they have added dab and flounder which are already included in NP. All herring stocks are combined in the table. Should be separated in future NPs. New species added. Oversamling in few species sampled during surveys. Oversampling of salmon. Dab and sole undersampled. Yes Mostly No Mostly justified, except for 600% oversampling of salmon arrabbes, and for sole Mostly justified, except for 600% oversampling of salmon wariabbes, and for sole Mostly vexcept for maturity at age and sex ratio Mostly vexcept for maturity at age and sex ratio No Yes Mostly No No No No No No No No No N	100	103	110
inconsistencies between NP and AR. Turbot and Brill added in AR. MS say they have added dab and flounder which are already included in NP. All herring stocks are combined in the table. Should be separated in future NPs. New species added. Oversamling in few species sampled during surveys. Oversampling of salmon. Dab and sole undersampled. Yes Mostly No Mostly justified, except for 600% oversampling of salmon arrabbes, and for sole Mostly justified, except for 600% oversampling of salmon wariabbes, and for sole Mostly vexcept for maturity at age and sex ratio Mostly vexcept for maturity at age and sex ratio No Yes Mostly No No No No No No No No No N			
NPs. Mostly stocks in area/stock row New species added. Oversamling in few species sampled during surveys. Oversampling of salmon. Dab and sole undersampled. Yes No Specify if the salmon sampling (up to 600 % oversampling) coused additional cost. What was the reason to increase sampling of salmon variables, and for sole Mostly justified, except for 600% oversampling of salmon variables, and for sole Mostly except for maturity at age and sex ratio Mostly except for maturity at age and sex ratio No No No No No No No No No	inconsistencies between NP and AR. Turbot and Brill added in AR. MS say they have added dab and flounder which are already included in NP. All herring stocks are combined in the		participating in sampling (billateral agreements). Clarify variables of flatfishes species added for sampling (inconsistency between text
New species added. Oversamling in few species sampled during surveys. Oversampling of salmon. Dab and sole undersampled. Yes Ves No Specify if the salmon sampling (up to 600 % oversampling) coused additionall cost. What was the reason to increase sampling effor? MS must explain how will ensure in future collection of sole data Mostly justified, except for 600% oversampling of salmon variables, and for sole Mostly except for maturity at age and sex ratio No No No No No No No No No		Mostly	
Specify if the salmon sampling (up to 600 % oversampling) coused additional cost. What was the reason to increase sampling effort? MS must explain how will ensure in future collection of sole data Mostly except for maturity at age and sex ratio Mostly except for maturity at age and sex ratio Mostly except for maturity at age and sex ratio No No No No No No No No No	New species added. Oversamling in few species sampled during surveys. Oversampling of salmon. Dab and sole undersampled.	Mostly	No
sampling (up to 600 % oversampling) coused additionall cost. What was the reason to increase sampling effort? MS must explain how will ensure in future collection of sole data Mostly except for maturity at age and sex ratio Mostly No	res	res	INO
sex ratio Mostly No Yes Yes No	oversampling of salmon variables,	Mostly	sampling (up to 600 % oversampling) coused additionall cost. What was the reason to increase sampling effort? MS must explain how will ensure in future collection
No Yes No No No Yes No		Mandh	M-
Yes No CVs in 93/2010 arbitrary and hard to reach. First step is to get unbiased samples in order to be able to calculate precision. MS try to improve sampling design. It is difficult to say if it is justified or not to not reach the target CVs.MS should probably in the next NP make sure that sampling is planned to meet precision targets for some of the basic parameters (this is a part of the design). Target number seems a bit low in some cases but this is a part of the design). Target number seems a bit low in some cases but this a part of the NP evaluation not AR eveluation NA No No derogations are listed NA No Yes No No Wes No MS need to describe how to avoid shortfalls in the future for the stocks were targets have not been met. This is particularly true for sole were DK is the main contributor to the fisheries and assessment data. If a survey is terminated it need to be replaced with other kind of sampling			
reach. First step is to get unbiased samples in order to be able to calculate precision. MS try to improve sampling design. It is difficult to say if it is justified or not to not reach the target CVs.MS should probably in the next NP make sure that sampling is planned to meet precision targets for some of the basic parameters (this is a part of the design). Target number seems a bit low in some cases but this is a part of the NP evaluation not AR eveluation No derogations are listed NA No No No No No MS need to describe how to avoid shortfalls in the future for the stocks were targets have not been met. This is particularly true for sole were DK is the main contributor to the fisheries and assessment data. If a survey is terminated it need to be replaced with other kind of sampling			
Yes Yes No Yes No Yes No MS need to describe how to avoid shortfalls in the future for the stocks were targets have not been met. This is particularly true for sole were DK is the main contributor to the fisheries and assessment data. If a survey is terminated it need to be replaced with have not been met Partly other kind of sampling	reach. First step is to get unbiased samples in order to be able to calculate precision. MS try to improve sampling design. It is difficult to say if it is justified or not to not reach the target CVs.MS should probably in the next NP make sure that sampling is planned to meet precision targets for some of the basic parameters (this is a part of the design). Target number seems a bit low in some cases but this is a part of the NP evaluation not	Yes	No
Yes Yes No Yes No Yes No MS need to describe how to avoid shortfalls in the future for the stocks were targets have not been met. This is particularly true for sole were DK is the main contributor to the fisheries and assessment data. If a survey is terminated it need to be replaced with have not been met Partly other kind of sampling	No derogations are listed	NA	No
Yes No MS need to describe how to avoid shortfalls in the future for the stocks were targets have not been met. This is particularly true for sole were DK is the main contributor to the fisheries and assessment data. If a survey is terminated it need to be replaced with have not been met Partly other kind of sampling	Yes	Yes	No
MS need to describe how to avoid shortfalls in the future for the stocks were targets have not been met. This is particularly true for sole were DK is the main contributor to the fisheries and assessment data. If a survey is terminated shrotfalls for the stocks were target have not been met Partly other kind of sampling			
avoid shortfalls in the future for the stocks were targets have not been met. This is particularly true for sole were DK is the main contributor to the fisheries and assessment No description on how to avoid shrotfalls for the stocks were target have not been met Partly other kind of sampling			
shrotfalls for the stocks were target have not been met Partly it need to be replaced with other kind of sampling	No description on the		avoid shortfalls in the future for the stocks were targets have not been met. This is particularly true for sole were DK is the main contributor to the fisheries and assessment
have not been met Partly other kind of sampling			
		•	to be replaced willi
		Partly	

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal E2

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Atlantic

Е

Biological stock-related variables E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV targets met?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?
Actions to avoid shortfalls

E4

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

F Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

		MS to add countries participating in sampling (billateral agreements).
L		Lemon sole and witch
Table is complete, only small	L.	flounder variables must be
adjustment is desirable	Yes	separated
Noted over and under - sampling		
mostly during surveys	Mostly	No
MS to clarify and explain reasons of	L	MS to clarify and explain
deviations	Partly	reasons of deviations
Only for survey sampling, for some		
stocks DK is a main contributor and decrease of catches cannot be a		
	D- ath.	N-
reason for undersampling.	Partly	No
Mostly except for maturity at age and		
sex ratio	Mostly	No
NO Sex Tallo	No	No
Yes	Yes	No
165	163	140
CVs in 02/2010 orbitron, and hard to		
CVs in 93/2010 arbitrary and hard to		
reach. First step is to get unbiased samples in order to be able to		
calculate precision. MS try to improve sampling design. It is difficult to say if		
it is justified or not to not reach the		
target CVs.MS should probably in the		
next NP make sure that sampling is		
planned to meet precision targets for		
some of the basic parameters (this is		
a part of the design). Target number		
seems a bit low in some cases but		
this is a part of the NP evaluation not		
AR eveluation	V	N
AR eveluation	Yes	No
No derogations listed.	NA	No
Recommendations from the RCM are	IVA	140
listed. MS picked only relevant		
recommendations.	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
163	163	140
MS only states that it is difficult to		
predict samples in surveys. Shortfalls		1
appear however in harbour sampling		1
and sea sampling as well. MS must		1
describe more detailed about work on		MS to desrcibe actions to
adjusting sampling scheme	Partly	avoid shortfalls
NA	NA	No
	j. w .	1

The only sampled stock is boarfish	l	
witch was not included in NP	Yes	No
Blue whiting stock not sampled, new s	No	No
Yes	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
Only for boarfish weight@age, data		
on Lenght@age still not in a database	Mostly	No
No	No	No
Yes	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
No derogations for stock related		
variables are listed.	NA	No
No, 2 recomendations are missing	No	To be updated
NA	NA	No
NA	NA	No
Yes	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No

	MS shall provide information
	for the effort varaibles for
	small vessels (<10m).
Mostly	Nothing is stated in the table.

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
_		
	Na	NA
	NA	NA

In general there are missing		
information on effort variables for		
vessles <10 meters. Also noted		
inconsistency between NP and AR		
given that for vessles<10 m, it's		
planned to estimate the number of		
days@sea based on the sales notes		MS shall further explain if
(onesalenote=onedaysatsea) however		days@sea is being estimated
nothing is stated in the AR.	Mostly	for <10 meters.
	Mostly	No
	Mostly	No

			Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations		Yes	No
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
			Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
			to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		No	Further explanation
			Are actions to avoid shortians in the ruture described :		NO	Identify actions to be taken in
						the future to overcome
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No	shortfals for small scale.
	F3	Landings F11 Achieve	ements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
			ality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
			up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
			Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
			to avoid shortfalls		1	T
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
	G Resea	arch surveys			100	ji to
	G1		nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			le Table III G 1 complete and consistent with AD avidelines?	Acronyms for working groups should	Voc	No
			Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	be updated next year	Yes Yes	No No
			Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
			Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ?		Yes	No
	G2		/: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in			
			gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	G3		Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations		Yes	No
	GS		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
			Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
	G4		avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA NA	No
	A Collec		concerning the aquaculture		1	Įr. i v
			Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?		Yes	No
			Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes Yes	No No
	A1		its: Results and deviation from NP proposal		100	ji to
			• •	For many variables the data collection		
				plan doesn't match with the planned		MS should justify why the
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	Census method	Mostly Yes	census was unsuccessful No
			Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	A2		Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?		Yes Yes	No No
			Are the deviations explained: Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	A3	Follow-up of	Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	No No
			Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	No No
	A4		void shortfalls		1101	1110
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
	B Collec		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? concerning the processing industry		Yes	No
	- conec		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
			The state of the s			MS should provide all
				1		information
				There is no information about		requested by resubmiting table or justify why the
			Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	subsidies.	Mostly	information is missing
	B1		tts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
						MS should clarify the
				1		difference between NP and AR for data
				Data sources and estimation methods		sources and estimation
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	don't match in NP and AR	Mostly	method
				There is no information about		MS peed to explain device!
			Are the deviations explained?	subsidies	Mostly	MS need to explain deviations from NP.
				There is no information about		
	. -		Are the deviations justified?	subsidies	No	MS to clarify
	B2	Data quality:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	В3		Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	No No
			Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	No
	B4	Actions to av	void shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
v	Module of		of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		1.00	p.10
			ults and deviation from NP proposal			
			le Table V.4 complete and consistent with AD 11.5 C	Text is not in line with table	Manda	Total Control Control
			Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	concerning indicator 4.	Mostly NA	Text to be updated by MS No
	2 Action	s to avoid sho			1	1
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		NA	No
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
			nt and use of the data			

			See general text on data		
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	transmission from sub group 3	Yes	No
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP			
		proposal?		Yes	No
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?		Yes	No
		Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?	Information is in section II. A	NA	No
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
	2 Actions to avoid sl	nortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
VII	Follow-up of STECF r	ecommendations			
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
VIII	List of acronyms and	abbreviations			
			The list is not in an aphabetic		
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	order as requested in the guidelines	Mostly	No
IX	IX. Comments, sugge	stions and reflections			
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?			
Х	X. References				
		Is there a complete list of references?			
ΧI	XI. Annexes				
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support			
		statements made in the main text?			

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

DENMARK

	STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task	
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		
JRC/DG MARE	Fishing effort		interpreted it as such as that FDF records should be reported separately only (and therefore substracted from the total estimate within the same strata.) The data call doesn't make it explicit enough that FDF should be actually summed up twice. As a consequence of this ambiguity, all Danish catches figures in the specton 'none' where some FDF fahreries are involved were by mandwetteneu understimated. This missinterpretation was also present in the 2011 report of the STECF, but the extent of FDF fisheries was been in 2010 than in 2011 and this was therefore not noticed. This issue was manually addressed by the STECF EWG for all years, leading to more accurate reporting in 2012. Denmark will make sure that these will be accounted for in future submissions, and underlines also the absolute need to remove all ambiguities and potential sources of misinterpretation in future data calls. The data regarding small vessels ("Colim in Annex III and -8m in Baltic) was observed to be erroneous (and thus largely underestimated) for data up to 2009 "STECF EWG 1-26 noted that the Danish 2011 submission does not cover the special conditions BACOMA or 70. "Fishing activity (days at sea) in the Baltic up to 2007 is missing. A_CATCH: -Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 741 records with no gear information and 25 records with missing mesh size information for gear types such as pots, dredges and gillnets. EFFORT: -Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 76 records with no gear information and 30 records with missing mesh size information for gear types such as pots, dredges and gillnets. -EFFORT: -Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 95 records with no gear information and 30 records with missing mesh size information for gear types such as pots, dredges and gillnets. -EFFORT: -Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 95 records with no gear information and 30 records with missing mesh size information for gear types such as pots, dredges and gillnets. -	1st part -self-explanatory; <tom 190="" 8="" <2007="" a="" activity="" and="" bacoma="" evident="" explanation="" failure;="" for="" issue,="" issues<="" minor="" no="" td=""><td></td></tom>	
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: - Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital 8. investment - Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings - Recreational catches: catches	Cluster information not provided. Fleet segment dustering information not provided. - Fishing enterprise data for 2011 not submitted. - Only partial effort data submitted for all years. - Possible incomplete landings dataset. Reported landings weight and value significantly lower than Eurostat data. Landings income for 2011 not provided. - Missing capacity data for 2011 and 2012, effort data for all years. Capacity data for 2012 not provided; missing antional level capacity data for 1012. - Forecast figures for 2011 had to be based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, as the later was not provided during the data call. - Recreational catch data not submitted	no evident explanation for failure; 2012 data and recreational catch data not mandatory	MS needs to clarify missing DCF data
ICES	Brill in Subdivisions 22 to 32		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Raturity Discards Raturity	Not applicable. MS collect discard data on brill. Only few brills have been measured, probably because they are uncommon in the discard fraction. Assessment method is based on surveys and does not require discard data.	Agreed
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock in Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are not fishing in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13.69) "master stock table" indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information in needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.	Agreed
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock in Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are not fishing in the area. ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (3.156) "master stock table" indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information in needed. Additionally it country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Nowegian law.	Agreed
ICES	Salmon in the Main Basin and Gulf of Bothnia (Salmon in Subdivisions 22–31)		Landings Maturity	Not applicable. Multin'y of salmon from Mann Basin and Gulf of Bothna Salmon in Subdivisions 22–31) is requested from some counties. Multin'y data would be relevant for assessment, however, there is no method available at the moment, which could be used to discriminate between salmon that will mature later in auturna and salmon that will say on the feeding grounds for at least one more year. This is why the ICES WGBAST did not use maturity data for assessments and Baltic countries are not providing such a data. Only relevant maturity information could be obtained from salmon actively migrating or spawning in rivers.	
ICES	Flounder in Subdivisions 22 to 32		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Raturity	Not applicable. Concerning requested flounder discard biological variables (Baltic sea), there is no regular assessment of flounder stock. Some attempts have been made in the past - currently wKFLABA group is working on it, but in general WGBFAST responsible for the Baltic stocks assessment is not requesting discard data, mainly due to problems with age determination and serious age inconsistencies within and between countries.	
ICES	Plaice in Subdivisions 24 to 32		Landings Sex Ratio Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Muturity Discards Sex Ratio Commercial Fleets	(Probably) Not applicable -depending on the purpose with analysing failures. The present assessment method is based on surveys implying that discard data is not needed for the assessment. MS collect the data and made it available—if the quality of data is poor this need to be discussed at a regional level since all participating MS get the same comment	
ICES	Demersal elasmobranchs in the North Sea, Skagerrak and eastern English Channel		Discards Age	Not appicable. MS do not age read rays.	

Evaluation of	f 2012 Dat	a Transmission
---------------	------------	----------------

DENMARK

	STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task	
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		
ICES	Nephrops in Division IVa (Norwegian		Landings Length	Applicable. It is not possible to evaluate from the NP if MS sample this stock or not since MS do	
	Deeps, FU 32)		Landings Maturity	not identify the FU in the NP. They do sample Nephrops discards in the North Sea but it is unclear	
			Discards Length	in which FU. MS need to be asked	
			Discards Weight		
			Discards Maturity		
			Discards Sex Ratio		
ICES	Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)		Landings Length	(Probably) Not applicable. Age based assessment, all MS involved in fishery have got the same	
				comment. WG probably have not asked for the data.	
ICES	Whiting in Division IIIa (Skagerrak -		Surveys at Sea	(Probably) Not Applicable . MS collect the data and made it available- if the quality of data is poor	
	Kattegat)			this need to be discussed at a regional level or in a survey group since all participating MS get the	
				same comment. It is not a transmission problem	
ICES	Herring in the Northeast Atlantic			Not applicable. MS do not sample discards this pelagic fisheries (derogation).	
	(Norwegian spring-spawning		Discards Length		
	herring)		Discards Weight		
			Discards Maturity		
			Discards Sex Ratio		
ICES	Mackerel in the Northeast Atlantic		Discards Age	(Probably) Applicable. MS has a derogation to sample the metier OTB_SPF_32-69_0_0 for discards	
	(combined Southern, Western and		Discards Length	(were the mackerel are caught. But in the derogation is only the herring part of the fishery	
	North Sea spawning components)		Discards Weight	described. MS need to be asked	
			Surveys at Sea		

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

Memb	_		_		
	ber State:	Estonia Reference year	2012	Judgen Compliance class	nent levels Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	31.05.2013	No No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal		Partly	10-50%
		Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	***	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
General fr	amework				
		on organisation ondent and participating institutes	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
	•	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles			
		well described? Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination		Yes	No
		meetings?		Yes	No
		Are derogations listed?		Yes	No
		If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?		NA	
3 Regio		rnational coordination e of international meetings			
		•	MS to clearly state if attended		
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?	meeting or not.	Partly	Yes
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	MS to explain reason for non attendance.	No	Yes
B2	Follow-up	of regional and international recommendations	attoridantos	1110	100
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No No
SUPRA-RI	EGION Baltic	Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic		Yes	INO
Module of	the evaluati	on of the fishing sector on of the fishing sector			_
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?		VAS	no
		Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?		yes yes	no no
B Econo	omic variabl				
			All grov colle are amphy for in activity		MS should submit table or
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	All grey cells are empty; for inactive vessels no gear should be provided	No	justify why the information was not provided.
			Asterisk should be added to the		,
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	clustered fleet segment name	Yes	no
					MS should submit table or justify why the information
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	all grey cells are empty	No	was not provided.
B1	Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs are not		MS shoul provide reasons why the did not apply PIM
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	provided	Mostly	method
		Are the deviations avalained?	Sampling scheme has been changed	V	N.
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	from probability sampling to census	Yes Yes	No No
B2	Data quality	r: Results and deviation from NP proposal		[11.12
		Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	No No
В3	Follow-up o	f Regional and international recommendations			•
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	No No
B4	Actions to a	void shortfalls		[: ··· ·	11.12
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
PEGION B	BALTIC SEA	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
		related variables			
		Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?		Yes	No
C1	Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal		I	1
			Table format changes. Information on		
			sampling scheme incomplete. Wrong year mentionned. Same metiers split		
			in different lines according to		
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	sampling strategy creating mismatch		
			between the Total No. of trips during		
			the Sampling year in tables III.C.3 and III.C.4.		
		In Table III C 4 complete and consistent with AD wilds for an		Mostly	Yes
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table format changes.	Yes	No
			Table format changes. Wrong		
			precision target for G2 species. Only		
			unsorted catches mentionned. Table		1
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	unsorted catches mentionned. Table III.C.3 mentions concurrent sampling		
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	III.C.3 mentions concurrent sampling at sea and no discard sampling on		
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	III.C.3 mentions concurrent sampling	Mostly	Yes
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	III.C.3 mentions concurrent sampling at sea and no discard sampling on table III.C.5. Table fromat changes. MS to clarify	Mostly	Yes
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	III.C.3 mentions concurrent sampling at sea and no discard sampling on table III.C.5. Table fromat changes. MS to clarify why the total number of fish sampled	Mostly	Yes
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	III.C.3 mentions concurrent sampling at sea and no discard sampling on table III.C.5. Table fromat changes. MS to clarify why the total number of fish sampled in III.C.6 is less to the III.C.5 one.	Mostly	Yes
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	III.C.3 mentions concurrent sampling at sea and no discard sampling on table III.C.5. Table fromat changes. MS to clarify why the total number of fish sampled in III.C.6 is less to the III.C.5 one. Only species mentioned in III.C.5 are	Mostly	Yes
			III.C.3 mentions concurrent sampling at sea and no discard sampling on table III.C.5. Table fromat changes. MS to clarify why the total number of fish sampled in III.C.6 is less to the III.C.5 one.	Mostly	Yes
			III.C.3 mentions concurrent sampling at sea and no discard sampling on table III.C.5. Table fromat changes. MS to clarify why the total number of fish sampled in III.C.6 is less to the III.C.5 one. Only species mentioned in IIII.C.5 are provided by metier in III.C.6. However	Mostly	Yes
			III.C.3 mentions concurrent sampling at sea and no discard sampling on table III.C.5. Table fromat changes. MS to clarify why the total number of fish sampled in III.C.6 is less to the III.C.5 one. Only species mentioned in III.C.5 are provided by metier in III.C.6. However MS carried out in 2012 concurrent	Mostly	Yes
			III.C.3 mentions concurrent sampling at sea and no discard sampling on table III.C.5. Table fromat changes. MS to clarify why the total number of fish sampled in III.C.6 is less to the III.C.5 one. Only species mentioned in IIII.C.5 are provided by metier in III.C.6. However MS carried out in 2012 concurrent sampling at sea. MS to clarify how concurrent sampling is applied.		
			III.C.3 mentions concurrent sampling at sea and no discard sampling on table III.C.5. Table fromat changes. MS to clarify why the total number of fish sampled in III.C.6 is less to the III.C.5 one. Only species mentioned in III.C.6. However MS carried out in 2012 concurrent sampling at sea. MS to clarify how		
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	III.C.3 mentions concurrent sampling at sea and no discard sampling on table III.C.5. Table fromat changes. MS to clarify why the total number of fish sampled in III.C.6 is less to the III.C.5 one. Only species mentioned in III.C.5 are provided by metier in III.C.6. However MS carried out in 2012 concurrent sampling at sea. MS to clarify how concurrent sampling is applied. MS to clarify why targets planned in	Mostly	Yes
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	III.C.3 mentions concurrent sampling at sea and no discard sampling on table III.C.5. Table fromat changes. MS to clarify why the total number of fish sampled in III.C.6 is less to the III.C.5 one. Only species mentioned in III.C.5 are provided by metier in III.C.6. However MS carried out in 2012 concurrent sampling at sea. MS to clarify how concurrent sampling is applied. MS to clarify why targets planned in NP appear unreallistic compared to		

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

СЗ Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? **REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - RFMO NAFO**

Biological metier related variables

Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?
Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified? C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Baltic Sea

Recreational fisheries

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal D2

Were data quality targets provided Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Cvsprovided only for unsorted			
catches.	Yes	Yes	
	Partly	No	
MS to explain deviations.	No	Yes	
	NA	No	
	NA	No	
	Yes	No	
	Yes	No	
	Yes	No	
	Yes	No	
	Voc	No	

	yes	No
Table format changes. Information on sampling scheme incomplete. Wrong year mentionned. Inconsistencies between Total No. of trips during the Sampling year and Achieved number of trips in tables III.C.3 and III.C.4.	Mostly	Yes
Table format changes.	Mostly	No
Table format changes. Discards achieved length sampling only for Sebastes spp. and Reinhardtius hippoglossoides.	Mostly	Yes
Table fromat changes. MS to verify total number of Sebastes spp. sampled in 3L and 3LMNO. Only species mentioned in III.C.5 are provided by metier in III.C.6. However MS carried out in 2012 concurrent sampling at sea. MS to clarify how concurrent sampling is applied.	Mostly	Yes
No deviations in terms of numbers of trips sampled. Concerning length composition, undersampling for Pandalus and Sebastes, halibut oversampled. MS to clarify why only few cods sampled.	Mostly	Yes
Comments are not really explaining why observers on board cannot take samples for measurements.	Partly	Yes
See comment above.	Partly	Yes
No Precision (CV) provided for achievements on discards.	Partly	Yes

Yes

NA

NA

Yes

Partly

MS to complete the lake of

No recommendations arising from 8th

LM. Only RCM NA 2008 mentioned

MS to clarify actions regarding

sampling intensity and not only

information

Nο

Nο

Νo

No

Yes

	yes	No
Appendix IV of the EU Decision 93/2010 reports also sharks as target group for Recreational Fishery. MS should report the approved derogation or demonstrate (i.e. through appropriate references or eventually carrying out a pilot study) that Sharks are not target species for recreational fishermen.	Mostly	Yes
recreational iisheriien.	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes NA NA	No No No
	NA NA	No
_	NA	No

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

REGION BALTIC SEA

Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?
Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? **REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - RFMO NAFO**

Biological stock-related variables Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?
Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal E2

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations E3

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Most recommendations arise from working groups. Only 1		
recommendation arising from RCM		
Baltic 2007.	No	Yes
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
V	lv	Ixi-

Yes	Yes	No
Table is complete, but contains also a data from other than DCF sources	Yes	No
Cannot evaluate due to additional data given in a table. Lack of fecundity variables planned in III.E.2 table	Mostly	MS to explain lack of fecundity variables planned in III.E.2 table
Yes except for fecundity. Data provided in AR are collected through several projects. Oversampling has no effects on DCF costs justified by MS. Undersampling due to low landings and decreasing budget for buying samples (eel, salmon).	Mostly	MS to explain lack of fecundity variables planned in III.E.2 table
Yes	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
Target is not reached even for pelagic species sampled in large amounts	No	No
MS stated that CVs can only be achieved at regional level,as too small samples at national level are obtained	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
One derogations listed in section 1.	Yes	No
Only some older recommendation provided, but there are no relevant ones to stock variables in Baltic	Yes	No
NA	NA	No
NA	NA	No
Better planning in NP and increase of budget for buying more samples.	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No

yes	yes	no
Yes	Yes	No
Only one stock sampling was planned in NP. MS reported additional sampling of cod, redfish and greenland halibut. Need to clarify	Partly	Need to clarify additional sampling
Low catch level, small number of trips	Yes	No
MS sampled all planned at-sea trips, but did not collect target numbers of sampled. Only 12 thous. shrimps collected during 3 long distance fishery trips. EWG is confused about number available fish/crustaceans for sampling during long fishing trips with observers onboard	Partly	MS shall clarify small numbers of samples taken during long observer trips

No reason given	No	Yes, MS to provide	
140 reason given	140	explanations	
NA	NA	NA	
No derogations listed	NA	No	
Some recommendations are missing.	No	MS shall list recommendation related to year of sampoling	
NA	NA	No	
NA	NA	No	
Better training of observers	Yes	No	
MS should improve rather sampling desing to avoid undersampling	Mostly	No	

Target precision is never reached

Yes

footnote c) shold be followed; NR		
assumed to be "Not Relevant" but		
could be interpretated as "Not		
reliable":).	Mostly	No

	F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls		•	•
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
- 2	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
F2	Effort F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Transference recent and acriaicin normal proposal			
		No effort data (except Number of		
		nets/length and Number of pots,		
		traps) for vessels < 10m eventhough it		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the ND proposal?	is stated in the text that all vessels are	Month	Vac
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	keeping logbooks.	Mostly Yes	Yes No
	Are the deviations explained:	Data for vessels < 10m are not	165	NO
		digitalized. No accepted derogation		
	Are the deviations justified?	listed)	No	Yes
	F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		Yes	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
	F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls		•	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
F^	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
F3	Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			<u> </u>
	Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	<u></u>	Yes	No
	F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		I	
		None of the two STECF		
		recommendations listed are relevant		
		in this section as it is assumed that		
		the recommendations are about		
		biological information in the landings		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	and not the landing amounts.	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
	F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
			Yes	
				No
Rese	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Mostly	No
Rese	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea	Nm to be reported in the table for the		No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Acoustic survey, in line with the	Mostly	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Mostly Mostly	table to be updated
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Acoustic survey, in line with the	Mostly Mostly Yes	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	Acoustic survey, in line with the	Mostly Mostly Yes NA	table to be updated
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Acoustic survey, in line with the	Mostly Mostly Yes	table to be updated
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text.	Mostly Yes NA NA	table to be updated
G1	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text.	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes	table to be updated No No
G1	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text.	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes	table to be updated No No No
G1	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text.	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes	table to be updated No No No No No
G1 G2	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text.	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes	table to be updated No No No
G1	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text.	Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	table to be updated No No No No No
G1 G2	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text.	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes	table to be updated No No No No No
G1 G2	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text.	Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	table to be updated No No No No No
G2 G3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text.	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA	table to be updated No No No No No
G2 G3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text.	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA	table to be updated No No No No No
G1 G2 G3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text.	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA	table to be updated No No No No No
G1 G2 G3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text.	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA	table to be updated No No No No No
G1 G2 G3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text.	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	table to be updated No No No No No
G1 G2 G3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text.	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA	table to be updated No No No No No
G1 G2 G3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text.	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	No No No No No No No
G1 G2 G3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text. In the information put in text. In the information put in text. In the information put in text.	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	No N
G1 G2 G3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text. Inge in Inge in Inge in Inge in Indicators and information have been provided	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should submit table or justify why provided. MS should submit table of was not provided. MS should submit table of was not provided.
G1 G2 G3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text. Inge in Inge in No indicators and information have been provided No indicators and information have	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should submit table or justify why the information
G1 G2 G3 G4 Uule (Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text. Inge in Inge in Inge in Inge in Indicators and information have been provided	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should submit table or justify why provided. MS should submit table of was not provided. MS should submit table of was not provided.
G1 G2 G3 G4 dule (Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text. Inge in Inge in No indicators and information have been provided No indicators and information have	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should submit table or justify why the information was not provided.
G1 G2 G3 G4 dule (Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text. Inge in Inge in No indicators and information have been provided No indicators and information have	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should submit table or justify why the information was not provided.
G1 G2 G3 G4 Uule (Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text. Inge in Inge in No indicators and information have been provided No indicators and information have	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should submit table or justify why the information was not provided. In o no no no
G1 G2 G3 G4 dule (Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text. Inge in Inge in No indicators and information have been provided No indicators and information have	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should submit table or justify why the information was not provided.
G1 G2 G3 G4 dule (Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text. Inge in Inge in No indicators and information have been provided No indicators and information have been provided	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should submit table of justify why the information was not provided.
G1 G2 G3	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text. Inge in Inge in No indicators and information have been provided No indicators and information have	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should submit table or justify why the information was not provided. In o no no no
G1 G2 G3 G4 dule (Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text. g industry No indicators and information have been provided No indicators and information have been provided Indicators are not reported in the table	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should submit table or justify why the information was not provided. Ino Ino Ino Ino Ino Ino Ino Ino Ino In
G1 G2 G3 G4 Lule (Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text. g industry No indicators and information have been provided No indicators and information have been provided Indicators are not reported in the table	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should submit table or justify why the information was not provided. MS no provided. MS should submit table or justify why the information was not provided. MS no provided. MS no provided.
G1 G2 G3 G4 Lule (Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text. g industry No indicators and information have been provided No indicators and information have been provided Indicators are not reported in the table	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should submit table on justify why the information was not provided. MS no provided. MS should submit table on justify why the information was not provided. MS should submit table on justify why the information was not provided. MS needs to provide deviations from NP MS needs to explain deviations from NP MS needs to explain
G1 G2 G3 G4 Lule (Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no char gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations instified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing lection of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	Acoustic survey, in line with the information put in text. g industry No indicators and information have been provided No indicators and information have been provided Indicators are not reported in the table	Mostly Mostly Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should submit table on justify why the information was not provided. Ino Ino Ino Ino Ino Ino Ino Ino Ino In

IV

	NA	
	NA	
No information have been provided	No	MS should indicate sho
No information have been provided	INO	MS should indicate sho
No information have been provided	No	yes (see comments)
	1	MS should submit table
No data quality and accuracy figures		justify why the informat
provided, even if stated in AR-text.	No	was not provided.
,		MS should submit table
		justify why the informat
No information have been provided	No	was not provided.
	Yes	no
	Yes	no
	Yes	no
	1	
No information has been provided	No	MS should clarify data
140 Illioimation has been provided	INO	MS should clarify data MS need to explain dev
	No	from NP
		MS need to justify devi
	No	from NP
	Thia	
	NA NA	
	NA	
	1	•
		MS should describe ac
	No	avoid shortfals MS should describe ac
	No	avoid shortfals
	Partly	avoid siloitiais
	,	
Content in table is not consistent		
between AR and NP. (North Atlantic is missing in NP).		Update in order to be consistent
missing in NF).	Partly	to be consistent
	NA	
	NA	
	NA NA	
	NA NA	
	NA	
See general comment on data	NA NA	
See general comment on data transmission from SG 3	NA NA	No
	NA NA Mostly	
	NA NA Mostly Yes	No
	NA NA Mostly	
	NA NA Mostly Yes	No No
	NA NA Mostly Yes	No No Information to be
	NA NA Mostly Yes	No No Information to be
	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc
	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines.
	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines.
	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines.
	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes Ves No Yes NA NA	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines.
transmission from SG 3	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA NA Yes	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines.
transmission from SG 3	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA NA NA Partty	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines. no No
transmission from SG 3 Header and reference for some recommendations are missing.	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA NA NA	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines.
transmission from SG 3 Header and reference for some recommendations are missing. Explanation of "action taken", to be	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA NA NA Partty	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines. no No
Header and reference for some recommendations are missing. Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA NA NA Partty	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines. no No
transmission from SG 3 Header and reference for some recommendations are missing. Explanation of "action taken", to be	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA NA NA Partty	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines. no No
Header and reference for some recommendations are missing. Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA NA Partly Mostly	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines. no No Table to be updated
Header and reference for some recommendations are missing. Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table Explanation of "action taken", to be	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA NA Partly Mostly	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines. no No Table to be updated
Header and reference for some recommendations are missing. Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA NA Partly Mostly	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines. no No Table to be updated
Header and reference for some recommendations are missing. Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes NO Yes NA NA NA Partly Mostly Partly	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines. no No Table to be updated Table to be updated
Header and reference for some recommendations are missing. Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA NA Partly Mostly	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines. no No Table to be updated
Header and reference for some recommendations are missing. Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes NO Yes NA NA NA Partly Mostly Partly	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines. no No Table to be updated Table to be updated
Header and reference for some recommendations are missing. Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table The list is not complete	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA NA Partly Mostly Mostly	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines. no No Table to be updated Table to be updated
Header and reference for some recommendations are missing. Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA NA Partly Mostly Mostly	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines. no No Table to be updated Table to be updated
Header and reference for some recommendations are missing. Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table The list is not complete	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA Partly Mostly Partly Mostly	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines. no No Table to be updated Table to be updated Table to be updated To be updated
Header and reference for some recommendations are missing. Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table The list is not complete	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA NA Partly Mostly Mostly	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines. no No Table to be updated Table to be updated
Header and reference for some recommendations are missing. Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table The list is not complete	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA Partly Mostly Partly Mostly	No No Information to be added in chapter II accuto the guidelines. no No Table to be updated Table to be updated Table to be updated To be updated
Header and reference for some recommendations are missing. Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table The list is not complete	NA NA Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA Partly Mostly Partly Mostly	No No Information to be added in chapter II acc to the guidelines. no No Table to be updated Table to be updated Table to be updated To be updated

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Collection of data concerning the processing industry

Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal **B1**

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

вз Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

В4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Module for management and use of the data

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the proposal?

Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?

Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations

Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?

X. References

Is there a complete list of references?

XI. Annexes

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to supstatements made in the main text?

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

ESTONIA

STECF & DG MARE - Comments				EWG comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		
C/DG MARE	Fishing effort		- In catch and landings by rectangle data, the mesh sizes for fleet smaller than 12 meters are	PS-1: no evident explanation for failure;	MS to clarify the missing DCF data
			inconsistent with the data call.	missing effort data for <12 indicated in AR (not a justification or approved derogation)	
			- Discards submitted only for flounder.	PS-2: In Baltic region, MS performed biological sampling (metiers variables) only on unsorted	
			- No effort data for fleets under 12 meters in length.	catches. So no discards data are collected.	
/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including:	- Only partial effort data reported for all years	no evident explanation for failure;	MS to clarify the missing DCF data
		. Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure	- Fleet segment clustering information not submitted		
		(costs), capital & investment	- Landings value data lower than Eurostat statistics		
		Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings			
		Recreational catches: catches			
S	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast		Discards Age	According to MS AR 2012, Estonian industrial trawlers were only operating in NAFO areas.	
	Arctic)		Discards Length		
			Discards Weight		
			Discards Maturity		
S	Haddock in Subareas I and II		Discards Age	According to MS AR 2012, Estonian industrial trawlers were only operating in NAFO areas.	
	(Northeast Arctic)		Discards Length		
			Discards Weight		
			Discards Maturity		
;	Flounder in Subdivisions 22 to 32		Discards Age	In Baltic region, MS performed biological sampling (metiers variables) only on unsorted catches.	
			Discards Length	Data to update biological parameters (stocks variables) have been collected at that scale.	
			Discards Weight		
			Discards Maturity		
			Discards Sex Ratio		
S	Herring in Subdivisions 25 to 29 and 32 minus Gulf of Riga		Commercial Fleets		MS to clarify the missing DCF data
S	Herring in the Gulf of Riga		Landings Maturity	In its AR 2012, MS mentionned that data for updating maturity were collected. 9239 fish have	MS to clarify the missing DCF data
				been sampled for fishing ground IIIbd (SA29-32). No detail by SA were provided.	,
5	Black scabbardfish (Aphanopus		Landings Weight	According to MS AR 2012, no national vessels were fishing in these areas.	
	carbo) in in Subareas VI, VII, and		Discards Length		
	Divisions Vb. XIIb		Discards Weight		

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

Member State:		ber State:	Finland	7	Judgement levels		
				Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
				Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	31.5.2013	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
					EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
				Overall compliance	XXX	Yes	>90%
	Gen	eral fi	ramework			NA	not applicable
						I	I=
				on organisation ondent and participating institutes	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed? (Yes/No)
			оооор	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles			7.64.617.116.646.41. (1.66,116)
				well described? Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination		Yes	No
				meetings?		Yes	No
				Are derogations listed?		Yes	No
	ь	Dogie	anal and Inta	If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?		Yes	No
		B1		e of international meetings			
				Is Table II.B.1 complete?		Yes	No MO to single and leasting and
				Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?		Mostly	MS to give explanation on n attendance WKADS2
		B2	Follow-up	of regional and international recommendations			•
				Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed? Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
				c Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic		1.55	
ı				ion of the fishing sector on of the fishing sector			
	A	Gene	erai descripti	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP			
				implementation well described?		Yes	No
	P	Foor	omic veriet	Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?		Yes	No
	В	∟con	omic variabl	ls Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
					table about the control of		
					table should not contain all segments, just the ones subject to clustering;		
					clustered segment names should be		
				Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	marked with asterisk	Mostly	MS should follow guidlines
					Gross value of landings not listed (but		MS is required to clarify the
					apparently collected and correctly		absence of missing variable
					delivered for data call). Achieved		and achieved sample rates
		D4	A alai a va sa a	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	sample rates are missing	Mostly	and to resubmit it.
		B1	Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			In the future MS is advised
					Assumptions made for estimation of		report information in correct
					capital value and capital costs are not		section and to follow the
				Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	reported in specific section as it is required in guidlines.	Mostly	requirements listed in quidlines
				Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	g
		B2	Data avalit	Are the deviations justified? y: Results and deviation from NP proposal	NA	NA	
		B2	Data quality	Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
				Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
		D2	Fallaw va a	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
		В3	rollow-up c	of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no relevant recommendations	Yes	No
				Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	
		В4	A ationa to a	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	
		B4	ACTIONS TO 8	avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	NA	
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	
			BALTIC SEA	related variables			
	C	БЮЮ	gicai mener	Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?		NA	
		C1	Achieveme	ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
				Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Only reporting on 2012 results were to be provided.	Mostly	MS to update table.
				Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	See comment above	Mostly	MS to update table.
					Only reporting on 2012 results were		
				Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	to be provided. Some CV provide in %.	Mostly	MS to update table.
					76.	Wostly	ino to apaate table.
							MS to update table and clari
				Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Only reporting on 2012 results were to		if concurrent sampling at sea is really applied for all specie
						Mostly	caught.
					FYK_SPF which was undersampled.		
				Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	One stock undersampled.	Mostly	No
				Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
		•-	_	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
		C2	Data qualit	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	<u></u>	Yes	No
				Were CV targets met?		Yes	No
				Are the deviations explained?		NA	
		СЗ	Follow-up	Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations		NA	
		-55	i onow-up	Were the relevant derogations listed?		NA	
				Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?	L	i 69	טויון
		C4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls			
		C4	Actions to	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No

Region Baltic Sea

Recreational fisheries

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations D3

> Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

REGION BALTIC SEA

Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?
Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal E2

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

F1 Canacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Effort

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Landings

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

	NA	
		1110
		MS should report the
		approved derogation or
		demonstrate (i.e. through
		appropriate references or
		eventually carrying out a pilot
Appendix IV of the EU Decision		study) that Sharks are not
93/2010 reports also sharks as target		target species for recreational
group for Recreational Fishery.	Mostly	fishermen.
	NA	
	NA	
	NA	
	T	T
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	
	NA	
	NA	
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	1.55	Į i i o
	NA	
	NA	
	1	
MS operates in only one region	Yes	No
7		
According to the guideline and		
According to the guideline only relevant year of sampling can be		
presented, MS shall take this into		
consideration submitting further AR's	Yes	No
Only some variables of salmon and		
sea trout undersampled	Mostly	No
Deviations coused by the human		
mistake.	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
For around 50% of parameters		
updated. Achievement rates OK for all		
ALKs, less good for other parameters.		
ALKS, less good for other parameters.	Mostly	No
Priority is given to the most important		
parameters for stock assessment		
issues. Data collection for sex-ratio		
and maturity would be too expensive		
if ttarget precision must be reached.		
0 1	Yes	No
	Yes	No
One deregations listed in section 4		
One derogations listed in section 1.	Yes	No
MC listed all relevant recovered to		
MS listed all relevant recomendations	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Improvement of the self-sampling		
programme for salmon in SD32.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	·	
	T	E.
· ·	Yes	No
	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	To a	1
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
·	Yes	No
	To a	1
-	Yes	No
	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	T	-
·	Yes	No
	Yes	No
·	Yes	No
	·	
	•	
	Yes Yes	No No

Yes

Yes

Nο

No

		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
		F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?			No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?			No No
		F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		res	NO
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
		F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described 3		Voo	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
G	Resea	arch surveys at sea		163	140
	G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Number of hauls planned and conducted is not consistent		
			between text and tables. Deviation in		
			the BIAS survey in SD30,		
			regaring number of days.		
			2. Put the planned no days from NP in		
			this table (No= 6 instead of 4,5) and		
		to Table III O A consolete and constituted with AD with the co	the % achivement will change	Manatha	Table to be updated
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	accordingly. see above	Mostly Mostly	by MS Table to be updated
		Are the deviations explained?	See above	Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
		•	MAPs are reported in annex II of the		
			AR. For next year, Maps should be		
			put		
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	in text according to the AR	Moothy	No
	G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	guidelines.	Mostly	NO
	J2	Zata quanty. Noodho dha donadhii iidii iidi proposal			
			There is no information on data		
			quality. Since there is half the effort in		
			BIAS sd30 compared to the plan,		
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in	there might be an effect of the data		T 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
		gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained?	quality and for the stock assessment.	Yes	To be clarified by MS No
		Are the deviations explained: Are the deviations justified?			No
	G3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		163	140
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		V	Na
					No
	64	Are the responsive actions acceptable?			No
	G4		No text inserted. It's expected		
	G4	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No text inserted. It's expected to be a text on future actions to avoid		
	G4	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No text inserted. It's expected to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS		
	G4	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	to be a text on future actions to avoid	Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes	MS to insert a text
Mod	dule of	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industrials.	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes	MS to insert a text
Mod	dule of	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? If the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industration of data concerning the aquaculture	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA	MS to insert a text
Mod	dule of	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industrials.	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	No NA Yes	MS to insert a text to describe future actions
Mod	dule of	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? If the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industation of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	No NA Yes Yes	MS to insert a text to describe future actions
Mod A	dule of	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? If the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industrion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to insert a text to describe future actions No No No
Mod A	dule of Collec	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? If the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industation of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to insert a text to describe future actions No No No
Mod A	dule of Collec	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? If the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industrion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Mod A	dule of Collec	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? If the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industation of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to insert a text to describe future actions No No No
Mod A	dule of Collec	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? If the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industation of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Mod A	dule of Collec	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes	No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Mod A	dule of Collect	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? If the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industrian of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations gustified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes	MS to insert a text to describe future actions No N
Mod A	dule of Collec	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? If the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industrion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations form NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Mod A	dule of Collect	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes	No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Mod A	dule of Collect	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? If the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industrion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations form NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Moo A	dule of Collect	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? If the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industrian of the according the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes	No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Moo A	dule of Collect A1 A2	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes	No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Mod A	A1 A2 A3	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industriant of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations instified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes	MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Mod A	A1 A2 A3	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? If the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industriant of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industriant of the according the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes A NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes Yes	MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Mod A	A1 A2 A3	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industriant of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations instified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	MS to insert a text to describe future actions NO
Mod A	A1 A2 A3	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Stion of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes A NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes Yes	MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Mod A	A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes	MS to insert a text to describe future actions NO
Mod A	A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Action of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Active design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes	No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Moo A	A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industrion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? action of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes	MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Moo A	A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industriant of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industriant of the according the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations ipustified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Action of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation spulatified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes	No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Moo A	A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? If the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industriation of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Action of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal Are deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Moo A	A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Action of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes	No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Moo A	A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? If the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industriation of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Action of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal Are deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes	MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Moo A	A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect B1	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Action of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation suptified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pustified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes	No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Moo A	A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect B1	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Action of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Moo A	A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect B1 B2	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industrion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Action of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviation sexplained? Are the deviations pustified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? Pota quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? Pota quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the responsive actions described?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes Yes <t< th=""><th>No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No No</th></t<>	No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Moo A	A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect B1	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It he evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Action of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Moo A	A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect B1 B2	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Actions of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations pustified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with he NP proposal? Are the deviations pustified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes	No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No
Moo A	A1 A2 A3 A4 Collect B1 B2 B3	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It he evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industion of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Action of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls	to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	Yes No NA Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes	No MS to insert a text to describe future actions No

		·		
		MS should update the table with the		
		indicators from 1 to 4 (following the		
		last version of the AR Guidelines		
		2013). Moreover MS should keep the		
		standard format of presentation for all		
		indicators (e.g. don't split in several		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	rows indicator n. 8)	Mostly	Update of table
	Are the relevant derogations listed?		NA	
2 Actions to avoi	id shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	
Module for manage	ement and use of the data			
	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	See general comment	Yes	No
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP	9		-
	proposal?		Yes	No
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?		Yes	No
			. 65	
	Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?	in section II	NA	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	iii dediloii ii	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained: Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
2 Actions to avoi			res	INO
Z ACIIONS IO AVOI	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	section empty	INA	T
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	section empty	NA	
Fallani um af CTFC			INA	
rollow-up of STEC	CF recommendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?		Iv	Int-
			Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
List of acronyms a			T	T
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?		Yes	No
IX. Comments, sug	ggestions and reflections			
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?		No	No
X. References				
	Is there a complete list of references?		Yes	No
XI. Annexes				
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support			
	statements made in the main text?			

۷I

VII

VIII IX X XI

		STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment	
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		Action needed by MS, please specify task
JRC/DG MARE	Fishing effort		Data submitted in an inconsistent with the definitions of the data call format together with a hin towards the data confidentiality clause in the DCF. -No mesh size information for any gear, over 10 m vessel length, category used not defined in the data call. -Missing quarter information for all >10 meter vessels. -Aggregated data for areas 24,25,267,27 & into area 24-28. -Invalid gear codes "PASSIVE" and "MoBILE". -No rectangle information for effort (thence no effective fishing time available). -No landings by rectangle data for 2003-2007. -No sindings the prectangle data for 2003-2007. -No sindings the information for effort (thence no effective fishing time available).		
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: • Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (cost), capital & investment • Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings • Recreational catches: catches	- Fleet segment level capacity data for 2012 not provided.	delivery of 2012 data not mandatory	MS to provide missing data available through the DCF
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: Including: Income, *Personal costs, *Energy costs, *Raw materia costs, *Other operational costs, *Capital costs, *Extraordinary costs, *Capital value, *Net investments, *Pebt, *Raw material volume, *Total volume, *Employment, *Rumber of enterprises*	- The only variable not disaggregated at segment level was Net investment for 2008.	MS should be asked for that. Maybe some problems during transition from DCR to DCF? MS is asked to clarify this issue with disaggregated data for investment in 2008	MS to provide missing data available through the DCF
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Obsards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	According to AR 2012, Finish vessels were fishing only in the BALTIC region.	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock in Subtreas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of above cited countries are not fishing in the area. ICES has provided to the last TEEF meeting (13-05) "master stock table" indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	According to AR 2012, Finish vessels were fishing only in the BALTIC region.	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock in Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of above cited countries are not fishing in the area. (ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13-65) "master stock table" indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.
ICES	Herring in Division IIIa and Subdivisions 22–24 (Western Baltic Spring spawners)		Surveys at Sea		
ICES	Salmon in the Main Basin and Gulf of Bothnia (Salmon in Subdivisions 22–31)		Landings Maturity	MS did not planned to collect data for maturity updating in 2012. In a footnote provided in NP table III.E.7, MS wrote "Coastal saimon fisher trargets on spawning migrants, making maturity determination purposeless. Catch from the off-shore shery landed to other MS', excluding the requirement for maturity sampling from the Finnish NP".	Not applicable Maturity of salmon from Main Basin and Gulf of Bothnia Salmon in Subdivisions 22–31) is requested from some counties. Maturity data would be relevant for assessment, however there is no method available at the moment, which could be used to discriminate between salmon that will mature later in autumn and salmon that will stay on the Feeding grounds for at least on more year. This is why the ICES WGBAST did not use maturity data for assessments and Baltic countries are not providing such a dato. Only relevant maturity information could be obtained from salmon actively migrating or spawning in rivers.
ICES ICES	Herring in Subdivision 31, Bothnian Bay Herring in Subdivisions 25 to 29 and		Surveys at Sea Commercial Fleets		
	32 minus Gulf of Riga				

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

	ber State:	France Reference year	2012	Judgem Compliance class	ent levels Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	Version 1 (6 juin 2013)	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
		Overall compliance	XXX	Yes	>90%
eneral fr	amework			NA	not applicable
ational d	lata collectio	on organisation	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		ondent and participating institutes		- Judgement	Action needed?
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles we described?		Yes	No
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination		Yes	No
		meetings? Are derogations listed?		Yes	No
		If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?	Type of data, Region and justiftification is missing	Mostly	MS to add type of data, regi- and justification
		ernational coordination	justification is missing		and justinoution
B1	Attendanc	e of international meetings Is Table II.B.1 complete?		Yes	
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Answer too generic	Mostly	MS to specify reasons for n attending meetings
B2	Follow-up	of regional and international recommendations			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed? Are the responsive actions described?		Yes Yes	No No
IDD 4 DI	FOIGH D.W	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
		ic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic			
Gene	ral descripti	ion of the fishing sector Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP		T	MS to describe changes in
		implementation well described?	Lack on description of changes	Mostly	fishing sector
Fcon	omic variab	Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?		Yes	No
	Onnic variab				
			fleet register: 7222 vessels, IIIB1: 6004 vessels: no inactive vessels		MS to resubmit table IIIB1. I to clarify the differences
			listed (in contrast to NP), both to be		between the fleet register a
			clarified; clustered segments should be displayed as clusters and marked	Maria de la companya della companya	the target population number in the table IIIB1; cluster
			with asterisk; column M should be	Mostly	segment should be marked
			formatted as percentage (minor). For the some segments Planned		with asterisk; Planned samp numbers and planned samp
			sample no and Planned		rate should be provided for
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	sample rate not provided		segments
			AR contains many more clustered		MS to provide the number of
			segments than NP, but it is consistent and in line with guidelines/93/2010;	Mostly	vessels by segment and the sum in the cluster
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
			NP year and AR year should be filled in; all response rates missing; variable		MS to resubmit table IIIB3.
			group not always in line with 93/2010;		to provide economic variab
			many lines missing (102 segments in IIIB1, 10 different variables used, but	Partly	from Appendix VI for all segments; NP and AR year
			only 580 lines provided); gross value		should be filled in; MS to fill
			of landings missing (and not provided for data call)		response rate
B1	Achieveme	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal	,		
			Assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs are not		MS to provide a methodolog
			provided; capital costs not	Partly	for Capital Value estimation
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	determined.	Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
B2	Data quality	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal	The lack of information about the		MS to clarify how to
			procedure that country to apply to	Mostly	guarantee the data quality for
		Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	check the data for 2011	NA	2011
В3	Faller	Are the deviations justified?		NA	
ь	rollow-up o	of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	
B4	Actions to a	avoid shortfalls		INA	I.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
		· ·		1.00	110
		iterranean Sea and Black Sea tion of the fishing sector			
		ion of the fishing sector		Г	MC to docaribe at a const
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Lack on description of changes	Mostly	MS to describe changes in fishing sector
Econ	omic variab	Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?		Yes	No
LCOIN	Offic Variab	103			
			fleet register: 7222 vessels, IIIB1:		MS to resubmit table IIIB1.
			6004 vessels; no inactive vessels listed (in contrast to NP), both to be		to clarify the differences between the fleet register a
			clarified; clustered segments should		the target population number
			be displayed as clusters and marked with asterisk; column M should be	Mostly	in the table IIIB1; cluster segment should be marked
			formatted as percentage (minor). For the some segments Planned		with asterisk; Planned samp numbers and planned samp
			sample no and Planned		rate should be provided for
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	sample rate not provided		segments
		13 (435) III.5.1 complete and consistent with MN guidelines?	AR contains many more clustered		MS to provide the number of
			segments than NP, but it is consistent	Mostly	vessels by segment and the
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	and in line with guidelines/93/2010;		sum in the cluster
			NP year and AR year should be filled	. <u> </u>	
			in; all response rates missing; variable group not always in line with 93/2010;		MS to resubmit table IIIB3. I to provide economic variable
					from Appendix VI for all
			many lines missing (102 segments in	Partly	
			IIIB1, 10 different variables used, but	Partly	segments; NP and AR year
				Partly	

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

SUPRA-REGION Other regions

Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector

A General description of the fishing sector

Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?

Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?

B Economic variables

Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?
Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

84 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Sea & Eastern Arctic
C Biological metier related variables

Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?
C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs are not provided; capital costs not determined,	Partly	MS should to provide a methodology for Capital Value estimation
	Yes	
	Yes	
The lack of information about the procedure that country to apply to check the data for 2011.	Mostly	MS to clarify how to guarantee the data quality for 2011
	NA	
	NA	
	Yes	No
	NA	
	NA	
	Yes	No
	Vos	No

lack on description of changes	Mostly	MS to describe changes in fishing sector
	Yes	No No
fleet register: 7222 vessels, IIIB1: 6004 vessels; no inactive vessels listed (in contrast to NP), both to be clarified; clustered segments should be displayed as clusters and marked with asterisk; column M should be formatted as percentage (minor). For the some segments Planned sample no and Planned sample rate not provided	Mostly	MS to resubmit table IIIB1. Ms to clarify the differences between the fleet register and the target population number in the table IIIB1; cluster segment should be marked with asterisk; Planned sample numbers and planned sample rate should be provided for all segments
AR contains many more clustered segments than NP, but it is consistent and in line with guidelines/93/2010;	Mostly	MS to provide the number of vessels by segment and then sum in the cluster
NP year and AR year should be filled in; all response rates missing; variable group not always in line with 93/2010; many lines missing (102 segments in IIIB1, 10 different variables used, but only 580 lines provided); gross value of landings missing (and not provided for data call)	Partly	MS to resubmit table IIIB3. M to provide economic variables from Appendix VI for all segments; NP and AR year should be filled in; MS to fill in response rate
assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs are not provided; capital costs not determined.	Partly	MS to provide a methodology for Capital Value estimation
determined,	Yes	No
	Yes	No
The lack of information about the procedure that country to apply to check the data for 2011.	Mostly NA NA	MS to clarify how to guarantee the data quality for 2011
	INA	l l
	Yes NA NA	No
	Yes Yes	No No

	Yes	No
Sampling year is 2011. Is this an error? One metier OTT_CRU_16_32_0_0 is missing in AR. Inconsistency between AR and NP in the overall planned number (due to the missing metier). Small inconsistency (planned and achieved) between AR table and summary table in AR text. MS have not used updated tables. Sampling strategy missing for 3 metiers. Sampling schemes not given.	Mostly	MS to clarify whether sampling year 2011 is an error. MS to specify what 'stock specific autosampling' refers to. MS to amend according to comments.
Consistent with NP but the planned, achieved no., and total number of trips between III.C:3 and III.C.4 do not match. Some coloumns were hidden. 2011 and 2013 data are also reported in table.	Mostly	MS to update table accrodingly and to adhere to guidelines.
2011 and 2013 data are also reported in table. Revised standard tables were not used.		No
2011 and 2013 data are also reported in table. Metier definitions are not given at level 6.	Mostly	No
High percentage of under-sampling, with 3 metiers having no sampling at all.	Partly	No
	Yes	No
Is a human resource issue in a main port justified? MS have tried to compensate by increasing sea- sampling. Some metiers are however unsampled	Mostly	No

C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal
02	Were CV estimates provided?
	Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?
СЗ	Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
	Were the relevant derogations listed?
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?
C4	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?
	orth Atlantic
C Biolo	gical metier related variables Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
	,
	In Table III C 4 complete and consistent with AD midelines?
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal
	Were CV estimates provided?
	Were CV targets met?
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?
C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
	Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
	Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?
C4	Actions to avoid shortfalls
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?
	ed & Black Sea gical metier related variables
C Biolo	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
	is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with Art guidelines?
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal
	Were CV estimates provided?
	Were CV targets met?
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?
C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
	Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
	Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?
C4	Actions to avoid shortfalls
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?
	ther (IOTC, ICCAT and WECAF) gical metier related variables
C Bloid	gical metier related variables Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Yes	No
Partly	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
•	
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No

Sampling year is 2011. Is this an error? MS have not used updated tables. Sampling strategy missing for 8 metiers. Sampling schemes missing.	Mostly	MS to clarify whether sampling year 2011 is an error. MS to specify what 'stock specific autosampling' refers to. MS to amend according to comments.
Consistent with NP but the planned, achieved no., and total number of trips between III.C:3 and III.C.4 do not match. Some coloumns were hidden. 2011 and 2013 data are also reported in table.	Mostly	MS to update table accrodingly and to adhere to guidelines.
No 2012 NA data submitted	No	MS to submit 2012 NA data in table III.C.5
2011 and 2013 data are also reported in table. Some metier definitions are not given at level 6.	Mostly	MS to clarify how data is presented in III.C.6. but not in III.C.5
The overall performance is good as indicated in summary table i text. However 2/3 of sea-sampling frames undersampled. 1/3 of on shore sampled frames undersampled 1/5 of on shore sampled frames sampled in excess + no information in table III.C.5	Partly	No
	Partly	MS should give more detailed description by metier and stock to explain undersampling.
	Partly	No
No NA data presented in table III.C.5	No	MS to provide all missing CVs
No NA data presented in table III.C.6	No	No
	No	MS to provide explanations for deviations.
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Internal	Is .
	Mostly	No
	No	No

Samping year 2011, error? MS have not used updated tables (C.3-C.5). Sampling scheme absent. The achieved number of trips are given in broad ranges which is not correct	Mostly	MS to update table accordingly (see comments).
Samping year 2011, error? Total number of trips was not provided. Planned number of trips is inconsistent with table C.3. Achievements impossible to assess	Partly	MS to update table accordingly (see comments).
Revised standard tables were not used. 2011 and 2012 data is presented. Only a selection (10) of G1, G2 and G3 species	Partly	MS to update table accordingly (see comments).
No data for the Mediterranean region given	No	MS to provide data for the MED region.
	No	MS has to revise entire section and tables
	No	MS to provide explanation for deviations
	NA	No
CVs for only 10 species	Partly	MS to clarify and provide CVs
	No	No
	No	MS to provide explanation for deviations
	NA	No
	NA	No
	No	MS to provide list
	NA	MS to also provide responsiv actions
	NA	NA
		luo i i i
	No	MS to provide relevant actions to address all shortfalls
	NA	No

have not used updated tables. ICCAT-planned no of trips to sample have ow 91 to be clarified. MS to been changed between NP and AR. clarify and amend the table WECAF- inconsistency between NP and AR, sea-sampling has ccordingly. disappeared in AR Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Revised standard tables are not used Some planned no of trips to sample have been changed between NP and AR. WECAF- inconsistency between NP and AR, sea-sampling has MS to clarify and update table ccording to comments disappeared in AR. The region is not reported bnut the RFMO Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? 2011 and 2012 data is presented MS are missing from the table. Results MS to amend to tables are not presented for all the species i ccordingly the table. Only few stocks included from WECAF. CVs missing for nearly all stocks Is Table III C.5 complete and consistent with AR quidelines? 2011 and 2012 data is presented. MS MS to amend to tables artly have not used updated tables. No accordingly Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? stocks included from WECAF. MS to explain diferences artly Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? etween NP and AR. MS to provide explanation for other deviations not tackled in artly Are the deviations explained? text (see above) Are the deviations justified? Partly C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal
Were CV estimates provided? Except for one stock
For the one stock for which CV was MS to provide the CVs No No Were CV targets met?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified? C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
Were the relevant derogations listed? MS to provide list of 2011 LM No recommendations

MS to also provide respo Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? NΑ Are the responsive actions described ? actions Are the responsive actions acceptable? NA C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls MS to provide actions for the Information given only for CVs Partly Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? other shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? For CVs only. Recreational fisheries Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Yes No Are design and achievements consistent with the NP prop MS to show proof (pilot study report) of the study on sharks Yes Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal MS to provide data quality Were data quality targets provided? Partly argets for eel, BFT (Med) For BFT (Med) no quality targets are MS to provide data quality reported but a general overview of the achieved data and the statistical Were data quality targets met? Partly argets for eel, BFT (Med) MS to provide information on Are the deviations explained? Partly leviations for eel BET (Med) Partly D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Yes No Are the responsive actions described ' Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Yes Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Biological stock-related variables Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal MS to provide the table including the CV. In the table All CVs are missing Mostly MS should report only the AR ear (i.e. 2012 and not 2011) Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Most stocks are sampled in accordance with plan. Several variables for saithe and raja spp are /lostly not sampled at all. Age sampling of sea bass is included in E.2 but not in Are design and achievements consistent with the NP propos Are the deviations explained? May be individual weights of saithe can be obtained even if fish is gutted Are the deviations justified? E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal MS says that it will be done gradually but analysis of levels of precision for MS to provide CVs for all the biological variables should start stock parameters present in efore in order to have analysis ready he table for the submission of the AR Were CV estimates provided? MS to provide CVs for al stock parameters present in Were CV targets met? he table

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

and present all the results of

the previous year in time

MS to provide CV respecti

the deadline for the

submission of the AR

es/

2011 and 2012 data is presented. MS

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Atlanic

Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Med & Black Sea

E Biological stock-related variable.

Biological stock-related variables
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

•	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

Automatic procedure to calculate CVs will be ready in 2013. MS have not commented upon how to improve sampling on saithe	Moetly	MS to include actions to improve sampling of saithe
	Mostly	No

All CVs are missing. MS should used and report the correct naming convention for the Region (i.e. North Atlantic and not North East Atlantic and Western Channel)	Mostly	MS to provide the table complete with the CVs. MS to replace the name of the Region using the correct name. In the table MS should report only the AR year (i.e. 2012 and not 2011)
Comparing the Planned minimum No of individuals to be measured with the achieved ones, approximately 40% of stocks variables are not sampled at all	Mostly	No
Undersampling usually explained by that the biological variables are collected at surveys and that it is difficult to predict survey catches. Some sampling carried out on commercial catches were undersampled as well. Reasons for excess sampling not discussed	Mostly	MS to explain reasons for failing when sampling is carried out on commercial fish. Explain sampling in excess
	Mostly	See comment above
	No	MS to provide CVs for all stock parameters present in the table
	No	MS to provide CVs for all stock parameters present in the table

		submission of the AR.
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Regarding John Dory's age, MS followed the output of the WGNEW 2010	Yes	No

Yes

MS to respect the deadline and present the all the results of the previous year in time

MS ito provide CV respecting

Automatic procedure to calculate CVs will be ready in 2013. MS have not commented upon how to improve sampling for all the stock parameters missing	Partly	MS to include actions to avoid shortfalls for all the stock variables not analysed
·	Partly	See comment above

There are inconsistencies between AR and NP. Palinurus elephas and Nephrops norvegicus are missing in AR (for these two in Table III.E.2 are planned also sampling for some biological parameters such as weight and sex ratios). No biological sampling in GSA 08.	Partly	MS to provide the table complete with the CVs. MS to replace the name of the Region using the correct name. In the table MS should report only the AR year (i.e. 2012 and not 2011). There are inconsistencies between AR and NP: Palinurus elephas and Nephrops norvegicus are missing in the AR (the two species are present in Table III.E.2 and in the NP); MS to report on GSA 8 even if no sampling has been carried out (it is present in Table III.E.2 and in the NP)
One stock is sampled in accordance with plan, one in excess and the rest undersampled	Partly	No
MS claims that the hole programme runned like plan.	No	MS to explain under sampling and missing information for GSA 8
_	No	No
	<u> </u>	MS to provide CVs for all

·		MS to provide CVs for all
	No	stock parameters present in
		the table
		MS to provide CVs for all
	No	stock parameters present in
		the table
		MS to respect the deadline
	Yes	and present all the results of
		the previous year in time
		MS to provide CV respecting
	No	the deadline for the
		submission of the AR.
	NIA	NI=

Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Other (IOTC, ICCAT and WECAF)

Biological stock-related variables E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Inland waters

E Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal E1

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?
Were CV targets met?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

F Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Capacity
F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

	Mostly	for the relevant Recommendations See comment above
Automatic procedure to calculate CVs will be ready in 2013. MS have not commented upon how to improve sampling for all the stock parameters undersampled	Partly	MS to include actions to avoid shortfalls for all the stock variables undersampled and for the missing information for GSA 8
	Partly	See comment above
undersampled	Partly	

III tile text		table III.L.3
WECAF-no results included in AR, ICCAT- only few sharks sampled. Tunas undersampled in relation to plan, in particular skipjacks. IOTC-only few sharks sampled. Tunas undersampled in relation to plan, in particular skipjacks (0%) and bigeyes	Partly	No
MS sampling carried out at cannaries. Difficult to sample stocks that are not commonly used in the canning industry . No explanation for WECAF	Partly	MS to provide more explanation for undersampling in ICCAT and report on WECAF area.
Explanation are justified for IOTC	Partly	No
	No	MS to provide CVs for all stock parameters present in the table
	No	MS to provide CVs for all stock parameters present in the table
	Yes	MS to respect the deadline and present all the results of the previous year in time
	No	MS to provide CV respecting the deadline for the submission of the AR.
	NA	No
In the IOTC area research program get biological information on bigeye and skipjack. In the ICCAT area permanent technicians from IRD on place. For WECAF no actions are described. How to improve the sampling on sharks?	Mostly	MS should provide more information for WECAF area
ouriping or oriano.		

Region is present in the AR but not in NP tables	No	No. For future: MS to report this Region also in the table of the NP (it is already mentioned in the NP text)
Difficult to evaluate since not included in NP tables. Reading the AR text seems that regarding salmon there are not difficulty, for eels there are some major problems	Mostly	MS to better clarify the results and the deviations from the planned targets (if any)
	NA	See comment above
	NA	See comment above
		GGG GGHIIIIGH GGGVG
	No	MS to provide CV for the biological parameters mentioned in the table
No	No	See comment above
No	No	No
No	No	No
NA	NA	No
Yes for eels	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Missing variables have been indicated in NP (apparently accepted); achieved sample rates and response rates not provided in many cases for non-probability surveys (C). "CV (c)" has been indicated ad "Census" even with a "Achieved sample rate (c)" of 0.38.		MS to provide updated table.

Extensive description does not refer to NP and is contradictory if census with 100% response rate was applied, as indicated in table IIIF1;	Yes	No
Extensive text does not refer to clearly stated deviations. MS should be more concise.	No	MS to update text referring to specific deviations indicated in table IIIF1.
DO MIDIO GONDIGO.		in table iii 1.

	And the desirations instituted		No	No I
	Are the deviations justified? F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls		•	INO
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
F2	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Effort		Yes	No
	F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No sampling in Corsica. No CV calculated for 3 sampling schemes of type "C" for vessels <10m where the achieve sampling rate is e.g. 0.04. This is the case for Reunion Island, French Guyana, Martinique and Guadeloupe. "CV (o)" has been indicated ad "Census" even with the "Achieved sample rate (c)" of 0.38 in	Mostly	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	French Guyana.		
	Are the deviations explained?	Only in very general form	Partly	MS to explain each deviation separately.
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No derogations listed.	No	No
	F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	No CV calculated for 3 sampling schemes of type "C" for vessels <10m where the achieve sampling rate is e.g. 0.04. This is the case for Reunion Island, French Guyana, Martinique and Guadeloupe. "CV (c)" has been indicated ad "Census" even with the "Achieved sample rate (c)" of 0.38 in French Guyana.	Partly	MS to calculate missing CV.
	And the deviations contained?	No specific explanations given	No	MS to explaine each deviation specifically
	Are the deviations explained?	No justification. Depending of the		specifically
	Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	missing CV values justification should evaluated.	No	No
			no relevant recommendations	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
	F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
F3	Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No sampling in Corsica. No CV calculated for: Live weight of landings total and per species, Other areas, 10-15 M with the responce rate of only 0.14.		No
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No derogations listed.	Yes No	No No
	F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		•	
	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	All census	Yes Yes	No No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Γ	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
G Rese	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? earch surveys at sea		Yes	No
G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	For the future MS should report only the achieved number under the column "Achieved Target"	Yes	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Major problems are fully explained concerning the 83% of achievement in number of hauls during IBTS-Q4	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?		Yes Yes	No No
G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	-	NA NA	No No
G3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		•	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	No No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	No
G4	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
N/ Mar 1:-1	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	ofry	NA	No
	of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing indu ection of data concerning the aquaculture			
	Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	empty cells corresponding other	Yes	No
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	marine fish on growing segment	Yes	No
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	For "Sea bass & Sea bream: cages" and other segments CV is missing; Response rate more than 100% for the financial accounting data in the follow segments: trout combined, shellfish mussels bottom	Mostly	MS to provide CV and to clarify response rate if it is more than 100%
A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
A2	Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
		The information about quality is not	Mostly	MS to clarify how data quality
	Is respective data quality information given?	provided for 2011	Mostly	was guaranteed No
	Are the deviations explained?			
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Mostly	No
А3	Are the deviations explained?			
А3	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		Mostly	No

			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Not mention the objectives and the aims of the different working groups	Mostly	MS to clarify the actions to avoid shortfalls and the effect of the working group results
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
	В Со	ellection of data	concerning the processing industry		L.	
			Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	B1	Ashiovomo	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? hts: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
	ы	Achievemei	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	B2	Pata quality	r: Results and deviation from NP proposal		1	
			Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	B3	Follow-up o	f Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
			Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
	B4	Actions to a	void shortfalls		by	Is a
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
v	Modulo	of avaluation	of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		res	140
٧			sults and deviation from NP proposal			
				MS should report also information on	1	
				indicator 9 in the table and report the	Manada.	MC to conduct to blo
				different indicators separately for	Mostly	MS to update table
			Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	each Region		
			Are the relevant derogations listed?		NA	
	2 Act	tions to avoid sh		г	Trans.	1
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		NA NA	No No
VI	Modulo	for monogom	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data		INA	NO
VI			sults and deviation from NP proposal			
					Yes	No
			Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
			Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP			
					Yes	No
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP	Some of the diagrams and screen		
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP	shots cannot be read due to low	Yes	No
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is		
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP	shots cannot be read due to low	Yes Yes	No No
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes	No
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes Yes Yes	No No
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes Yes Yes	No No
	2 Act	tions to avoid st	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No No
	2 Act	tions to avoid sł	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? outfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ontfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No
VII			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? commendations	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes	No
VII			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ontfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? commendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes	No
VII			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? scommendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes	No N
	Follow-	up of STECF re	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Oritalis Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Commendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes	No
	Follow-		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? outfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? commendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes	No N
	Follow-	up of STECF re	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ** **commendations** Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Stephen succeptable? ** **abreviations** Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes	No N
	Follow-	up of STECF re	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? outfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? commendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes	No N
	Follow-	up of STECF re acronyms and nments, sugge	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? Stons and reflections Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes	No N
VIII IX X	Follow- List of a IX. Corr X. Refe	acronyms and nments, sugge	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? commendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes	No N
VIII IX X	Follow- List of a	acronyms and nments, sugge	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? outfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? commendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? stions and reflections Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections? Is there a complete list of references?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes	No N
VIII IX X	Follow- List of a IX. Corr X. Refe	acronyms and nments, sugge	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? stions and reflections Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections? Is there a complete list of references? Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes	No N
VIII IX X	Follow- List of a IX. Corr X. Refe	acronyms and nments, sugge	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? outfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? commendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? stions and reflections Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections? Is there a complete list of references?	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes	No N
VIII IX X	Follow- List of a IX. Corr X. Refe	acronyms and nments, sugge	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? stions and reflections Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections? Is there a complete list of references? Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes	No N
VIII IX X	Follow- List of a IX. Corr X. Refe	acronyms and nments, sugge	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? stions and reflections Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections? Is there a complete list of references? Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support	shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is	Yes	No N

A4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

FRANCE

	STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task	
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		
JRC/DG MARE	Fishing effort		No age information submitted. Missing for years 2009 - 2011. - Discards information available only for years 2010-2011. Missing for 2003 - 2009. - Many records with missing rectangle information for effort and landings by rectangle data submitted. Missing 2003-2010 landings by rectangle data. - No fishing cathy data for 2000 - 2009. - No fishing capacity data at all. - Some missing area information was evident. - A_CATCH: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 161 records with no gear information, 21 with missing area information and 553 records with missing mesh size information for gear types pots. - E_FFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 68 records with no gear information, 17 with missing area information and 123 records with missing mesh size information for gear types pots. - C_SPECIFIC EFFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 183 records with no gear information of 17 with missing area information and 567 records with missing mesh size information for gear formation of 17 with missing area information and 567 records with missing mesh size information for gear types pots. - E_ANDINGS: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 212 records with no gear information, 32 with missing area information and 1604 records with missing mesh size information for gear types pots.	no evident explanation for failure;	
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: - Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital kinvestment - Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings - Recreational catches: catches	Landings and effort data for 2011 (total and fleet segment level) not provided Missing effort data for several of the requested years, no sea days, fishing days data, energy consumption for 2009 at national and fleet segment levels Capacity data for 2011 and 2012 not provided Reported capacity data lower than Eurostat statistics Landings income data and fishing enterprise data for 2011 not submitted Financial position data for all requested years and depreciation replacement value for 2009, at national and fleet segment levels not provided Unpaid labour values not submitted for any years A change in methodology in 2010 has rendered, in some case, incompatibility with previous year's data Forecast figures for 2011 were based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, sat he latter was not provided during the data call	no evident explanation for failure; delivery of 2012 data not mandatory	MS asked to clarify why the data were not provided or provided missing data.
JRC/DG MARE	Mediterranean & Black Sea	Fisheries' specific landings and discards by species, fishing effort and surveys' data for the years 2008-2012	Catch data from GSA 8 is entirely missing. Only 2011 Effort data was submitted for GSA 7 and 8.	MS should be able to submit not only catch data for GSA 8 and the other requested data for 2011 for both GSA.) Regarding surveys (both MEDITS and MEDIAS), IRC/DG MARE should be aware that under each National Programme under Module III.G "Research Survey at Sea", there is a section III.G.3 namely "Data presentation", where each Member State reports the deadline for the availability of the data. All Mediterranean Countries established a deadline of 6 months after the sampling results of the data. All Mediterranean Countries established adealline of 5 months after the sampling RCMMedi8S 2012 also reported that "recalling its 2011 recommendation, and also the STEC PKG 11-20 recommendation on a Harmonized time period required for data to be available for transmission to end-users, recommends that the time period of 6 months following the end of the callection of transversal and biological data is respected by the data calls and the end users". So all surveys data (both MEDITS and MEDIAS) and transversal ones, should be requested not less than 6 months after the sampling year. IRC/DG MARE should be aware that not all metiers present in the Appendix IV of the EU Decisions 37/2010 are sampled by MS and for sampling purpose, only the major metier will be considered. So not all metier are sampled during the year and this could imply that data (i.e. length) for species caught by those metier are not available. Consequently, no data should be requested for those metiers/species. Regarding discards, IRC/DG MARE should be aware that RCMMedi8S created a regional view of the discards sampling programmes (i.e. melter important to sample for discards, in order to optimise the spatial, time and meters coverage. Moreover, the RCMMedi8S identified the key metiers important to sampling programmes (i.e. melter important to sample for discards, in order to optimise the spatial, time and meters coverage. Moreover, the RCMMedi8S identified the key metiers important to sampling perial metiers. RCMMedi8SS 2010 (Varna, Bulgaria 2010) r	
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: Including: Income, Personal costs, • Energy costs, • Raw materia costs, • Other operational costs, • Capital costs, • Extraordinary costs, • Capital value, • Net investment, • Debt, • Raw material volume, • Total volume, • Employment, • Number of enterprises	 - France did not report economic indicators for the following segments as the results may not be reliable: Mussel rafts (seg7.1), Mussel long line (seg7.2), other shellfish rafts (seg10.1), other shellfish long line (seg10.2). 	If confidentiality issues arise, they should be clearly justified and then it is ok. According to AR 2011 and AR 2012, the first years were rance collected data on aquaculture since a longer time, results are improving but data for 2008-2009 will maybe neeve be collected anymore. Mavbe it could be asked when MS thinks to have a reliable data collection, having in mind that it more or least started from the scratch and it is a huge sector with a lot of small enterprises. If results are not reliable, they are better not published. If MS works on improvement, as France obviously does, no reason for blaming them. If situation does not improve next year, some seriuos questions should be asked. But currently an improvement is obvious.	No actions needed
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic) Haddock in Subareas I and II		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Mage	Probably Partly Applicable. MS have applied for a derogation from sampling this fishery, but it has not been granted (MP). NP states that FR will try to initiate a selfsampling program. Biological parameters not included in NP. Probably Partly Applicable. Unclear from NP if and how metiers in I, II will be sampled (suggestion	Cod data available only in subareas IV and VIId. MS cannot submit this data. Haddock data available only in subareas IV and VIId. MS cannot submit this data.
ICES	(Northeast Arctic) Herring in Subarea IV and Division		Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Murrity Landings Age	for a self sampling program for the cod fishery, saithe fishery sampled if the selected trips end up in I,II) Biological parameters not included in NP. Probably not applicable. France is not sampling this stock for biological variables (NP), this is	
	Illa and Vild (North Sea Autumn spawners)		Landings Length Landings Weight	either due to the exemption rule as indicated in NP table E.1 or it might be that this sampling is subject to a bilateral with NI. There is a bilateral but it do not specify stocks only french landings into NI. The NP states that most small pelagics are landed into NI. In accordance with the bilateral is it NI that have the responsibility to submit data to ICES. To be clarified if the landings take place in NI and if it is NI. that are responsible for data transmissions or if the exemption rule apply.	

	STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task	
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		
ICES	Herring in Division VIa (North)		Landings Age Landings Length Landings Weight	Probably not applicable. France is not sampling this stock for biological variables (NP), this is either due to the exemption rule as indicated in NP table E.1 or it might be that this sampling is subject to a bilateral with NI, There is a bilateral but it do not specify stocks only french landings into NI. The NP states that most small pelagic s are landed into NI. In accordance with the bilateral is it NI. that have the responsibility to submit data to ICES. To be darfilled if the landings take place in NI. and if it is NI. that are responsible for data transmissions or if the exemption rule apply.	
ICES	Cod in Division VIIe-k (Celtic Sea)		Landings Maturity Discards Age	Partly applicable. Maturity is not included in NP. Discards applicable.	
ICES	Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland)		Landings Age Landings Length Discards Age Discards Length	Partly applicable. Biological variables (age) not included in NP. Exemption rule (<200 tonnes). France carry out metier sampling in area VI so lengths should be availabe.	
ICES	Haddock in Divisions VIIb-k		Landings Maturity Discards Maturity Commercial Fleets	Partly applicable. Maturity is not included in NP for this stock. Problem with commercial fleet need to be sorted out. France main contributor to fishery	
ICES	Plaice in Divisions VIIf,g (Celtic Sea)		Landings Age Commercial Fleets Surveys at Sea	Partly applicable. Biological variables (age) not included in NP. Exemption rule (<200 tonnes).	
ICES	Whiting in Divisions VIIe-k		Landings Age Landings Length Landings Weight Discards Weight Commercial Fleets	Applicable. Included in NP	MS to submit data available collected through the DCF
ICES	Spurdog (Squalus acanthias) in the Northeast Atlantic		Landings Maturity Discards Maturity	Not appicable. Maturity sampling not included in NP (how could this be sampling of maturity triannually required in 2010/93)	
ICES	Demersal elasmobranchs in the North Sea, Skagerrak and eastern English Channel		Discards Age	Probably not applicable. Other biological variables are included in NP but not age. No agreed age reading method?	
ICES	Sardine in Divisions VIIIabd and subarea VII		Landrings Age Landrings Length Landrings Maturity Landrings See Ratio Discards Age Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Weight Discards See Ratio Surveys at See	Applicable. France sample this stock (except for maturity)	MS to submit data available collected through the DCF
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius budegassa) in Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b		Discards Weight	Probably not applicable- MS collected data and made it availabe to ICES but the quality/ representativity of the data is considered to low. All participating MS (that submit data) get the same comment so it need to be sorted on a regional scale.	
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius) in Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b		Discards Weight	Probably not applicable. MS collected data and made it availabe to ICES but the quality/ representativity of the data is considered to low. All participating MS (that submit data) get the same comments or in each to be sorted on a regional scale.	
ICES	Megrim (L. whiffiagonis) in Subarea VII & Divisions VIIIa,b,d,e		Landings Maturity Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Commercial Fleets	Applicable. MS collect data except for maturity The real problem with the assessment is however that other MS do not provide data.	MS to submit data available collected through the DCF
ICES	European seabass in the Northeast Atlantic		Landings Age Discards Age Discards Length	Applicable. FR is sampling the stock. Data made available but quality/representativity was considered low.	MS to submit data available collected through the DCF
ICES	Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)		Landings Length	(Probably) Not applicable. Age based assessment, all MS involved in fishery have got the same comment. WG probably have not asked for the data.	
ICES	Blue whiting in Subareas I-IX, XII an XIV (Combined stock)		Landings Maturity	Applicable. It is unclear from the NP if maturity is collected or not	
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.1	Segment: * Fleet segment * Vessel number * Capacity (measure, value) GSA-Segment: * Geographical Sub-Area * Fleet segment * Vessel number * Capacity (measure, value)	All Task 1.1 data - not provided		
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.2	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup: - Fishing gear class - Group target species - Vessel number GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: - Fishing per-God month (start-end) - Fishing gear class - Vessel number - Species - Species	All Task 1.2 data - not provided		

		STECF & DG MARE - Commer	nts	EWG comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.3	Segment: *Engine power *Employment *Salary share % *Landing weight *Landing value *Vessel value of total fleet *Working days/year per vessel *Working hours/days per vessel *Working hours/days per vessel *Vorking total fishing/days per vessel *% of Vc. from fuel costs *Yearly fixed costs per vessel	All Task 1.3 data - not provided		
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.4	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: - Effort measure - Catch or Landing - CPUE/LPUE - Discard - Bycatch GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: - Catch or Landing - CPUE/LPUE - CPUE/LPUE	All Task 1.4 data - not provided	MS to submit available data collected through the DCF to GFCM	
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.5	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: Length range of captured species Length average Sex Maturity	All Task 1.5 data - not provided	MS to submit available data collected through the DCF to GFCM	
ютс	Reunion Longline (swordfish)	IOTC species: - Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any - Catch-and-Effort data - Size frequency data Sharks: - Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any - Catch-and-Effort data - Saize frequency data	IOTC species: • Catch-and-Effor data - incomplete report • Size frequency data - incomplete report, data only provided for swordfish (target species) Sharks: • Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any - incomplete report • Catch-and-Effort data - no data reported • Size frequency data - no data reported	MS to submit data available on SWO for IOTC area	
ЮТС	Reunion coastal fisheries (hanline and trolling)	"Size frequency data ICTC species: *Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any *Catch-and-Effort data *Size frequency data Sharks: *Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any *Catch-and-Effort data *Catch-and-Effort data *Size frequency data	IOTC species: • Catch-and-Effort data - incomplete report • Size frequency data - no data reported Sharks: • Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any - incomplete report • Catch-and-Effort data - no data reported • Size frequency data - no data reported	MS to submit data available for IOTC area	
ютс	Purse seine	IOTC species *Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any *Catch-and-Effort data *Size frequency data *Number and activities of supply vessels (purse seine only) Sharks: *Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any *Catch-and-Effort data *Size frequency data	Sharks: • Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any -incomplete report • Catch-and-Effort data - no data reported • Size frequency data - no data reported	MS to submit data available for IOTC area	

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

Member State: Germany Judgement levels Reference vear 2012 Compliance class Compliance level Version of the AR reviewed 29/05/2013 Version of the NP proposal Partly 10-50% 50-90% **EWG Answer** Mostly Overall compliance Yes >90% NA not applicable General framework National data collection organisation EWG COMMENTS EWG judgement EWG National correspondent and participating institutes Action needed? Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles Yes No well described? Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination Yes Nο meetings? Are derogations listed? Yes No List of derogations was provided in Yes Nο If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines? Chapter 2 instead of Chapter 1 Regional and International coordination Attendance of international meetings R1 Is Table II.B.1 complete Mostly No Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained? B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations RCM 2012 recommendation given; MS to update list of general No Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed? reference year is 2011 recommendations Are the responsive actions described ? NΑ Nο Are the responsive actions acceptable? No SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector General description of the fishing sector Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP No Yes implementation well described? Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? Economic variables Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes Nο Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Gross value of landings missing (but they were delivered for data call and from IIIE1 it can be deducted that they are collected exhaustively); "all gears and "all" length classes were not No elements of original dropdown list but were introduced in case a variable was NA or sampling homogeneous over all segments Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? В1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Yes Are the deviations explained? Yes No Are the deviations justified? Yes Νo Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal R2 Is respective data quality information given? Yes No Are the deviations explained? No Yes Are the deviations justified? Yes No Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations ВЗ Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Yes Are the responsive actions described ? NΑ No Are the responsive actions acceptable? NA Ŋς Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? NA No NA NΩ SUPRA-REGION Other regions Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector General description of the fishing sector

Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP Yes Nο implementation well described? Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? Yes Nο Economic variables Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? No Gross value of landings missing (but they were delivered for data call and from IIIF1 it can be deducted that they are collected exhaustively), "all gears Mostly and "all" length classes were not No elements of original dropdown list but were introduced in case a variable was NA or sampling homogeneous over all segments Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal **B**1 Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? No Yes Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Yes Yes Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal B2 Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Yes No Nο Are the deviations justified? Yes No Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Yes Nο NA No Are the responsive actions acceptable? No

В

R4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? NA Nο Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? NA No Region Baltic Biological metier related variables Are information on III C 1-4 given for each region? Yes Nο Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal MS to specify whether Yes 'Concurrent' is at sea or Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? market? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes MS to explain from where the Precision target is incorrect. Planned Mostly numbers to be measured at targets for plaice are blank regional level originated. Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? No Yes Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? No Are the deviations explained? Yes Are the deviations justified? No Yes Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided' Yes No Were CV targets met? Yes No Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? NA Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations C3 Were the relevant derogations listed? No Yes Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Yes Are the responsive actions described? Yes Nο Are the responsive actions acceptable Yes No Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Yes Nο Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Yes No **Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic** Biological metier related variables Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal No Sampling frame codes are missing Mostly Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes Nο MS to explain from where the Precision targets are wrong Yes numbers to be measured at regional level originated. Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes No Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Yes No Are the deviations explained? Yes No Are the deviations justified? Yes No Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal C2 Were CV estimates provided? Yes No Were CV targets met? Yes Are the deviations explained? NA No Are the deviations justified? NA Nο Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Yes No Yes Nο Are the responsive actions described? Yes No Are the responsive actions acceptable? Yes No Actions to avoid shortfalls C4 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Yes No Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? **Region North Atlantic** Biological metier related variables C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Sampling frame codes are missing Yes Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes No Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? No Yes Are the deviations explained? Yes Are the deviations justified? Yes No Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal MS to provide CV for cod in No CV given for cod in NAFO Mostly Were CV estimates provided? NAFO Were CV targets met? Yes MS to provide explanation for No Are the deviations explained? missing cod CV Are the deviations justified? NA No Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Yes Nο Yes No Are the responsive actions described? No Yes Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls C4 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Mostly No Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Region Long distance fisheries Biological metier related variables Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? NΑ Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? NA No Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? NA No Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? NΑ No Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? NA No Are the deviations explained? No Yes Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal C2

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?
Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations СЗ

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region: Baltic Sea

Recreational fisheries

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are obtained derogations mentioned?

Are the deviations explained?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal D2

Were data quality targets provided?

Were data quality targets met?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

D4

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region: North Sea & Eastern Arctic:

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal D2

> Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Baltic Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?
Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

	NA	No	
	NA	No	
	NA	No	
	NA	No	
•	•	•	
	Yes	No	
•	NA	No	
	NA	No	
	-	-	
	Yes	No	

	Yes	No
	Iv.	(v)
	Yes	No
All the requested derogations are provided at the begining of the AR. For the pending ones MS should provide the acceptance, For sharks derogation have been accepted	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Quality targets nor provided for 2012 data (2010 is last year provided)	Partly	MS to submit data quality targets for 2012 data
Not possible to assess this since targets for 2012 were not submitted	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	•	
	Yes	No
	•	
	No	No
	NA	No

On the basisi of the pilot studies carried out by the MS, Sharks and Eel derogation are still pending. Cod and sharks derogations have been approved		MS to confirm and update tex (see comment)
All the requested derogations are provided at the begining of the AR. For the pending ones MS should provide the acceptance	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
		•
	No	MS to present the pilot study results
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	•	•
	No	No
	NA	No

The amount of rows do not match the amount of rows in the NP - One stock (pike-perch) has been deleted because no sampled was conducted due to a derogation for FWS. (plaice was also inserted twice in the NP which has been corrected). Why are the different cod stocks presented at the same row? (Though issue for NP eveluation). Commission Decision asks for the two stock separately.	Mostly	Although it is consistent with NP proposal. MS to clarify the reason to present the diferent cod stocks in the same row. Are the data collected separately or together?
--	--------	---

No

Yes

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Sea and Eatern Arctic

E Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

targets

Pike-perch have been deleted. MS has a derogation for metiersampling of freshwater species but no derogation from biological sampling. The derogation was asked in 2012 NP Proposal and it is mentioned in AR section too. However it is clear that is not posible to sample the species if the metier catching this species is not sampling. Most stocks sampled in excess of plan, eel an exception which is undersampled.	Mostly	Ms should ask for a derogation for biological sampling of species from metiers not sampled.
Yes and MS had a very conservative plan in NP	Yes	No
Yes (difficult to predict sample sizes in sea-sampling programme, very conservative plan)	Yes	No
-	T	
Yes except for sex-ratio@length	Mostly	No
No, except for length@age (and despite sampling in excess showing that the initial plan was too conservative)	No	No
No. Only "compatibility problems" are mentioned. MS need to at least comment upon the CVs	No	MS should try to solve the compatibility problems or use other tools to calculate CV.
No	No	No
In chapter 1, MS claims that they have a derogation in this section for pike-perch. This is unclear. However it is clear that is not posible to sample the species if the metier catching this species is not sampling.	Mostly	Ms should ask for a derogation for biological sampling of species from metiers not sampled.
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
r	Yes	No
Yes MS need to update sampling targets	Yes	Targets need to be revised in future NPs
	I	T
The amount of rows do not match the amount of rows in the NP - sampling of some biological (such as maturity and sex-ratio) parameters for demersal stocks in area I,II have been removed from the AR. It is unclear if it was a mistake in the NP to heprin with		MS should clarify why some rows have been removed (which should not remove

The amount of rows do not match the amount of rows in the NP - sampling of some biological (such as maturity and sex-ratio) parameters for demersal stocks in area I,II have been removed from the AR. It is unclear if it was a mistake in the NP to begin with since E.2 and E.3 are not consistent. Needs to be clarified by MS (which should not remove rows without explanation)		MS should clarify why some rows have been removed (which should not remove rows without explanation)
Most stocks*parameters sampled in excess. Herring in I,II and Saithe in North Sea undersampled.	Yes	No
The sampling in excess is inherent from the german conservative sampling targets and sampling design.	Yes	Targets need to be revised in future NPs
aceign	Yes	No
For approx. Half of the stocks*parameters. Acceptable for stocks sampled in surveys. Not calculated for sex-ratio@lenght.	Partly	No
For some stocks*parameters targets are met (despite sampling in excess confirms that sampling targets were to conservative to begin with)	Partly	No
	Partly	MS should try to solve the compatibility problems or use other tools to calculate CV.
	No	see above
-		
	Yes	No
Yes MS need to update sampling		Targets need to be revised in
targets	Yes	future NPs

future NPs

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Other regions

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Transversal variables

MS should respect RCM regions in the column "regions" instead of including eg NAFO.Although the coordination is made under RCM NS&EA, the correct naming for the region is North Atlantic, and the fishig ground is NAFO instead of NAFOSA 1-2, acording RCM NS&EA naming conventions.	Mostly	MS to follow the naming conventions in future NP and AR
Half stocks*parameters are undersampled (halibut, blue whiting and horse mackerel). Rest is sampled in excess. Sex-ratio and maturity were planned for Sebastes according to table III_E_2 but only samples on age and weight was collected	Partly	MS to clarify why data on sex- ratio and maturity for Sebastes stock were not collected .
Yes, but MS could expand on logistical reasons. The sampling in excess is inherent from the german conservative sampling targets and sampling design.	Yes	MS could expand on "logistical reasons".
If MS relay completely on sea- sampling to collect biological parameters access to vessels need to be asured. Target levels need to be adjusted in text NP.	Yes	-
V	Mostly	
Yes except for sex-ratio@length No	No	_
Only "compatibility problems" are mentioned. MS need to at least comment upon the CVs	No	Yes. MS should try to solve the compatibility problems or use other tools to calculate CV.
No	No	No
_	L .	T
	Yes	No

	Yes	No
If MS relay completely on sea- sampling to collect biological parameters access to vessels need to be assured. Or there need to be a plan B to get access to the fish. Target levels need to be adjusted in text NP.		No

Inconsistencies between NP and AR. CECAF not included in NP, results no included in AR. Why does MS claim that they have a derogation (in table III_E_3) when they have a multilateral agreement. DE either need to present achivements or make a reference to NL AR. MS should follow the naming convention defined in RCM LDF. The name of the region should be "other regions" and the fishing ground should be "from Morocco to Guinea Bissau"	No	MS need adjust the table in order to reflect the multilateral agreement for sampling in CECAF area and be consistent with the texts. MS should follow the naming convention according RCM LDF in future NP and AR.
No achivements presented. Some sampling were carried out (present in the AR of NL)	Partly	MS either need to present achivements or make a reference to NL AR.
see above	NA	No
see above	NA	No
see above see above	NA NA NA	No No
see ahove	IIVA	IINO

occ above				
see above	NA	No		
see above	NA	No		
see above	NA	No		

Yes, inchapter 1. It is a mixture of bilaterals and derogation	No	No
No recomendation are applicable as MS have a multilateral agreement.	NA	No
NA	NA	No
NA	NA	No

What will happen with the CECAF fisheries if it reopens?	NA	No
_	NA	No

			On Table IIIF1 the regions must be		For next years MS shall detail
			identified so as the capacity variables	Yes	the name of Regions and variables in accordance with
			instead of just stating "all".		the guidelines.
	F1	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Capacity			3
		F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?		Yes Yes	No No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
		F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			No No
	F2	Effort		res	INO
		F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?		Yes Yes	No No
		Are the deviations justified?			No
		F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?		Yes Yes	No No
		Are the deviations justified?			No
		F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		Yes Yes	No No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?			No
		F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls		V	N
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			No No
	F3	Landings			
		F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
		F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?			No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
		F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described ?			No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
		F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			No
G	Resea G1	arch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	٠.	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	No No
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?		Yes	No
	G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in			
		gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	G3	Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		Yes	No
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			No
		Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?			No No
	G4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		INA	INU
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			No
Mod	dule o	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? If the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing indus		NA	No
		ction of data concerning the aquaculture	,		
		Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No freshwater data collection	Yes Yes	No No
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?		Yes Yes	No No
		Are the deviations justified?			No
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?		Yes Yes	No No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	А3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		A1.A	N
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	No No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
	A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
В	Colle	ction of data concerning the processing industry			
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			No No
	В1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		165	140
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	No No
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	No No
	В3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No

	Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
B4 Actions to a	avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
		An explanation of the *		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	in table is missing in AP but exist in	Yes	No
	Are the relevant derogations listed?	-	NA	No
2 Actions to avoid sh	nortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
Module for manageme	ent and use of the data			
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	See general text, datatransmission, SG 3	Yes	No
		In AR no details are given, but a reference is given to the NP were the details are well explained.	Yes	No
	is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?			
	Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A) ?	Information is in section II	Yes	No
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
		triat S Wriy a NA	NA	No
2 Actions to avoid sh			IVA	140
Z Actions to avoid si			INA	No
				No
Follow-up of STECE re	•		INA	140
			Yes	No
				No
				No
List of acronyms and		L	1	i : : -
and				
IX. Comments, sugges				
X. References	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
	Is there a complete list of references?			
XI. Annexes	•			-
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?			
	statements made in the main text?		1	l .
	Module of evaluation 1 Achievements: Res 2 Actions to avoid sh Module for manageme 1 Achievements: Res 2 Actions to avoid sh Follow-up of STECF res List of acronyms and	Are the responsive actions acceptable? B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem 1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? 2 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Module for management and use of the data 1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations in avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Follow-up of STECF recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? List of acronyms and abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections? XX. References Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support	Are the responsive actions acceptable? B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem 1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? 2 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Module for management and use of the data 1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations usuffier? 2 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Follow-up of STECF recommendations Are the responsive actions acceptable? List of acronyms and abherviations Is there a list of acronyms and abhreviations? Is there a list of acronyms and abhreviations? X. References Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem 1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal 2 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Module for management and use of the data 1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions accep

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

GERMANY

STECF & DG MARE - Comments						
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*	- EWG comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task	
JRC/DG MARE JRC/DG MARE	Fishing effort Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: • Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital & investment • Transversal data: capacity. effort, landines	Late submission of catch data for vessels under 10 meters in length with no discards information available. For the small vessels submitted, no quarter, mesh size, discards or age information is available. No complete data on the spatial distribution of landings could be provided for vessels <10m in the North Sea and <3m in the Balitz as these vessels are not mandatory to provide detailed logbook information. Not a real national picture; around half (or more than half according to Eurostat statistics) total weight of landings are not reported due to confidentiality issues (pelagic fleet). A significant proportion of the German national fleets landings are made by a small number of pelagic vessels	1st issue appears self-explanatory and consistent with AR (stating "pelagic vessels cannot be published for confidentially reasons") and would probably not require further action. The confidence of landings should be lower than Eurostat (because of missing the confidence of landings should be lower than Eurostat (because of missing the confidence of landings).	No action needed by MS	
		Iransversal data: capacity, errort, landings Recreational catches: catches	which are owned by a single fishing enterprise. Due to confidentiality reasons, all the data relating to these vessels were not submitted. Significant differences in landings data were observed: whereas the value of landings appears to have a good coverage in the DCF data (pipler that the figures reported by Eurostat), the volumes of landings reported in DCF are less than half of that reported by Eurostat.			
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: Income, • Personal costs, • Energy costs, • Raw materia costs, • Other operational costs, • Capital costs, • Extraordinary costs, • Capital value, • Net investments, • Debt, • Raw material volume, • Total volume, • Employment, • Number of enterprises	oyster production. The data was provided only for blue mussel segment and therefore represents the German marine aquaculture.			
ICES	Brill in Subdivisions 22 to 32		Landings Age Landings Length Landings Weight Landings Weight Landings Sex Ratio Discards Age Discards Age Discards Weight Discards Weight Discards Sex Ratio	Not applicable. MS is not obliged to sample brill and it is not included in the NP. However MS states in AR that find it data is collected anyhow. Only few discard brills have been measured, probably because they are uncommon in the discard fraction. Assessment method is based on surveys.		
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddoci in Subrareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are no fishing in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13.69): master stock to fishing in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13.69): master stock in the indicating that cod and haddock stocks in (ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, disearn information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.		
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Commercial Fleets	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddoci in Subrareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are not fishing in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13.69) 'master stock as the indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore an information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Nonwegian law.		
ICES	Saithe in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Landings Maturity Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Commercial Fleets	Parthy Applicable. MS perform in accordance with the NP a sea-sampling programme in the area. However were no discarded saither measured in 2012. Maturity is not cluteded in NP. Registration that commercial fleet seems it like data is available but not considered representative. It might be that MS fishery only cover a part of the geographical distribution of the stock (border to North Sea).		
ICES	Red fish Sebastes mentella Subarea I and II	is i	Landings Age Landings Weight Landings Maturity Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Weight Commercial Fleets	Parthy applicable. Sampling of this stock is included in NP but only for weight and sex-ratio. Why do MS not sample for age? Issue for future NP? Germany a main contributor to the EU part of the fisheries		
ICES	Cod in Subdivisions 22 to 24 Flounder in Subdivisions 22 to 32		Commercial Fleets Discards Age Discards Uneight Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Raturity	Applicable. MS a main contributor in this fishery Not applicable. Concerning requested flounder discard biological variables (Baltic sea), there is negular assessment of flounder stock. Some attempts have been made in the past - currently WKFLABA group is working on it, but in general WGBFAST responsible for the Baltic stock assessment is not requesting discard data, mainly due to problems with age determination anserious age inconsistencies within and between countries.		
ICES	Herring in Subdivisions 25 to 29 and 32 minus Gulf of Riga	4	Landings Age Landings Length Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio	(Probably) Not Applicable. This stock is not included in the MS NP (share of EU quota relatively low so an exemption rule is probably applied). Table E.3 in AR indicates (fishing grounds have been merged) though that there may be data from this stock. In such case should data have been delivered to ICES. To be explained by MS		
ICES	Plaice in Subdivisions 24 to 32		Landings Sex Ratio Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Muturity Discards Sex Ratio Commercial Fleets	(Probably) Not applicable -depending on the purpose with analysing failures. The present assessment method is based on survey implying that discard data is not needed for the assessment. MS collect the data and made it available if the quality of data is poor this need to be discussed at a regional level since all participating MS get the same comment		
ICES	Sole in Division IIIa and Subdivision 22–24 (Skagerrak, Kattegat, and the Belts)		Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio	Not applicable. Stock not included in MS NP.		

Evaluation o	f 2012	Data	Transmission
--------------	--------	------	--------------

GERMANY

STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment			
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		Action needed by MS, please specify task
ICES	Turbot in Subdivisions 22 to 32		Landings Age	Not applicable. Stock not included in MS NP but turbot is an accordance to AR sampled for	
			Landings Length	biological parameters anyhow. Data is obviously provided to ICES but considered	
			Landings Weight	unrepresentative,. Assessment method is based on surveys so data would not have been used	
			Landings Maturity	anyhow.	
			Landings Sex Ratio		
			Discards Age		
			Discards Length		
			Discards Sex Ratio		
ICES	Spurdog (Squalus acanthias) in the		Landings Maturity	Not applicable. Spurdog not included in NP. Germany not a main contributor in spurdog fisheries	
	Northeast Atlantic		Discards Maturity		
ICES	Demersal elasmobranchs in the		Discards Age	Not appicable. MS do not age read rays.	
	North Sea, Skagerrak and eastern				
	English Channel				
ICES	Haddock in Subarea IV (North Sea)		Landings Age	Applicable. MS should, in accordance with NP collect age data.	
	and Division IIIa		Discards Age		
ICES	Nephrops in Division IIIa (Skagerak		Discards Weight	Applicable. MS have a bilateral with DK and/or SE that should carry out metier sampling in Illa. It	
	Kattegat, FU 3,4)			need to be clear who should transmit data (it is a bilateral not a derogation)	
ICES	Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)		Landings Length	(Probably) Not applicable. Age based assessment, all MS involved in fishery have got the same	
				comment. WG probably have not asked for the data.	
ICES	Herring in the Northeast Atlantic		Discards Age	Applicable. MS perform sea-sampling programme but very few discarded herrings are measured.	
	(Norwegian spring-spawning		Discards Length	MS need to explain	
	herring)		Discards Weight		
			Discards Maturity		
			Discards Sex Ratio		
ICES	Horse mackerel (Trachurus		Discards Age	Applicable. Germany sample horse mackarel. Measured individuals of discarded fish is low.	
	trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb,		Discards Length		
	VIa., VIIa-c, e-k, VIIIa-e (Western		Discards Weight		
	stock)				
ICES	Blue whiting in Subareas I-IX, XII and		Landings Maturity	Probably non-applicable. Maturity included in NP. All countries have got the same comment	
	XIV (Combined stock)			about unrepresentative data so this has to be solved in a regional context	

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

Reference year Version of the RP proposal PMO Assert Ver		Men	nber State:	Greece	1	Judgeme	ent levels
Version of the Affine proposed Euro Affine Euro Affine Colfs						_	
The Authority of Control Contr				Version of the AR reviewed		No	<10%
Committee Comm				Version of the NP proposal		Partly	10-50%
Majorat data colection operations EVIS Columnia EVIS Adjacement EVIS Adjacem				Overall compliance			
It National data critication expansionation A National correspondent and participating institutes First and converse control in the critical data coloration or of horizonts. In Regional and terrespondent and participating institutes B Regional and terrespondent and participating institutes. B Regional and terrespondent and participating institutes. B Regional and terrespondent conditions are designed in the control of the control conditions menting left in the control control of the control control of the control of		0		Over all compliance	***		
A National correspondent and participating institutes of the collection and their relative of control of the collection of the	1	General	tramework]	
A National correspondent and participating institutes of the collection and their relative of control of the collection of the							
Professional procession in control description of control of con	II				EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
Enter an overview and description of content		A Nati	onai correspo	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles	<u></u>	Ī	
Exposured and continues toward processing the guidelines? Processing the gu				Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination	No national coordination meeting held;	·	
B Attentions of international coordination 15. Attentions of international coordination 15. Table 1.R.1 complaine? 15. Table 1.R.1 complaine to the substance of party and their reports of party and t					reason not justififed		
State 18.1 complete? An international and international accordance at all processing to the control of the		B Reg	ional and Inte			Yes	No
Trails II it is transported to the reasons for from standardown at planned meetings equipment. By Follow-up of regional and international recommendations An interactional control of the control of th		В1	Attendance	of international meetings	T		
to Table III it completes and consistent with AR guidelines? B1 Follow-up or frequency and provides the proposal of the propo							MS to update table
Region of the proposal and international recommendations with accommendation to the commendation of the co				Is Table II.B.1 complete?		Mostly	
the fire persons recommendations from it assess between the complete control is not between the person and black flow. If Module of the evaluation of the firely spector A development for the firely spector A development for firely spector A development for firely spector A development for firely spector of any and their impact on the NP report of the new report name incomplete. B1 Activements. Results and consistent with NP proposal? B2 Data quality. Results and devote the NP report of the new report name incomplete. B3 February of the NP report of the NP report of the new report name incomplete. B4 Call the NP report of the NP report of the NP report of the new report name incomplete. B5 Data quality. Results and devote the NP report of the new report name incomplete. B5 Data quality. Results and devote the NP report of the new report name incomplete. B5 Data quality. Results are devoted to the NP report of the new report name incomplete. B5 Data quality. Results are devoted to the NP report of the new report name incomplete. B5 Data quality. Results are devoted to the NP report of the new report name incomplete. B5 Data quality. Results are devoted to the NP report of the new report name incomplete. B5 Data quality. Results are devoted to the NP report of the new report name incomplete. B6 Data quality. Results are devoted to the NP report of the new report name incomplete. B6 Data quality. Results are devoted to the NP report of the new report name incomplete. B7 Results are devoted to the NP report of the new report of the new report name incomplete. B7 Results are devoted to partition in the failure devoted to the NP report of the new report of t		P2	Follow up			Yes	No
Bit Active vertex Regular and deviations updated? Bit Active vertex Regular and deviations updated? Bit Active vertex Regular and deviations updated? Active vertex Regular and the active vertex Regular vertex		62	rollow-up	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?			
A General description of the fishing sector A General description of the fishing sector Section of the fishing sector Sec				Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
Proceedings in the failing sector of anyly and distributed? B Economic variables In Table III.8.1 compiles and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.2 compiles and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.2 compiles and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.2 compiles and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.2 compiles and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.2 compiles and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.2 compiles and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.3 compiles and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.3 compiles and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.3 compiles and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.3 compiles and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.3 compiles and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.3 compiles and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.3 compiles and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.3 compiles and consistent with the NP proposal? And the deviations explained? And the deviations explained? And the deviations explained? In a activity, no further information And the deviations explained? In a activity, no further information And the deviations explained? In a activity, no further information And the deviations explained? In a activity, no further information And the deviations explained? In a activity, no further information And the deviations explained? In a activity, no further information And the deviations explained? In a activity, no further information And the deviations explained? In a activity, no further information And the deviations explained? In a activity, no further information And the deviations explained? In a activity and further information And the deviations explained? In a activity and further information And the deviations explained? In a activity and further information And the deviations explained? In a activity and further information And the deviations explained? In a activity and the activi	Ш	Module o	of the evaluati	on of the fishing sector			
B Economic variables Examination under III.814 for each super-region given? No No		A Gen	eral description	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP			
Is Table III B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? B1 Achievements, Results and deviation from NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pathward? Are the deviation from NP proposal? Are the deviatio							No
In Table III.8.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.8.2 complete and consistent with the NP proposal? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations and deviation from NP proposal to actively, no further information in No III.8 Read follow DCF requirements recommendations in NP proposal recommendations in NP proposal recommendations		В Есо	nomic variable	es			
In Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? September of citals collection at all; September of				Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		No	
B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal An the deviations patients? An the deviations patients? An the deviations patients? An the deviations patients? As the deviations explained? As the deviations patients? As the deviations explained? As the deviations explained? As the deviations explained? As the representations patients? As the representations patients? As the representation patients? As a patient patients patients. As the representation patients patients patients patients patients patients patients. As a patient patients patients patients patients patients patients patients. As a patient patients patients patients patients patients patients patients patients. As a patient patients patients patients patients patients patients patients. As a patient patients patients patients patients patients patients patients. As a patient patients patients patients patients patients patients patients. As a patient patients pa					empty table, no clustering, according	Yes	
B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from MP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with ne NP proposal? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pushfield? Are the deviations pushfield? Are the deviations pushfield? Are the deviations pushfield? B2 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal B3 Follow-up or Regional and invancations given? B4 Actions to acoust abordinals. B5 Follow-up or Regional and invancations from LM bised? B5 Follow-up or Regional and invancations from LM bised? B6 Are the deviations acceptable? B7 Are the deviations acceptable? B8 Actions to acoust abordinals in the future described? B8 Actions to acoust abordinals in the future described? B9 Acceptable and consistent with AR guidelines? B9 Actions to acoust abordinals in the future described? B9 Acceptable and consistent with AR guidelines? B9 B				5			MS need follow DCF
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations (sutified? Are the responsive actions (sutified? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? C1 Are information in ILC.1-4 given for each region? Are sufformation on ILC.1-4 given for each region? Are information filled for the only 1 Is Table ILC.2-4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table ILC.3-complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table ILC.5-complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table ILC.6-complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained?		R1	Achievemer			No	
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations (published?) Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal 1. The proposal property of the deviations (published?) Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions (published?) Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? REGON MEDITERANEAN & BLACK SEA C Biological metier related variables Are reformation on III.C 1-4 given for each region? Is Table III.C 3-c complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C 5-c complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C 5-c complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C 6-c complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C 6-c complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? C Data quality. Results and deviation from MP proposal Are the deviations explained? C Data quality. Results and deviation from MP proposal Are the deviations explained? C Data quality. Results and deviation from MP proposal Are the deviations explained? C Data quality. Results and deviation from MP proposal Are the deviations pushfied? C Data quality. Results and deviation from MP proposal Are the deviations pushfied? C Data quality. Results and deviation from MP proposal Are the deviations pushfied? C Data quality. Results and deviation from MP proposal		٥,	Acilieveillei		no nativity, no firsther information	Ne	
Are the deviations justified? Are the deviation from NP proposal B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal B3 respective data quality information given? Are the deviation explained? Are the deviation explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM Issued? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to explained and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? B4 Actions to explained and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to explained acceptable? B4 Actions to explained acceptable? B5 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to explained acceptable? B4 Actions to explained acceptable? B5 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to explained acceptable? B5 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? B6 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations B7 Follow							MS need follow DCF
B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviation's explained? Are the deviation's explained? B3 Follow-up or Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are the responsive actions acceptable? B5 Follow-up or Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? B6 Actions to avoid shortfalls B6 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? B7 REGION MEDITERRANCHAI & BLACK SEA. C Biological metier related variables C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.5 complete and consist							MS need follow DCF
Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustfield? Are the deviations pustfield? Are the deviations pustfield? Are the relevant recommendations? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are actions to avoid abnorfalls Are actions to avoid abnorfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid abnorfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid abnorfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid abnorfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid abnorfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid abnorfalls in the future acceptable? C Biological metier related variables Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 sampled metier Information filled for the only 1 sampled metier Yes No Information filled for the only 1 sampled metier Yes No Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Follow-up of the conditions explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Were CV stargets met? Were CV stargets met? Were CV stargets met? No No No No No No No No No N		B2	Data quality		data collection is an obligation	No	•
Are the deviations supstified? Are the deviations splatified? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA C Blological metter related variables Are information on III.C.1-d given for each region? C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Were CV targets met? Were CV targets met? Were CV targets met? No N				Is respective data quality information given?	no activity, no further information	No	requirements
Are the deviations justified? data collection is an obligation No requirements Are the relevant recommendations of the three prositive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are described shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are design and achievements with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Are design and achievements consistent with AR guideli				Are the deviations explained?	budgetary issues	No	requirements
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? REGION MEDITERRANEARS ABLACK SEE C Biological metier related variables Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 sampled stock Information filled				Are the deviations justified?	data collection is an obligation	No	
Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA C Biological metier related variables Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? Are incompanied to the consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 sampled stock Yes No Tables give evidence that only data collection for swordfish was carried out by MS in 2012. However metler LD. LPF. Swowsordfish was carried out by MS in 2012. However metler LD. LPF. Swowsordfish was carried out by MS in 2012. However metler LD. LPF. Swowsordfish argues for swordfish is largely achieved. Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Commission to decide and follow-up. The swordfish is largely achieved. Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Were CV targets met? Are design and alcievement? Are design and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met?		В3	Follow-up of		no relevant recommendations	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? REGION MEDITERRANEAR & BLACK SEA C Biological metier related variables Are interest of the deviations explained? MS operates in only one region NA No Table III.C.1-4 given for each region? MS operates in only one region NA No Information filled for the only 1 Sampled metier Yes No Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.9 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.9 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.9 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.9 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.9 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.9 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.9 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Is Table III.C.9 co							
Reaction McDiteranAveAn B LaCk Set		B4	Actions to a	void shortfalls			MS need follow DCF
REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA C Biological metier related variables Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Sampled metier Information filled for the only 1 Sampled metier Information filled for the only 1 Sampled stock Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Sampled stock Information filled for the only 1 Sampled stoc				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			requirements
Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 Sampled stock Information filled for the only 1 Sampled stock Yes No Tables give evidence that only data collection for swordfish was carried out by MS in 2012. However metier LD_PF. SWO appears undersampled (achievement 24%). But length sampling target for swordfish is largely achieved. Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV stargets met? MS operates in only one region No No Information filled for the only 1 Sampled stock Yes No No No No No No No No No N				IEAN & BLACK SEA		1	
Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 sampled stock Yes No Tables give evidence that only data collection for swordfish was carried out by MS in 2012. However metier LLD_LPF_SWO appears ULD_LPF_SWO appears ULD_LPF_SWO appears No Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Commission to decide and follow-up. Tonly for swordfish all Greek GSAs merged No No No No No No No No No N				Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	MS operates in only one region	NA	No
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 sampled metier Information filled for the only 1 sampled stock Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 sampled stock Yes No Tables give evidence that only data collection for swordfish was carried out by MS in 2012. However metier LLD_LPF_SWO appears No Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. To provide the only 1 sampled stock Yes No		O.	Acilievellie			Vac	No
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 sampled stock Information filled for the only 1 sampled stock Yes No No No Tables give evidence that only data collection for swordfish was carried out by MS in 2012. However metier LLD_LPF_SWO appears undersampled (achievement 24%). But length sampling target for swordfish is largely achieved. Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Commission to decide and follow-up. Pres No No action required by MS. EU Commission to decide and follow-up. Commission to decide and follow-up. Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? No No No No No No No No No N				Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Information filled for the only 1		
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Information filled for the only 1 sampled stock Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Pes No				Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR quidelines?	Information filled for the only 1		
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Proposal Were CV estimates provided? No No No No No No No No No N					Information filled for the only 1		
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? LLD_LPF_SWO appears undersampled (achievement 24%). But length sampling target for swordfish is largely achieved. Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Commission to decide and follow-up. Proposal Were CV estimates provided? Only for swordfish all Greek GSAs merged Were CV targets met? No						Yes	No
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? LLD_LPF_SWO appears undersampled (achievement 24%). But length sampling target for swordfish is largely achieved. Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Commission to decide and follow-up. P? Cample and follow-up. Commission to decide and follow-up. P? Cample and follow-up. Commission to decide and follow-up. P? Cample and follow-up. Cample and follow-up. Cample and follow-up. P? Cample and follow-up. P. Cample and follow-up. No No No No No No No No No N					collection for swordfish was carried		
But length sampling target for swordfish is largely achieved. Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Commission to decide and follow-up. Proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? But length sampling target for swordfish is largely achieved. No No No No No No No No No N				Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	LLD_LPF_SWO appears	No	
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Commission to decide and follow-up. Proposal Were CV estimates provided? No No No No No No No No No N					But length sampling target for		
Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Commission to decide and follow-up. Proposal Were CV estimates provided? Only for swordfish all Greek GSAs merged No				Are the deviations explained?	swordfish is largely achieved.	Yes	
Are the deviations justified? Commission to decide and follow-up. Commission to decide and follow-up. ?? C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Only for swordfish all Greek GSAs merged No							
C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Only for swordfish all Greek GSAs merged No				Are the deviations justified?	Commission to decide and follow-up.		
C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Only for swordfish all Greek GSAs merged No No No No No No No No No No					V		
Were CV estimates provided? Only for swordfish all Greek GSAs merged No No Were CV targets met? Ves for swordfish all Greek GSAs merged No No No		C2	Data qualit	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal		??	
Were CV targets met? Yes for swordfish all Greek GSAs merged No No						No	No
				Were CV targets met?	Yes for swordfish all Greek GSAs		
				Are the deviations explained?	. g		

		Are the deviations justified?	Commission to decide and follow-up.	Yes	No action required by MS. EU Commission to decide and follow-up
C3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations		res	
		Were the relevant derogations listed?		NA	No
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Relevant RCM Med&BS ecommendation on LPF sampling nultilateral agreement not listed by RCM. Likewise LPF metiers coding by RCM Med&BS and RCM LDF 2011.	No	MS to update accordingly
		Are the responsive actions described?		NA	MS to update accordingly
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	NA
C4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			No
		and Black Sea			·
D Recre	eational fishe		//S operates in only 1 region	NA	No
D1	Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	There is no recreational fisheries of bluefin tuna in Greece. Greece conducted pilot study for eel fishery in 2012 (annexed in report). Appendix IV of the EU Decision 93/2010 reports also sharks as target group for Recreational Fishery. MS should report the approved derogation or demonstrate (i.e. through appropriate eferences or eventually carrying out a pilot study) that Sharks are not target species for recreational fishermen.	Mostly	MS to clarify abou the sahrks recreational fishery
		Are obtained developed montioned?		Yes	No
		Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained?			No No
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
D2	Data quality	r: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided?		NA	No
		Were data quality targets met?		NA	No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?			No No
D3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations		INA	NO
		Were the relevant derogations listed?			No No
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?			No No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
D4	Actions to	Avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			No
		EAN & BLACK SEA			
E Biolo	gical stock-r	Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	MS operates in only one region	Yes	No
REGION N	MEDITERRAN	EAN & BLACK SEA	Wio operates in only one region	163	NO
		elated variables			
E1	Achieveme	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? If the second sec	AS clearly explained at the beginning if the AR that they had problems due to administrative and financial obstaclesmoreover, the late utthorization of the budget in December 2012 allowed the mplementation of only some modules of 2012 NP*. Table not filled except or Swordfish at ICCAT_BIL95 scale. For this species multilateral greement not complete (more MS wolved).	No	Yes. At least for swordfish MS should report the agreement reached at Regional level plus the CV estimated during the PGMed)
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Regarding III.E.2, 8 species were lanned to be updated in 2012. But 27 pecies found in table III.E.3 and nally only results provided for two arameters on swordfish (length and naturity @age) under the RCM greement frame. In term of number of fish sampled, arget planned for swordfish is chieved.	No	No
		fi p P Are the deviations explained? d S p C	Ill the deviations are linked to nancials and administrative roblems. Note that a pilot study on el Greek fishery is given in Annex 1, temonstrating interest for performing nonitoring in the mid-long term. samples for calculating biological arameters for this species were also ollected but not yet analysed.	Yes	No
E2	Data quality	Are the deviations justified? 7: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
ĒŽ	Dusa quality	Were CV estimates provided?		No	Yes. At least for swordfish MS should report the CV estimated during the PGMed)
		Were CV targets met?		NA	No
		Are the deviations explained?	Deviations are explained only for swordfish: samples collected will be analysed in 2013.	NA	No
E3	Follow-up (Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations	Yes for swordfish.	NA	No
			relevant derogation listed in section	NA	NA

			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No specific LM and RCM Med&BS recommendation was provided in 2011 for section E.	NA	NA
		ŀ	Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	NA NA
	E4		void shortfalls	Main problems are related to financial		
			Are actions to avoid shortialis in the ruture described?	and administrative issues	NA	NA
F	Trans	uersal variab	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	NA
			Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		No	No
	F1	Capacity F11 Achieve	ments: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?		No No	No No
		[Are the deviations justified?		No	No
			to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		No	No
	F2	Effort [Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			No
		F11 Achieve	ments: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No	No
			Are the deviations explained?		No	No
			Are the deviations justified? ality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		No	No
			Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?		No No	No No
			Are the deviations justified? up of Regional and international recommendations		No	No
		1101011011	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		No	No
		ŀ	Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		No No	No No
		F14 Actions	to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		No	No
	F3	Landings	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No	No
			ments: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		ŀ	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?		No No	No No
		F12 Data qu	Are the deviations justified? ality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		No	No
			Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?		No No	No No
			Are the deviations justified?		No	No
			up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		No	No
			Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		No No	No No
		F14 Actions	to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		No	No
G	Danas		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No	No
G	G1		nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
				In table III.G.1 there is missing information on collection of the ecosystem indicators and the planning of surveys to be undertaken in 2013	Mostly	Table to be revised concerning the ecosystem indicators in accordance with the NP.
				The MEDITS survey was not performed in 2012 due to the delayed start of the programme. Whereas, the realized MEDIAS survey covered only 23% of the planned days at sea.		Proper planning is needed to conduct the survey in the right time of the year so the data can be used. MS to
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	Deviations in data quality are related only for the Medias surveys.	No Partly	clarify.
				Since the survey was conducted in another time of the year compared to the plan, the effect on the data use	•	The effects on the data use (stock assessment) should be described. MS to
			Are the deviations justified?	is not described. The map reports the achieved days	Partly	clarify
	G2	Data quality	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ? :: Results and deviation from NP proposal	for the Medias survey	Yes	No
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	The quality of the acoustic and the demersal surveys in the Mediterannean area could be compromised due to the absence of Greece data	No	The effects on the data use (stock assessment) to be described by MS
			Are the deviations explained?	*	Yes	No
			Are the deviations justified?		No	The effects on the data use (stock assessment) to be described by MS
	G3	Follow-up o	f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	
		ŀ	Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	
	G4		void shortfalls			The actions
				Only provided for the MEDIAS	Partly	The actions needed for avoiding shortfalls to be described The actions
				Only provided for the	Dorah	The actions needed for avoiding shortfalls
		the evaluati	on of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing indust	MEDIAS try	Partly	to be described
Α	Collec	ction of data	concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?		Yes	No
				No data collection undertaken, even if mandatory	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
		ŀ	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			MS need follow DCF requirements
	A1	Achievemen	ts: Results and deviation from NP proposal		No	
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	No data collection undertaken	No Yes	MS need follow DCF requirements

IV

						MS need follow DCF
			Are the deviations justified?		No	requirements
	A2 Da	nta quality	: Results and deviation from NP proposal		110	requirements
	7. 2 50	ita quanty	Treconce and deviation from the proposal			MS need follow DCF
			Is respective data quality information given?		No	requirements
			. , ,			MS need follow DCF
			Are the deviations explained?		No	requirements
						MS need follow DCF
			Are the deviations justified?		No	requirements
	A3 Fol	llow-up of	Regional and international recommendations		h	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA NA	
			Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	
	A4 Act	tions to a	void shortfalls		INA	
	74 /10	tions to a	void Shortians	Budget reasons, but MS has to ensure		MS need follow DCF
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	execution of programme	No	requirements
				No data collection undertaken, even if		MS need follow DCF
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	mandatory	No	requirements
	B Collection	n of data	concerning the processing industry	-		
				For some variables data are collected		
				by PPS, not shown in this table, to be		
			Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	changed	Mostly	No
				Notional authority is no apositio data		
				National authority is no specific data source, please specify which and		Table to be resubmitted with
				where they have the data from. Same		applying correct % for
				for fin. Forms, are they send to the		response rate and achieved
				data collector or basis for answering		sample rate; to specify a data
				questionnaire. Response rate wrongly		source for collected
			Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	calculated!	Mostly	information
	B1 Act	hievemer	ts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?		NA	
	P2 D-	ta quella	Are the deviations justified? Results and deviation from NP proposal	I	NA	
	B2 Da	ııa quality	. resums and deviation from NP proposal			MS should to provide more
						clear information about quality
			Is respective data quality information given?	Not exist information about data quality	Mostly	evaluation
				MS shall clearly state for which DCF	,	
				variables data have been collected or		
				estimated and not mixed it up with		
				data collection for other information.		
				Also indicators have to be calculated		MS need follow DCF
			Are the deviations explained?	properly.	No	requirements
						MS need follow DCF
	D0 5-1		Are the deviations justified?		No	requirements
	B3 Fol	ilow-up of	Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	Г
			Are the responsive actions described?		NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	
	B4 Act	tions to a	void shortfalls			
						MS should to provide
						information about actions to
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		No	avoid shortfalls
			Annualization to accord the effective feature and the C		NI-	MS need follow DCF
v	Module of eva	aluation o	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No	requirements
v			of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		INO	requirements
V				Even though the MEDIAS survey was	NO	requirements
V			of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem	Even though the MEDIAS survey was not complete, biological	NO	requirements
V			of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem	not complete, biological data was collected and could	NO.	requirements
v			of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem ults and deviation from NP proposal	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem		
v			of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem ults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	not complete, biological data was collected and could	Partly	To be clarified by MS
v	1 Achievem	ents: Res	of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem ults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem		
V		ents: Res	of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem ults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem	Partly	To be clarified by MS
V	1 Achievem	ents: Res	of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem ults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem	Partly	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the
v	1 Achievem	ents: Res	of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem ults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem	Partly	To be clarified by MS
V	1 Achievem	ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem	Partly NA Partly	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in
	1 Achievement	ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem	Partly NA	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? nt and use of the data	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem	Partly NA Partly	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? In and use of the data utls and deviation from NP proposal	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4	Partly NA Partly NA	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? nt and use of the data	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4	Partly NA Partly	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? In and use of the data utls and deviation from NP proposal	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken	Partly NA Partly NA	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? In and use of the data utls and deviation from NP proposal	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of	Partly NA Partly NA	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Ontfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken	Partly NA Partly NA	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012*	Partly NA Partly NA No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of	Partly NA Partly NA No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012*	Partly NA Partly NA No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012*	Partly NA Partly NA No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described.
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012*	Partly NA Partly NA No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? nt and use of the data ults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012*	Partly NA Partly NA No No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012*	Partly NA Partly NA No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the audit and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012*	Partly NA Partly NA No No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if.
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is and use of the data ults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012* No such section in AR	Partly NA Partly NA No No No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if.
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res	is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are and use of the data ults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No No No No No No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No
	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement	ents: Res avoid sh anageme ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012* No such section in AR	Partly NA Partly NA No No No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if.
	1 Achievem 2 Actions to Module for ma	ents: Res avoid sh anageme ents: Res	is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the "Transmission from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012" No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No Yes	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No
	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement	ents: Res avoid sh anageme ents: Res	of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem bults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It and use of the data ults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012" No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No Yes Yes	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No
VI	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement 2 Actions to	anageme ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? In and use of the data autis and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ontralls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012" No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No Yes	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No
VI	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement 2 Actions to	anageme ents: Res	of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem bults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It and use of the data ults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected "No data collected "No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012" No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No Yes Yes	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No
VI	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement 2 Actions to	anageme ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? In and use of the data autis and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ontralls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No Yes Yes	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No
VI	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement 2 Actions to	anageme ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? In and use of the data autis and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ontralls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected "No data collected "No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012" No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No Yes Yes	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No
VI	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement 2 Actions to	anageme ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? In and use of the data autis and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ontralls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected "No data collected "No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012" No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget 1. The recommendations not applicable to the MS should not be	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No Yes Yes	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No
VI	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement 2 Actions to	anageme ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? In and use of the data autis and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ontralls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected "No data collected "No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012" No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget 1. The recommendations not applicable to the MS should not be included in this table accordning to the AR guidelines. 2. the first recommendation is for	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No Yes Yes	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No
VI	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement 2 Actions to	anageme ents: Res	Its Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? nt and use of the data ults and deviation from NP proposal lis Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? commendations	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012* No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget authorization of the budget 2. The first recommendations not applicable to the MS should not be included in this table accordning to the AR guidelines. 2. the first recommendation is for Mediteranean stocks and should be	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No No No No No No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No No
VI	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement 2 Actions to	anageme ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? commendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected "No data collected "No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012" No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget 1. The recommendations not applicable to the MS should not be included in this table accordning to the AR guidelines. 2. the first recommendation is for	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No No No No No No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No No No
VI	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement 2 Actions to	anageme ents: Res	is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the action of the data ults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012* No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget authorization of the budget 2. The first recommendations not applicable to the MS should not be included in this table accordning to the AR guidelines. 2. the first recommendation is for Mediteranean stocks and should be	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No No No No No No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No No No
VI	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement 2 Actions to Follow-up of S	ents: Res	Its Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with he NP proposal? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Commendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012* No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget authorization of the budget 2. The first recommendations not applicable to the MS should not be included in this table accordning to the AR guidelines. 2. the first recommendation is for Mediteranean stocks and should be	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No No No No No No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No No No
VI	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement 2 Actions to	ents: Res	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Commendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012* No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget authorization of the budget 2. The first recommendations not applicable to the MS should not be included in this table accordning to the AR guidelines. 2. the first recommendation is for Mediteranean stocks and should be	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No No No No No No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No No No
VI	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement 2 Actions to Follow-up of S	anageme ents: Res avoid sh	is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? commendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? bibreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012* No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget authorization of the budget 2. The first recommendations not applicable to the MS should not be included in this table accordning to the AR guidelines. 2. the first recommendation is for Mediteranean stocks and should be	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No No No No No No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No No No
VI	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement 2 Actions to Follow-up of S	anageme ents: Res avoid sh avoid sh avoid sh	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Commendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? bbreviations	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012* No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget authorization of the budget 2. The first recommendations not applicable to the MS should not be included in this table accordning to the AR guidelines. 2. the first recommendation is for Mediteranean stocks and should be	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No No No No No No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No No No
VII VIII IX	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement 2 Actions to Follow-up of S	anagemeents: Res	Its Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It and use of the data ults and deviation from NP proposal Its Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? commendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? toons and reflections	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012* No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget authorization of the budget 2. The first recommendations not applicable to the MS should not be included in this table accordning to the AR guidelines. 2. the first recommendation is for Mediteranean stocks and should be	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No No No No No No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No No No
VII VIII IX	2 Actions to Module for ma 1 Achievement 2 Actions to Follow-up of S List of acronyll IX. Comments	anagemeents: Res	Its Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? It and use of the data ults and deviation from NP proposal Its Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? commendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? toons and reflections	not complete, biological data was collected and could therefore contribute to the ecosystem indicators 1-4 No data collected No data collected No data collection was undertaken in 2012, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012* No such section in AR Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget in December 2012 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget authorization of the budget 2. The first recommendations not applicable to the MS should not be included in this table accordning to the AR guidelines. 2. the first recommendation is for Mediteranean stocks and should be	Partly NA Partly NA No No No No No No No No No	To be clarified by MS Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS No Progress in datamanagement to be described. MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if. No No No

XI XI. Annexes

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

GREECE

STECF & DG MARE - Comments				EWG comments	Action needed by MS, please specify task	
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*			
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: • Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital & investment • Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings • Recreational catches: catches	- No data submitted during the 2012 call on fleet economic data. No data submitted for any of the requested years.	MS had indicated in the AR that no data were collected for 2011; no evident justification for failure;		
JRC/DG MARE	Mediterranean & Black Sea	surveys' data for the years 2008-2012	- JRC did not receive any data for any table from Greece, in response to the DG MARE data call 2012.	Regarding surveys (both MEDITS and MEDIAS), IRC/DG MARE should be aware that under each National Programme under Module III.G "Research Survey at Sea", there is a section III.G.3 namely "Data presentation", where each Member State reports the deadline for the availabilty of the data. All Mediterranean Countries established a deadline of 6 months after the sampling year. RCMMed&BS 2012 also reported that "recalling its 2011 recommendation, and also the STECF EWG 11-20 recommendation on a harmonized time period required for data to be available for transmission to end-users, recommends that the time period of 6 months following the end of the collection of transversal and biological data is respected by the data calls and the end users". So all surveys data (both MEDITS and MEDIAS) and transversal ones, should be requested not less than 6 months after the sampling year. IRC/DG MARE should be aware that not all metiers present in the Appendix IV of the EU Decisions 93/2010 are sampled. In order to identify the métiers to be sampled, the ranking system is yearly applied by MS and for sampling purpose, only the major metier will be considered. So not all metier are sampled during the year and this could imply that data (i.e. length) for species caught by those metier are not available. Consequently, no data should be requested for those metiers/species. Regarding discards, IRC/DG MARE should be aware that RCMMed&BS created a regional view of the discard sampling programmes (i.e. métier important to sample for discards), in order to optimise the spatial, time and metiers coverage. Moreover, the RCMMed&BS identified the key metiers important to sample for discards, providing scientific justification for not sampling certain metiers. RCMMed&BS 2010 (Varna, Bulgaria 2010) reported that "A discards behaviour table is used to provide justification for not sampling certain metiers. This justification could be based in the discards behaviour or in the non selection of métier in the regional ranking system" and recommends		
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: Income Income Personal costs Energy costs Raw materia costs Capital costs Capital costs Extraordinary costs Capital value Extraordinary costs Capital value Ret investments Debt Raw material volume Total volume Employment	- No data submitted by Greece for the current data call.	No AR for 2011 available, in AR Grece stated, that no data collection took place due to missing budget.		
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.2	Number of enterprises GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup: Fishing gear class Group target species Vessel number GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: Fishing period month (start-end) Fishing gear class Vessel number Species	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: • Species - not provided			
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.3	Segment: • Engine power • Employment • Salary share % • Landing weight • Landing value • Vessel value of total fleet • Working day/year per vessel • Working day/year per vessel • Working hours/days per vessel • Variable costs of fishing/days per Vessel • Variable costs of Vessel	Segment: Salary Share % - not provided Landing weight - not provided Landing value - not provided Landing value - not provided Vessel value of total fleet - not provided Vorking day/vear per vessel - not provided Working hours/days per vessel - not provided Variable costs of fishing/days per vessel - not provided % of V.C. from fuel costs - not provided Yearly fixed costs per vessel - not provided			

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

GREECE

	STECF & DG MARE - Comments			EWG comments	Action needed by MS, please specify task
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		
GFCM		GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: - Effort measure - Catch or Landing - CPUE/LPUE - Discard - Bycatch - Bycatch GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: - Catch or Landing - CPUE/LPUE	All Task 1.4 data - not provided	No metiers variables collected by MS in 2012, except for swordfish.	MS to provide data related to the swordfish fishery and CPUE data
GFCM		GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: - Length range of captured species - Length average - Sex - Maturity - Maturity	All Task 1.5 data - not provided	No biological data collected by MS in 2012, except for swordfish.	MS to provide data on Swordfish

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

	Member State:	Ireland		ludaom	ent levels
	Welliber State.	Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	23rd May 2013	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal		Partly	10-50%
		Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	***	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
I	General framework				пос аррпсавле
II	National data collection	on organisation ondent and participating institutes	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
	A National Correspo	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?		Yes	No No
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?		Yes	No
		Are derogations listed?		Yes	
	B Regional and Inte	If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?		Yes	No
		e of international meetings			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?		Yes	No
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?		Yes	No
	B2 Follow-up	of regional and international recommendations Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
III	Module of the evaluat	ic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic ion of the fishing sector ion of the fishing sector			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP		Voc	Ne
		implementation well described? Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?		Yes Yes	No No
	B Economic variable			100	1140
			Total achieved sample no. appears		MS should provide all information requested by resubmiting table or justify
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	quite low, no vessels listed as inactive Clustering scheme inappropriate;	Mostly	why the information is missing MS should explain the reasons of clustering more
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	many segments are big enough (>10) to be reported unclustered	Mostly	than 10 vessels in the segment
	B1 Achieveme	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Type of data collection scheme is empty for some variables; variables are not reported for all segments; CV should not be provided as percentage	Partly	MS should resubmit the table IIIB3, to provide a CV, clarify which variables were collected, provide information about data collection scheme
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Low response rates for some segments; description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs is not complete	Mostly	MS should provide a methodology for Capital Valuestimation
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations iustified?	Voluntary nature of surveys It is a common problem; effort for improvement is appreciated, but result is still questionable; some statistical investigation of segment homogeneity (variability) might be advisable		MS is advised to review and change, if necessary data collection strategy for better response rate
	B2 Data quality	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal	(variability) filight be advisable	Failly	response rate
		Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	B3 Follow-up o	Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations		Yes	No
	20 Follow-up C	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No
	B4 Actions to a	Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls		NA	No
	ACTIONS TO 8	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
	REGION NORTH SEA	& EASTERN ARCTIC			
	C Biological metier	related variables Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	MS to present the variables BY region	Mostly	No
	C1 Achieveme	ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal		<u> </u>	
	O: Acilieveme	ило. позина ини истанов повтиг ргороза!			

MS to present only one line per metier (including different MS to present only one line per metie (including different sampling . sampling strategies). strategies). Changes in Table format Changes in Table format (e.i. Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Mostly (e.i. grey coulor for Achivement data, grey coulor for Achivement Adding line for Region name) make data, Adding line for Region ihem difficult to analyse. name) make ihem difficult to analyse. MS to clarify inconsistencies MS to clarify inconsistencies between between tables III.C.3 and tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 for number of III.C.4 for number of "Achived "Achived number of trips" and "Total Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Mostly number of trips" and "Total number of trips during the Sampling number of trips during the vear' Sampling year" Table properly filled.Changes in Table format (e.i. grey coulor for Achivemen data, Adding line for Region name) Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? No make ihem difficult to analyse. But no species planned in NP 2012 for the region and two found in AR tables. Only 49 Capros aper sampled in addition of the planed species Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? mentionned in III.C.5. This does not Mostly No reflect concurrent sampling as specified in III.C.3 and III.C.4 MS to clarify why no Achivement on Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? discards for Scomber scombrus since Mostly Yes on-board sampling is performed Are the deviations explained? see coment above Mostly Yes see coment above Are the deviations justified? Mostly Yes Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? No CV for Clupea harengus Partly No CV provided just for unsorted catches Were CV targets met? Yes No of Scomber scombrus Are the deviations explained? No Yes see comment above Are the deviations justified? see comment above Yes No Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations NA No Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? No Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable? NA No NA No Actions to avoid shortfalls MS to clarify the actions to avoid the Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Mostly No shortfall BY region Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? see comment above Mostly No **REGION NORTH ATLANTIC** Biological metier related variables Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? MS to present the variables BY region Mostly No Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal MS to present only one line per metier (including different Changes in Table format (e.i. grey sampling strategies). Changes in Table format (e.i. coulor for Achivement data. Adding Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Mostly line for Region name) make ihem grey coulor for Achivement difficult to analyse data, Adding line for Region name) make ihem difficult to analyse. MS to clarify inconsistencies MS to clarify inconsistencies between between tables III.C.3 and tables III C 3 and III C 4 for number of III.C.4 for number of "Achived "Achived number of trips" and "Total Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Mostly number of trips" and "Total number of trips during the Sampling number of trips during the vear" . Sampling year' Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? MS to provide discards data provided Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? in table III. C 5 in Table III. C.6 (only Mostly No Nenrhons is completed) Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Mostly S Stocks were generally correctly sampled or oversampled except for those of the undersampled fishing Are the deviations explained? grounds. Changes in the fishing No Yes strategies are also given as reasons for re-allocation of sampling effort between fishing grounds MS to explain if concurrent sampling Are the deviations justified? Mostly Yes is really applied Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Most CV's are provided. MS to Were CV estimates provided? precise why no CV's were calculated Mostly Yes for several species Were CV targets met? Partly Νo MS to state some explanation on No Are the deviations explained? No

devaited CV

C2

C3

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Atlantic

Recreational fisheries

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

REGION NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC

Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?
Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Are the deviations explained?

NA	NA
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No

MS to clarify the actions to avoid the shortfall BY region. Proposals to improve sampling for some metiers. But not covering all shortfalls identified.	Mostly	Yes
Proposals only for some metiers. If changes in Irish fisheries have significant effects on the quality of data collected, MS should modify its sampling protocoles	Partly	Yes

	Yes	INIo	
	res	No	
I			
	Yes	No	
	Yes	No	
	NA	NA	
	NA	NA	
	Yes	No	
	Yes	No	
	NA	NA	
	NA	NA	
	Yes	No	
	NA	NA	
	NA	NA	•

		ı
No stock variables collection planned in NP for the region. Widely distributed stocks (blue whiting, mackerel and horse mackerel) are included in North Atlantic region. Reasons for no separate sections between regions well explained in AR. This approach was accepted by RCM NS&EA 2010 "RCM NS&EA is approach was accepted by RCM not seen and the sampling obligations for the marginal catches in neighbouring fishing grounds and considered that these catches should be reallocated to the main fishing grounds for sampling considerations."	Yes	No

NA	NA	No	
NA	NA	No	
NA	NA	No	
NA	NA	No	
NA	NA	No	
NA	NA	No	
	•	•	
NA	NA	No	
NA	NA	No	

-	Yes	No
Around 50% of the stocks are oversampled (at national expense). Stocks of undersampled fishing grouds are consequently often undersampled.	Mostly	No
-	Yes	No
In general lack of avaibility of samples due to low landings	Yes	No
Yes for most of the stocks	Yes	No
In general yes for length@age, rather no for other parameters	Partly	No

No

Yes

Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

F1 Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Effort

F3

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Landings

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Research surveys at sea G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

for moturity only E00/ of stanks		
for maturity only 50% of stocks achieved the numbers planned. For		
sex ratio 14 out of 43 do not reach the		
		MS could review the numbers
planned numbers and for weight		of fish to be sampled to find
about 25% do not reach the planned	Mostly	better coherence between
numbers . If precision target is		planned and achieved targets.
achievable only at a non affordable		planned and demeved largete.
cost, then the numbers planned		
should be revised.		
		I
No derogation listed in section 1	NA	No
Yes. RCM NA 2011 recommendation		
on John dory is missing. (not relevant)	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
		T
MS remains focused on providing		
high-quality data to stock assessment		
	Yes	No
working groups. Other stocks or	res	INO
parameters that are not directly		
relevant will have a lower priority.		
Mostly	Mostly	No
		IMC shall provide a delicered
		MS shall provide additional information on the
		achievments particularly on
Missing capacity and landings		
Missing capacity and landings	Portly	regard to landings from small
information for small vessels (<10m)	Partly	vessels.
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
the number of trips covered by the sentinel programme shall be provided. The number of vessels is not enought to understand the level of coverage given that unit of observation for the		
effort must also be the fishing trip		
and not only the vessel.	Yes	No
		No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	
		No No No
	Yes	No
	Yes Yes Yes	No No
	Yes Yes Yes	No No No
	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No
	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No
	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No
	Yes	No No No No No No
	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No
	Yes	No No No No No No
	Yes	No No No No No No
	Yes	No the collection of landing
	Yes	No N
	Yes	No N
	Yes	No N
	Yes	No N
	Yes	No N
	Yes	No N
	Yes	No N
	Yes	No N
	Yes	No N
	Yes	No N
	Yes	No N
	Yes	No N
Missing landing information for small vessels (<10m)	Yes	No N

No

Yes

				I	
			It now requires knowledge		
			of an acoustic surveys to understand		
			the difference between number of fish		
			hauls planned and achieved. No		
			planned, to be explained in table by		
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	an * or in text in NP.	Mostly Yes	No No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ?		Yes	No
G2	Data quali	ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in			
		gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
G3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations	L	Yes	No
03	i ollow-up	or regional and international recommendations	No relevant LM rec for this		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	section	NA	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
G4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls		I.v.	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
Module o	of the evalua	ation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing indu	strv	162	NO
		a concerning the aquaculture			
			Fish farming techniques for Mussels,		
			Oyster, Clam, Other shellfish should		
		Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	be empty	Mostly	MS should follow guidlines
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes Yes	No No
A1	Achieveme	ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal		ı⊶	r · -
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
A2	Data qualit	ty: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Iv	Ne
		Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?		Yes Yes	No No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
A3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No
A4	Actions to	Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls		NA	No
A4	ACIONS IO	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
B Colle	ection of dat	a concerning the processing industry			
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
B1	A objectome	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
БТ	Achieveme	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
B2	Data qualit	ty: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	No No
В3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations	<u> </u>	IVA	NO _
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
B4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
Module o	f evaluation	of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		1.55	
		esults and deviation from NP proposal			
		In Table V.4. complete and consistent with AD available and	Description of "data required "	Mostly	Nie
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	is not in line with the AR guidelines	NA	No No
2 Actio	ns to avoid s	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		I IVA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
		ent and use of the data esults and deviation from NP proposal			
i ACIII	ovements. Re	sound and deviation from Art. proposal	See general comment on		
			datatransmission	Yes	
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			No
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP		Yes	
		proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?			No No
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?		Yes	INO
		Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A) ?	Described in section II.A	Yes	No
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
3 A a41 -	ne to oveid -	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
∠ ACTIO	ons to avoid s	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
Follow-up	p of STECF	recommendations		<u> </u>	
			Next year, the recommendation		
			from SGRN 10-01 could be left out		
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	since that is dealt with by the MS and COM.	Yes	No
		And the relevant of Lor recommendations iisted?	pre screen comment not relevant if	100	110
		Are the responsive actions described?	taken out	Yes	No
		The the responsive deterior described :	tanon out	. 00	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	tunon out	Yes	No

١٧

۷I

/III List of acronyms and abbreviations							
			Old Acronyms (e g PGNEPS, PGIPS)				
			on working groups				
			are used and should be updated next				
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	year.	Yes	No		
Х	IX. Comments, suggest	ions and reflections					
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?					
(X. References						
		Is there a complete list of references?					
(I	XI. Annexes						
	l de la companya de	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support					
		statements made in the main text?					

	STECF & DG MARE - Comments			EWG comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		
JRC/DG MARE	Fishing effort		-No nominal effort, effective effort by rectangle and landings by rectangle information submitted for vessels under 10 meters in length. -A CATCH: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 1237 records with no gear information, 237 with missing vessel length information and 2031 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types. -B_EFFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 26 records with no gear information, 59 with missing wesh length information and 2110 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types. -C_SPERICE FFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 20 records with no gear information, 48 with missing wessel length information and 3984 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types. -E_LANDINGS: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 58 records with no gear information, 1994 with missing vessel length information and 14962 records with missing mesh size information in synth missing wesh length information and 14962 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types.		
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: - Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital & investment - Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings - Recreational catches: catches	Landings value data significantly lower than Eurostat data Landings and effort data for 2011 (national and fleet segment levels) not provided Landings income data for 2011 not provided Only partial (energy consumption and fishing trips) effort data submitted - Forecast figures for 2011 were based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, as the latter was not provided during the data call	no evident explanation for failure;	MS asked to clarify why the missing data are not provided
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock in Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are no fishing in the arc, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13-69) "master stock table" indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.	
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock in Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are not fishing in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13.69) "master stock table" indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.	
ICES	Sprat in the Celtic Seas		Landings Age Landings Length Landings Weight Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio Discards Age Discards Age Discards Weight Discards Weight Discards Weight Discards Weight	According to MS NP 2011-2013, sprat was not selected for stock variables sampling. MS has no quota for this species in Celtic seas and national landings are given as none in NP.	
ICES	Cod in Division VIIe-k (Celtic Sea)		Landings Maturity	According to MS AR 2012, 367 fish were sampled for maturity@age parameter without mention if they were collected from landings or discards or both.	
ICES	Haddock in Divisions VIIb-k		Landings Maturity Discards Maturity	According to MS AR 2012, 209 fish were sampled for maturity@age parameter without mention if they were collected from landings or discards or both.	
ICES	Plaice in Divisions VIIf,g (Celtic Sea)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Commercial Fielets	According to MS AR 2012, 1377 fish were sampled for length@age and weight@length parameters, and 239 for maturity@age parameter. No mention if they were collected from landings or discards or both. For length distribution of discards, 2112 fish were measured for the different metiers.	
ICES	Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Muturity	According to MS AR 2012, 1334 fish were sampled for length@age and weight@length parameters, and 119 for maturity@age parameter. No mention if they were collected from landings or discards or both. For length distribution of discards, 4360 fish were measured for the different metiers.	
ICES	Spurdog (Squalus acanthias) in the Northeast Atlantic		Landings Maturity Discards Maturity	According to MS NP 2012, spurdog should be sampled for stock variables. AR 2012 did not provided any information on spurdog in III.E.3 table.	
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius budegassa) in Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b		Discards Weight Surveys at Sea	According to MS AR 2012, 1320 fish were measured. Enough to provide volumes estimates by metier or for the stock?	
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius) in		Discards Weight	According to MS AR 2012, 2268 fish were measured. Enough to provide volumes estimates by	
ICES	Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b Megrim (L. whiffiagonis) in Subarea VII & Divisions VIIIa,b,d,e		Surveys at Sea Landings Maturity	metier or for the stock ? According to MS AR 2012, 903 fish sampled for maturity @length parameter.	
ICES	Nephrops in Division VIIb,c,j,k		Discards Weight	In table III.C.6 of its AR 2012, MS states that 3260 individuals were measured for OTB_CRU_70-	
ICES	(Porcupine Bank, FU 16) Herring in the Northeast Atlantic (Norwegian spring-spawning herring)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sax Ratio	99_0 of discards and 2875 for OTB_DEF_100-119_0_0 discards. According to MS AR 2012, only unsorted catch are sampled on board industrial pelagic trawlers operating in Subareas I and II for metiers variables. No stock variables data collection on herring in these fishing areas were planned in MS NP 2011-2013. So information on discards are not collected.	
ICES	Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb, VIa,, VIIa-c, e-k, VIIIa-e (Western stock)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight	According to MS AR 2012, 2434 fish were measured. Enough to provide length distributions and discards volumes estimates by metier or for the stock? Data collection for updating stock variables parameters was carried out in 2012. Up to 2858 fish sampled, but no mention if they were collected from landings or discards or both.	
ICES	Blue whiting in Subareas I-IX, XII and XIV (Combined stock)	d	Landings Maturity	According to MS AR 2012, 1476 fish sampled for maturity @length parameter.	

 $[\]ensuremath{^*}$ For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

ivie	ambar Stata	lkel v		المحادرا	aont lavale
	ember State:	Reference year	2012	Compliance class	nent levels Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed	Text and Tables 31/05/2013	No	<10%
		Version of the NP proposal	Text and Tables 31/05/2013 Text and Tables Dec 2010	Partly	10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	XXX	Yes	>90%
		·	Į	NA	not applicable
I Genera	al framework				
		on organisation	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed ?
A Na	ational corresp	ondent and participating institutes Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles	B		140.
		well described?	Roles not well described	Mostly	MS to update text with roles
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?		Yes	No
		Are derogations listed?		Yes	No
D D-	!	If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?		Yes	No
B Re		ernational coordination e of international meetings			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?		Yes	No
			Only meetings attended are		L
			highlighted. Planned participation in	Mostly	MS to update table accordingly
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	non-attended meetings is not given		accordingly
B2	2 Follow-up	of regional and international recommendations			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed? Are the responsive actions described?		Yes Yes	No No
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	+	Yes Yes	No No
SUPRA	A-REGION Med	iterranean Sea and Black Sea		163	140
III Module	e of the evaluat	ion of the fishing sector ion of the fishing sector			
A Ge	eneral descripti	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP		V	N-
		implementation well described?		Yes	No
B Eco	conomic variab	Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?		Yes	No
2 200		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
			several segments are far too big to be		
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	clustered (e.g. DRB0612, PS0612, PS1218 etc.)	Mostly	No
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	1 31210 6(0.)	Yes	No
B1	1 Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes NA	No No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	+	NA NA	No No
B2	2 Data qualit	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?		Yes NA	No No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	+	NA NA	No No
В3	B Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations			*
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes NA	No No
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	+	NA NA	No No
В4	4 Actions to a	avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA NA	No No
REGIO	N MEDITERRA	NEAN & BLACK SEA		NA NA	I INU
		related variables			_
C4	1 Achiever	Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?		Yes	No
C1	ı Acnieveme	ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			MS to clarify 'NP' meaning. Sampling		
			strategy should be consistent and in		
			accordance to the guidelines i.e. MS		
			should specify whether concurrent sampling is at sea or market for all		
			metiers. Expected number of trips		
			were doubled. Some differences in		MC to under tell
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	numbers of trips found between NP	Yes	MS to update table according to the comments
		-	and AR tables III.C.3 : for GSAs 16,		to the confinents
			17 (metier FYK_DES_0_0_0 -		
			sampling frame DS17_8 disappeared		
			in the AR table). Number of trips operated by metier		
			MISC_LPF (sampling frame LP3)		
			missing.		
			MS to clarify 'NP' meaning. Two discrepancies between tables III.C.3		
			and III.C.4 found for sampling frames		MS to update table
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	DS9_4 and DS9_6 concerning	Yes	accordingly and provide
		•	numbers of trips really achieved for		information on discrepancies mentioned.
			metiers OTB_MDD_>40_0_0 and		ondonod.
			OTB_DWS_>40_0_0.		140.
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS is not required to include all species encountered during sample in	Yes	MS to clarify if planned targets are by GSA or
		.s . as.5 m.o.6 complete and consistent with All guidelines:	this table.		national level.
				Yes	No
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	+		
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			MS to adopt a more scientific
					presentation for usefull stock
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Mostly	presentation for usefull stock assessment issues and
					presentation for usefull stock

	Are the deviations explained?		Mostly	MS to explain poor consistency between targets planned for the different stocks and the effective numbers of fish measured (both oversampling or undersampling). MS did not mention if the general oversampling had consequences on the costs.
C2	Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Mostly	No
-	Were CV estimates provided?		Mostly	No
	Were CV targets met?		Partly	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
00	Are the deviations justified?		Mostly	MS to clarify resons for under- sampling especially related to how does seasonality interfere with sampling at landing site
C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			MS to clarify why pilot studies
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		Yes	were carried out after derogations were supposed to be granted ?
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	As written in the 2013 AR guidelines, only LM or RCM 2011 recommendations were references for 2012 ARs.	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
<u> </u>	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
C4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			MS to provide any actions to
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		No	avoid shortfalls required
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
	OTHER REGIONS - RFMO CECAF ogical metier related variables			
	Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?		Yes	MS requirements to be clearly specified, as no regional objectives were specified in NP technical tables. No request for derogation mentionned in MS' NP 2011-2013.
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Г		Commission / RCM LDF
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables.	No	should liase with MS regarding its obligations to sample in other regions
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables.	No	No
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No information provided on CECAF stocks targeted by MS vessels, neither in NP nor AR tables.	No	No
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No information provided on catches of CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables.	No	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No quantitative information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2012 AR.	No	No
	Are the deviations explained?	MS is waiting international agreements about sampling UE vessels operating in CECAF area.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Italian proposal and achievement (equal to 0) to be compared with Spanish and Portuguese ones.	No	No
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	<u> </u>	NIA	N ₀
	Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?		NA NA	No No
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?		No	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
C4	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls		Yes	No
U- 4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Mostly	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Mostly	Commission is requested to solve this ongoing issue with
Region M	editerranean and Black Sea			the MS
	eational fisheries			
	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?		NA	No
D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Г	Yes	No
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?		NA NA	No
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
D2	Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		NA	No

MS to explain poor

Were data quality targets provided?

Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls D4

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA

Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations E3

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

		MS should provide more
1	No	detailed information on
		achieved sampling
	NA	No
•	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
•		-
	NA	No
•	NA	No

Table properly filled. In the text, Ms reported that biological sampling was conducted separately for each Geographical sub-areas (GSA). EWG considered that the approach reported in Table III.E.2 is at GSA level (no need to modify the NP if the geographical scale remain the same), for the future MS should better clarify this approach also in the tables. MS to clarify if the sampling strategies between NP national objectives and AR follow the GSA. Regarding sharks due to the fact that are under recovery plan and that there is a monitoring plan for bycatch (see Marine Strategy issues) MS should continue when possible monitoring sharks species.	Yes	No
Table difficult to evaluate regarding NP objectives as AR results are not provided at the same scale (i.e. all GSA in the NP, each single GSA reported in the AR). Low achievement rates (around 50% only) registered for GSA 9 and 11 (why ?). MS to clarify its sampling strategies between NP national objectives and AR GSA achievements.	Mostly	Yes. In the next AR MS should clarify its sampling strategies between NP national objectives and AR GSA achievements
Mostly. MS states in its AR that oversampling has not financial effect on foreseen NP budget.	Yes	No
Italy is a MS whose fisheries cover several GSAs. MS accepts endly to plan its protocoles on a GSA basis for stock assesments purposes as GFCM and RCM promote this issue. MS should review the number of fish to be sampled (by GSA) in future NP	Yes	Yes. MS should review the number of fish to be sampled (by GSA) in future NP (i.e. column "Achieved No of individuals at a national level")
Variable and the second of the		

Yes, when numbers of fish measured were consistant to estimate CVs, i.e for around of 75% of parameters updated. CVs are provided by stock at GSA level.	Yes	No
CVs were estimated by stock at GSA level. Precision target is reached only for around 25% of the relationships updated.	Partly	No
Yes but only for some species. No comment on providing good data by GSA. Note that a specific chapter III.E.5 in AR compiles information on eel sampling (but without planned objectives in tables III.E.3).	Mostly	No
Italy is a MS whose fisheries cover several GSAs. MS accepts endly to plan its protocoles on a GSA basis for stock assesments purposes as GFCM and RCM promote this issue. MS should review the number of fish to be sampled (by GSA) in future NP	Yes	Yes. MS should review the number of fish to be sampled (by GSA) in future NP (i.e. column "Achieved No of individuals at a national level")

Yes in section 1. Five derogations concerning section III.C were listed in MS' AR.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? **REGION OTHER REGIONS - RFMO CECAF**

Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations E3

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

F1 Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Effort

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Landings

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Research surveys at sea G1

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

	Yes	No
No shortfall raised by MS	NA	No
	NΙΛ	No

No information provided on CECAF		
metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables.	NA	Yes. MS should prove that a
MS should prove that a derogation	107	derogation was accepted
was accepted		
No information provided in AR 2012.		
MS states it asked for a derogation for		Vac MS should prove that a
biological sampling in CECAF area	NA	Yes. MS should prove that a derogation was accepted
but no information is provided on the		delogation was accepted
finally grant or not.		
	NA	NA
	NA	NA
	NA	NA
	NA	NA
	NA NA	NA NA
	INA	INA
	No	Yes. MS should prove that a
		derogation was accepted
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
No shoutfall raise division	NIA.	NIA .
No shortfall raised by MS	NA NA	NA NA
	INA	INA
i	Yes	No
	163	110
"Other regions" is not in the NP. The		
fleet segments are aggregated in the		
NP (19 lines in total table) but splitted		
in the AR (195 lines in total table).	Mostly	No
This makes the camparison more	iviosity	NO
difficult. This is allowed according to		
food note a) in NP.		
1000 flote a) iii NF.		
	No	No
	Yes	No
No shortfalls. Census data	Yes	No
The energianer correde data	Yes	No
"Other regions" is not in the NP.	Mostly	No
No	No	No
	Yes	No
	No	No
	No	No
	Yes	No
•		117
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
T T	V	NI-
	Yes Yes	No No
	168	INU
"Other regions" is not in the NP.	Mostly	No
	No	No
	No	No
No CV is calculated in 19 cases		MS should calculate CV in
despite a low sampling achivement for	Partly	those cases
sampling type "B".		
	No	MS should provide
		explanations
Not possible to judge on missing CVs		•
Not possible to judge on missing CVs		
Not possible to judge on missing CVs	Yes	No
Not possible to judge on missing CVs	Yes Yes	No No
Not possible to judge on missing CVs		
Not possible to judge on missing CVs	Yes Yes	No No
Not possible to judge on missing CVs	Yes Yes Yes	No No
Not possible to judge on missing CVs	Yes Yes	No No
Not possible to judge on missing CVs	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No
Not possible to judge on missing CVs	Yes Yes Yes	No No

	Are design and achievements consistent with the ND proposal?	There are inconsistencies between the report text and the table in respect of the percentages and with the NP	Moothy	To be placified by MS
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	regarding the planned number of days and hauls. The hydroacoustic coverage seems to be too low with 200nm for a 60 day survey.	Mostly	To be clarified by MS.
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Maps are not mentioned in the table III.G.1 but are reported in the text under Annex 1 and in the chapter of the survey. For next year, maps should go into the text according to the guidelines.	Mostly	No
G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	trie guidelines.		
	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in		Yes	No
	gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?			NO
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	
G3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		IVA	<u> </u>
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
G4	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls		Yes	No
G4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		NA	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	
	of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing indu	stry		
A Colle	ction of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?		Yes	No
	13 AIC CONSISTENCE WITH CADIC TV.A.T:		163	140
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No data about Achieved no.sample and so no indicators could be given.	Partly	MS needs to resubmit table
A 1	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	no information provided on indicators	No	MS needs to resubmit table
A1	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
••	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	lack of information about the quality of		MS needs to provide quality
	Is respective data quality information given?	data	no	information
	Are the deviations explained?		yes	
	Are the deviations justified?	it is unclear why data are not already	no	MS should justify deviations.
А3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	processed		
7.0	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	
	Are the responsive actions described?		NA	
A4	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls		NA	
A4	Actions to avoid shortians			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	no information about actions to avoid shortfalls regarding achieved no.sample and data quality	Mostly	MS should clarify the issue regarding achieved no.sample and data quality
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	see comment above	Mostly	In the future MS should provide the quality information
B Colle	ction of data concerning the processing industry	Looking at table N/D 2 T		
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Looking at table IV.B.2, no only Type "B" is used, also "A", should be reflected in table IV.B.1. By the way: Exactly the same content as in AR 2011.	Mostly	MS should clarify the issue about the type of data collection scheme
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	For some variables data are collected	Mostly	MS to justify low response rate.
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?		Yes Yes	No No
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No No
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	CV missing No, MS explains a deviation	Partly	MS needs to clarify the quality information
	Are the deviations explained?	concerning non-main activity enterprises, but this should be done under B1.	no	MS need to explain deviation
	Are the deviations justified?		no	
В3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		NIA.	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	
В4	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	no information about actions to avoid shortfalls regarding data quality	Partly	MS should clarify the issue regarding data quality
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	see comment above	No	In the future MS should provide the quality
	f evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			information
1 Achie	everents: Results and deviation from NP proposal		yes	Ma
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?		Yes NA	No
2 Action	ns to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		NA	

I۷

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA NA	
VI	Module for management and use of the data			
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		yes	
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP			
	proposal?	see general comment SG3	Yes	No
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	· ·	Yes	No
	Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?		Yes	No
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
VII	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		yes	
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
VIII	List of acronyms and abbreviations			
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?		1	
IX	IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections		_	
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?		1	
Х	X. References		-	
	Is there a complete list of references?		1	
ΧI	XI. Annexes		_	
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support		1	
	statements made in the main text?		1	
		_	_	

	STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment Action needed by MS, please specify to		
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		
IRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: • Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital & investment • Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings • Recreational catches: catches	- Landings and effort data (for total and fleet segment levels) for 2011 not provided - No capacity and effort data for 2011 provided - Capacity data for 2012 not submitted - Landings income data for 2011 not provided - Financial position value for national fleet for 2010 and investment data for any of the years requested not submitted - Forecast figures for 2011 were based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, as	no evident explanation for failure; delivery of 2012 data not mandatory	MS to provide missing data available through the DCF
IRC/DG MARE	Mediterranean & Black Sea	Fisheries' specific landings and discards by species, fishing effort and surveys' data for the years 2008-2012	the latter was not provided during the data call - No fishing activity data for the period 2002 - 2005 MEDITS 2012 was not submitted, no MEDITS data from GSA 17 for 1994-2001, major gaps in MEDITS T1 and T0 tables Echo survey for 2012 not submitted Discards data for the years 2007 and 2008 were missing for all GSAs.	Regarding Medits and MEDIAS 2012, may be MS followed the output of the RCM Med& BS 2012: "RCMMed&BS, recalling its 2011 recommendation and also the STECF EWG 11-20 recommendation on a harmonized time period required for data to be available for transmission to end-users, recommends that the time period of 6 months following the end of the collection of transversal and biological data is respected by the data calls and the end users." Regarding discards: for some met selected, data should be available and MS should send it. Missing effort data and discards data should be aware that under each National Programme under Module III.6 "Researds Stards and S	er f 6 a d
RC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: Income Personal costs Personal costs Raw materia costs Capital costs Capital costs Capital costs Capital costs Estraordinary costs Capital cost Personal costs Capital cost Capital volue Net investments Debt Raw material volume Total volume Total volume Employment	- The data covered most of the parameters and was provided by segments: employment in full time equivalent and number of enterprises were missing (see also Table 3.3.1 coverage by segments groups). However, turnover and volume of sales were different in the economic data and the production data sheets, where the segment total also did not equate to the national total. The production volume provided with economic data only covered 24% of the national total. Explanation for this discrepancy was inquired from MS but not calification was provided. - For DCF data, the following parameters were not submitted: Employment in FTE, Employment in Male FTE, Employment in Female FTE, Number of enterprises by size category	provide justification for not sampling certain métiers. This justification could be based in the discar In AR 2011 text MS stated: "Parameters in table IV.A.3 are not yet available because we are still in the phase of data collection and validation of primary data. Only at the end of this steps, accuracy indicators will be calculated." But nothing has been said about not having for specific parameters.	MS to provide missing data available through the DCF
SFCM	GFCM - Task 1.3	Number of enterprises Segment: Engine power Employment Salary share % Landing weight Landing value Vessel value of total fleet Working days/year per vessel Working hours/days per vessel Variable cost of fishing/days per vessel % of V.C. from fuel costs '*Vearly fixed costs per vessel	Segment: • Yearly fixed costs per vessel - not provided		
FCM	GFCM - Task 1.4	* Tearry Trade Costs per vessel GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: • Effort measure • Catch or Landing • CPUE/RPUE • Discard • Bycatch GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: • Catch or Landing • CPUE/RPUE	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: • CPUE/LPUE - not provided • Discard - not provided • Bycatch - not provided GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: • CPUE/LPUE - not provided	According to AR 2012, MS collected data on discards by metiers for many species. Without more information on deficiencies by stocks, it is not possible to assess further GFCM request.	MS to provide missing data available through the DCF
FCM	GFCM - Task 1.5	CREATURE SAN-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: Length range of captured species Length average Sex Maturity	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: - Length range of captured species - only partially provided - Length average - only partially provided - Sex - only partially provided - Sex - only partially provided - Maturity - not provided	Information provided by GFCM not enough precise to be examined. Which species/stocks? Which metiers?	MS to provide missing data available through the DCF

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

Member State: Judgement levels Reference vear 2013 Compliance class Compliance level Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal Partly 10-50% **EWG Answer** Mostly 50-90% Overall compliance Yes >90% NA not applicable General framework National data collection organisation **EWG COMMENTS** EWG judgement **EWG** National correspondent and participating institutes Action needed? Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles Yes Nο well described? Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings? MS to provide list of Nο Are derogations listed? derogations If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines? No Nο Regional and International coordination Attendance of international meetings MS to update table with all Partly Is Table II.B.1 complete? eliaible meetinas MS to provide reasons for nor No Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained? attendance B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations MS to provide relevant 2011 No LM general recommendations Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? No SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector General description of the fishing sector Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP No implementation well described? Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? Yes No Economic variables No Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes Nο Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? No Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal R1 description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs should No be reported under chapter III.B.1 in the text and not under III.B.2. Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? NA Nο Are the deviations justified? Νo R2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal No Is respective data quality information given? Yes Nο Are the deviations explained? No Are the deviations justified? NA No Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations **B3** Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Yes No Are the responsive actions described? NΑ No Are the responsive actions acceptable? NA No В4 Actions to avoid shortfalls No Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? NA No Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? NA No SUPRA-REGION Other regions Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector General description of the fishing sector Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described? Yes No Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? **Economic variables** Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes Nο Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes No Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? R1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs should Mostly No be reported under chapter III.B.1 in the text and not under III B 2 Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? NA Nο Are the deviations justified? NA No B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Yes No NA No Are the deviations justified? NA No B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Yes Nο Are the responsive actions described? NA No Are the responsive actions acceptable? NΑ No Actions to avoid shortfalls B4 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? NA No Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? No **Region Baltic** Biological metier related variables Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? Yes Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes No

Single III C. Complete and consequent with A greatered New York					
In Table III.C Complete and conserver with AR guideliner? As copy and and affairments considered with Park Propriets 2 As copy and affairments considered with Park Propriets 2 As copy and affairments considered with Park Propriets 2 As copy and affairments and deviation from NP proposal CS Pollute Propriets and considered recommendations Need to recommendations Nee		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
In the Table III. Co. caregives and conductors with ARP guidalness? An elling and submissioner consistent with the Poli proposal? An in the destination guidalness? C. District guidalness and the Co. Caregives and the Poli proposal? An in the destination guidalness? C. Toflow-up of Regional and international recommendations When C' is larger under the Co. Caregives and the Co. Caregives and the Co. Caregives and consistent with ARP guidalness? C. Toflow-up of Regional and international recommendations C. Toflow-up of Regional and international recommendations An international and international recommendations C. Biological medier related variables are fasted and consistent and an international recommendations C. Biological medier related variables are fasted and consistent and an international recommendations C. Biological medier related variables In Training III. Co. complete and ovalidation and in Co. Caregives and ovalidations and international and internat		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Mostly	No
And design, and achievement estable with perspectal form of the proposal form of the perspectation of the perspect		Is Table III C.S. complete and consistent with AP avidelines?		Mostly	
As De Co-Charlom Coparisons (1997) Co Date quality: Results and devidend from MP proposal Visc CV galantees provided? Visc CV galantees provided? As The individual part of the charlom of the provided of the charlom of the charl				Yes	No
Diss quality, Results and deviation from NP proposal Very EX CV estimates (Very CV estimates) An Po dissage significant An Po dissage significant Very EX CV estimates (Very EX CV estimates) An Po dissage significant Very EX CV estimates (Very EX CV estimates) Very EX CV estimates (Very EX CV					
Was Col Supplies and Control of Supplies and Control o				Yes	No
Witer CV pages med Musey No.	C2			The state of the s	I
As the devictions appliated? GS Followers (in the interview) experience (in the interview) expe					
An It is desired to global and information concentrations. Call Following of Regional and information recommendations. And It is relevant recommendation for LUS lates? And It is relevant recommendation for the US lates? And a finish and a state of the Concentration of the Conce					
Follow-up of Regional and International recommendations where the relevant designation issued: Are the responses actions designed: Are the responses actions designed: Are the responses actions designed: Are success and with the following of					
Wee the relevant engagement such as factors that Unitation 1955 1950 1950 1950 1950 1950 1950 1950	C3			100	110
As the interpropose accorpation? As earthor to avoid shorted in the future decorbed? As earthor to avoid shorted in the future decorbed? As earthor to avoid shorted in the future decorbed? As earthor to avoid shorted in the future decorbed? C I acclosed to avoid shorted in the future decorbed? C I acclosed to avoid and doubtion from NP proposal C I Acclosed to avoid and doubtion from NP proposal L I Table III. C 6 compilete and consistent with AR guidelines? As the future of the future of the future decorbed in the future decorbed in the future decorbed in the future decorporate in t				No	No
Are the response actions accordance? C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are action to avoid shortfalls C5 Actions to avoid shortfalls C6 Actions to avoid shortfalls C7 Actions to avoid shortfalls C8 Table III.C. Complete and consister with AR guidelines? Are action to avoid shortfalls Are action to avoid shortfalls Are a consister and Are guidelines? Are the extensions equitaries? C6 Data qualified. C7 Data qualified. C8 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are the extensions equitaries? Are the extensions equitaries and extensions? Are the extensions extensions and extensions and extensions? Are the extensions extensions and extensions? Are the extensions extensio					
Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Region North Albated. Comparison of the future described of the future described? Comparison of the future described of the future described? In Table III. Comparison of consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III. Comparison of consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III. Comparison of consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III. Comparison of consistent with AR guidelines? An experison of the future described of the fut					
Are actions to any day fortigation in the future described? Region Natural Assumes. C Biological meter rolated variables C1 Anchorements: Results and deviation from NP proposal In Table III.C & complete and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.C & complete and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.C & complete and consistent with AR guidelines? In Table III.C & complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and archivements: consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and consistent with the NP proposal Are design and consistent with the NP proposal Are design and consistent with the NP proposal Are designed to accommendations Are the deviations expanses? Are the deviation of the future decribed? Are expanses to avoid shortfalls in the future decribed? Are expanses to avoid shortfalls in the future decribed? Are deviated to avoid shortfalls in the future decribed? Are the deviation expanses and the future decribed	0.4			Yes	No
Region from National Authority Complete and contention from NP proposal In Table III.C 2 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 2 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 2 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 2 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 2 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 2 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 2 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 2 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 2 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 3 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 3 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 3 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 3 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 3 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 3 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 3 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 3 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 3 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 3 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 4 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 5 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 5 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 5 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 5 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 5 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 5 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 5 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 5 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 5 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 5 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 5 complete and contention with All guidelines? In Table III.C 5 complete and contention with All g	C4			IVoo	No
Region both Alamies Coll Adviserer radied variables Coll Adviserer radied variables Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the divisions signification West CV targets mer? Are the divisions explained? Are the divisions explained from the proposal The third explained the explained explained the explained explained the explained expla					
Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III. C. Scorpiete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III. C. Scorpiete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III. C. Scorpiete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III. C. Scorpiete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the division of the proposal Vers CV estimates provided? Are the division from NP proposal Vers CV estimates provided? Are the division of regional and international recommendations Vers of estimate and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the division of regional and international recommendations Vers of estimates and estimates and estimates are the AR guidelines? Are the esporates actions devokable? Are actions to smooth estimates in the Area acceptable? C. Actions are the esporates actions devokable? Is Table III. C. 3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III. C. 4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III. C. 5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Actions are the esporate actions devokable? Is Table III. C. 5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are divisions to moid shortfalls in the Area acceptable? Are divisions to moid shortfalls in the Area acceptable? Actions are the esporate actions acceptable? Action of the actions to moid shortfalls in the Area acceptable? Action of the actions to moid shortfalls in the Area acceptable? Action of the action of the action of the Area acceptable?	Region N			1.00	1.10
Is Table III.C comprise and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C comprise and consistent with AR guidelines? Are deepen and software consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations and deviation from NP proposal Very CV existing spirities? Are the deviations is guidelines? Are the deviations is guidelines? Are the responsible addition from LM listed? Are the responsible accommendations in the LM listed? Are the responsible accommendations in the LM listed? A school to a void shortfalls. A school to accommendation of the LM listed? A school to accommendation of th		Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is Table III.C 6 complex and consistent with AR guidelines? All table III.C 6 complex and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the developments consistent with the NP proposal? Are the developments consistent with the NP proposal? Vers. Vers. No. 1					
Is Table III.C.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? An decoration particular consistent with the NP proposal? An the deviations justified? An the resolvent recommendations An the resolvent recommendations from Milester? An the resolvent recommendations from Milester? And the resolvent recommendations from Milester? An extens to nevel abortalis in the future described? Yes No. An extens to nevel abortalis in the future described? Yes No. C1 Actions to avoid shortalis in the future exceptable? C2 Actions to avoid shortalis in the future exceptable? An extens to nevel abortalis in the future exceptable? An extens to nevel abortalis in the future exceptable? An extens to nevel abortalis in the future exceptable? An extens to except abortalis in the future exceptable? An extens to except abortalis in the future exceptable? An extens to except abortalis in the future exceptable? An extens to except abortalis in the future exceptable? An extension to except abortalis in the future exceptable? An extension to except abortalis in the future exceptable? An extension to except abortalis in the future exceptable? An extension to except abortalis in the future exceptable? An extension to except abortalis in the future exceptable? An extension to except abortalis in the future exceptable? An extension to except abortalis in the future exceptable? An extension to except abortalis in the future exceptable? An extension to except abortalis in the future exceptable? And the deviation explanate? And the deviation explanate? And the deviation explanate? And the requirement extension to exceptable? An					
Is Table III.C 8 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? And begins and achievements consistent with AR puidelines? And begins and achievements and consistent with AR guidelines? As the deviations explained? As the deviations explained? As the deviations explained? As the deviations explained? As the deviations provided? Pyes. No. 15. Table III.C 3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? As the responsible and consistent with AR		is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Mostly	
And design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations enginities? Very Data quality. Routist and deviation from NP proposal Were CV stargets med? Were CV stargets med? Were CV stargets med? Were DV stargets med? And the deviational encommendations Were the release active accordance accordanc		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Mostly	
And the deviations politioned? As the deviations patient with Pyroposal Ware CV staff that patient with Pyroposal Ware CV staff that proposal Ware CV staff that patient with Pyroposal Ware CV staff that patient with Pyroposal Ware CV staff that patient with Pyroposal And the deviations explained? And the represent derrogations issent? And the represent derrogations issent? And the represent derrogations issent with Pyroposal And the represent derrogations issent with Pyroposal And the represent derrogations is the future described? And actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Region Other CECAF Region Client Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? And the deviations explained? And the deviation acceptable of the proposal And the deviation from MP proposal And the deviation explained? And the de				Mostly	No
Date quality, Revolts and deviation from NP proposal Were CV stages mer? Were CV stages mer? Were DV stages mer? Were DV stages mer? Were DV stages mer? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant decogations isted? And the relevant ecommendations from LM isted? And the relevant ecommendations from LM isted? And the relevant ecommendations from LM isted? And actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? And actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Press No. Monute CV Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Action to Revolution of the future described? Action to Revolution of		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
Were CV setantes provided? And the divisionis engineed? And the relevant decorpositionis issee? And the relevant ecomenistations from LM issee? And the responsive actions acceptable? And the responsive actions acceptable? And entire second shortfalls in the future described? And the responsive actions acceptable? And entire second shortfalls in the future described? And entire second shortfalls in the future acceptable? Region. Other. CECA.* An entire second shortfall is the future acceptable? An entire second shortfall is the future acceptable? An entire second shortfall is the future acceptable? An entire second second second with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? An entire second second second second with AR guidelines? An entire second second second with the NP proposal? An the deviations explained? An the deviations explained? An the deviations explained? An the deviation explained? An explained section and consistent with the NP proposal? An the deviation explained? An explained sec		•		Yes	No
Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant exponentiations from LM listed? Are the relevant exponentiations from LM listed? Are the relevant exponentiations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? C5 Biological metric related variables C6 In Table III.C3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? And the vertical actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the explainable of the future described? Are the explainable of the future described? Are the explainable of the future described? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant explained actions and the future described? Are the relevant explained? Are the relevant explained and the future described? Are the relevant explained accommendations. Are the relevant explained? Are the relevant explained accommendations. Are the relevant explained? Are the relevant explained? Are the relevant explained? Are the	C2			lV ₂₂	INIo
As the deviations explained? As the deviations patified? As the desponal and internationacommendations As the responsive actions described? As the responsive actions accordance of the factor of the state of the responsive actions accordance of the state accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As the responsive action of the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordance? As actions to avoid abortalis in the future accordanc					
As the deviations justified? C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant decognition titled? As the the responsive actions acceptable? C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? As a chairs to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? C5 Biological marter related variables C6 Biological marter related variables C7 Table III.C3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? As a facilists to avoid shortfall in the future acceptable? C8 Biological marter related variables C9 Biological marter related variables Active exemption of the complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Active exemption of the multi-stear of gasternative acceptable of the mu					
Policy of Regional and international recommendations No					
Are the relovant recommendations from LM island? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions described? As the the responsive actions described? As the the responsive actions described? Actions to an old with the responsive actions described? Actions to a void shortfalls in the future acceptable? Region Other; CECAF C Biological metter related variables C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III. C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III. C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III. C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III. C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III. C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III. C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III. C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III. C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III. C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III. C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? An deeling in a deviewments consistent with AR guidelines? An deeling in a deviewment with AR guidelines? An deeling in a deviewment with AR guidelines? An deeling in a deviewment with the NP proposal? An deeling in a deviewment with the NP proposal? An deeling in the deviations is patient? An deeling in the deviations is patient? An the relevant deviation from NP proposal Were CV agreet mere from NP proposal An the relevant deveragations is lated? An the relevant devera	C3			1	1.55
Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Assignment and acceptable? Region Other: CECAF C Biological matter related variables C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal In Table III.C 3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C 3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C 4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C 5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C 5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? And of the deviation spalaned? Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions explained? And a No. Are the responsive actions explained? Are the responsive actions explained? Are the responsive actions explained? And a No. Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?					
As the responsive actions acceptable? A actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Region Other; CECA first actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? C Biological metier related variables C I Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? As design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? As design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviation explained? Are sections to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Ar					
Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Region Other, CECAF C Biological metier related variables C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? As the deviation explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pointed? Are the relevant encompactions time? Are the deviations explained? Are					
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Region Other; CECAF Region Other; CECAF Region Other; CECAF Region Other; CECAF C Biological matter related variables C 1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Mostly M	C4			Yes	No
Region Other; CECAF C Biological metter related variables C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal S1 to amend MS Secretary	04			Yes	No
Region Other; CECAF C Biological metier rotated variables C1 Achievements; Results and deviation from NP proposal MS to amend 1MS participating in sampling to offect the multi-lateral participating in sampling to offect the multi-lateral displacements. Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? MS to amend 1MS participating in sampling to reflect the multi-lateral agreements. MS to amend 1MS participating in sampling to reflect the multi-lateral agreements. MS to amend 1MS participating in sampling to reflect the multi-lateral agreement present; some sampling frames are missing MS to identify which MS is reporting achieved sampling when there are multi-lateral agreement present; some sampling frames are missing MS to identify which MS is reporting achieved sampling when there are multi-lateral agreements. Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Mostly participating in sampling to reflect the multi-lateral agreements. Mostly participating in sampling to reflect the multi-lateral agreements. Mostly participating in sampling to reflect the multi-lateral agreement present. MS to dentify which MS is reporting achieved sampling when there are multi-lateral agreement present. MS to identify which MS is reporting achieved sampling of reflect the multi-lateral agreement present. MS to identify which MS is reporting achieved sampling of reflect the multi-lateral agreement present. MS to identify which MS is reporting achieved sampling when there are multi-lateral agreements. No Mostly Regional and advantage and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? No Mostly Regional and advantage and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? No Mostly Regional and international recommendations. Were the relevant decognitions isself? No Mostly Regional and international recommendations are responsible? No Mostly Regional and international recommendations are responsible? No Mostly Regional and international recommendations are responsible? No Mostly Regional and internat					
Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Mostly Mo	C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Mostly Mostly		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Mostly	agreement present. MS to identify which MS is reporting achieved sampling when there are multi-lateral
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations publified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations publified? NA NO No Proposal NA NO NO The deviations publified? NA NO Are the deviations publified? NA NO Are the deviations publified? NA NO NO C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant publified? NO Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? NO Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO N				Mostly	participating in sampling' to reflect the multi-lateral agreement present; some sampling frames are missing MS to identify which MS is reporting achieved sampling when there are multi-lateral
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? MS to amend *MS participating in sampling to reflect the multi-lateral agreement present. MS to identify which MS is reporting achieved sampling when there are multi-lateral agreements. Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? NA NO C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? NA NO C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? NA NO		is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Mostly	MS to amend 'MS participating in sampling' to
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with he NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations paylained? Are the relevant recommendations Were CV targest mer? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? NA No INA NO		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			agreement present MS to amend 'MS participating in sampling' to
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Rollow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? NA No		Is Table III C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Mostly	identify which MS is reporting achieved sampling when there are multi-lateral
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? NA NO N				NA	
Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? NA NO Roo NO Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? NA NO		Are the deviations explained?			
Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? No				NA	
Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO N	C2		<u> </u>	1	T
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? No No No No No No No No No N					
Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? No No No No No No No No No N					
C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? No No NA No No No No No No No					
Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? No No No No No No No No No N	C3			1	j o
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? No No No No No No No No No N		Were the relevant derogations listed?		No	No
Are the responsive actions acceptable? Yes No Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? No No No No No No No		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? No No No No					
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? NA No No	^ 4			Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? NA No	C4			NΔ	
				•	-

D Recreational fisheries

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are obtained derogations mentioned?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?

Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Baltic

Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? MS says

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Atlantic Biological stock-related variables

F1

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

	NA	No
	INA	140
		MS to clarify the situation on
	Month	the sharks recreational
	Mostly	fishery; MS to provide the
		results for the cod pilot survey
		, ,
	Yes	MS to provide list of
		derogations in Section 1
	No	No
	NA	No
		MS to identify if exhaustive
	No	coverage provided good
		qualikty of the data
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
		INC to more ide tiet of
1	Yes	MS to provide list of
		derogations in Section 1
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	•	
	No	No
	NA	No
	•	
Yes	Yes	No
Sampling of whitefish not planned in	Yes	Yes, MS to explain additional
NP.	100	sampling of whitefish
No salmon sampling of parr and smolt		
due to environmental conditions		
troubles (high water level). Over and		
under sampling occured of almost all	Mostly	No
variables. Some variables not		
sampled at all		
sampled at all		
Mostly, information about eel and pike	Manth	MS to clarify lack of eel and
perch is missing	Mostly	pike-perch variables
Yes	Yes	No
	1.00	1
Yes	Yes	No
For approx one third of the		
stocks*parameters	Mostly	No
Yes	Yes	No
Tes	162	INO
Yes, there are many explanations but		
it comes down to that the required		
precision levels sometimes cannot be	Yes	No
reached without substantially	1	
•		
increasing sampling and costs		
No derogations exist for Latvia	NA	No
Yes	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
	. 55	
MS says that possible cooperation		MS shall describe results of
about age reading task sharing has	Mostly	discussion with other MS's to
	1,	
been discussed during 2012		Isnare a tasks in age reaging
been discussed during 2012.		share a tasks in age reading.

Inconsistencies between NP and AR.	<u> </u>	1
Inconsistencies between NP and AK. In accordance with NP MS should sample biological parameters for redfish (2 fishing grounds) and Pandalus. In the AR there are only two rows (one with no results) and the only variable is length. MS says that otolits have been collected but not read. In NP age variables not included in III.E.3 but in IIIE.2.	No	MS to clarify differences between NP. and AR
Partly. Lengths of sebastes spp are sampled in excess, the rest of the plans have disappeared (see above)	Partly	MS to clarify differences between NP. and AR
Only in case of Pandalus	Partly	MS to explain lack of planned redfish variables
Jutified in case of Pandalus	Partly	see comment above
V /t thin-d	lv	Ist.
Yes (for the single parameter left)	Yes	No
No (despite excess sampling)	No	No
No	No	Yes, provide an explanation about data quality and how to reach precision level

Yes

Yes

NA

Yes adopt to a decrasing fleet

NA

No

No

Νo

F3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations I

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Other; CECAF

Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified? F3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

F2 Effort

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Recommendations from the RCM are		
listed. MS should not list recommendations which is not relevant for the MS	Yes	No
relevant for the MS		
Yes	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No

Unclear if Latvia is taking a steps to find a partner for task sharing	Partly	MS should describe steps made for sharing task about redfish age reading
NA	NA	No

Achieved samples are not included in table. Inconsistencies between NP and AR. In accordance with NP MS should sample biological parameters (maturity, weight, sex-ratio) for 7 species. These rows are deleted in the AR. Instead only variable is length and the number of species is 5.	No	Provide full explanations about CECAF sampling and multilateral agreement. MS to put also abbreviation of countries participated in sampling
The achievements are unclear since they are not included in the tables. In the AR from NL which is involved in the joint sampling scheme was fishery terminated implying that sampling targets could not be reached. Most parameters undersampled. This is not mentioned in the LV report.	Partly	Explain who is responsible for submitting a data in AR. From the agrrement it cannot be deducted MS either need to present achivements or make a reference to NL AR.
Cannot deduct from AR since data is missing	NA	No
see above	NA	No
		No
see above	NA	No
No derogations listed	NA	No
Yes, all relevant recommendations are listed	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No

		MS shall correct the table
Table was completed taking into account also the SGRN2010 recommendation, thus is not in accordance with the guidelines given also has the information coming from Table III.B.3	Yes	deleting lines from table III.B.3. Though the way it is, the table is in accordance with SGRN Rec, it's not in accordance with the guidelines that hadn't integreted that recommendation.

163	INU	
Yes	No	
Yes	No	
Yes	No	
Yes	No	

NIa

Voc

Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No

Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
Vaa	NI-
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Nο Yes Are the responsive actions described? Yes Nο Are the responsive actions acceptable? No Yes F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Yes No Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Yes No Research surveys at sea G Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal G1 Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Only for the BITS in the fourth quarte there were some minors problems in the achieved number of targets. Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Yes No Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Yes Are the deviations explained? Yes No Are the deviations justified? Yes Ŋς G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations No regional and international Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? recommendations NA Nο Are the responsive actions described? NA No Are the responsive actions acceptable? G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls The text "any shortfall Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? could be noted " is not informat NΑ Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? NA No Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry Collection of data concerning the aquaculture Derogation - collection of data NA No Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? concerning the aquaculture Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? NA Νo Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? NA No Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Yes Nο Are the deviations explained? Yes Are the deviations justified? Yes No Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal A2 Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? No Are the deviations justified? NA Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? NA Νo Are the responsive actions described ? NA Are the responsive actions acceptable? NA No Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? NΑ Nο Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? NA No Collection of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes Nο Yes No Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal MS planned probability sampling, but conducted Census for all enterprises This is an improvement. According to table.IV.B.1 for all segment the MS should clarify achieved sample rate is 100%, but contradiction in sample and specific data for the 11-49 segment response rate for segment 11 show respond rates under 100% and Mostly 49 and explain the differences archieved sample rates also clearly in achieved sample rates and below 100%. MS should clarify this respond rates for the other contradiction and also explain the segment. differences in achieved sample rates and respond rates for the other segment. Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? MS should explained the MS does not mention the issue No Are the deviations explained? deviations MS should explained the MS does not mention the issue No Are the deviations justified? issue Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Yes MS should explained the MS does not mention the issue No Are the deviations explained? deviations MS should explained the MS does not mention the issue No Are the deviations justified? ssue ВЗ Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Yes Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Yes Actions to avoid shortfalls MS should provide actions to No Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? avoid shortfalls MS should justify actions to Nο Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? avoid shortfalls Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem 1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? NA Νo 2 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? NA

1 Achievements:	Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	to rable vi. i complete and consistent with vit guidelines.	For next year; only put in single	163	140
		species if that		
		is what is done. E g only cod was		
		reported to be uploaded to DATRAS		
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP	while there are several species		
	proposal?	uploaded in DATRAS.	Yes	No
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	upidaded III DATRAS.	Yes	No
	is progress in the inianagement of data section well detailed?	Information provided but no	165	140
	Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A) ?	website is up running	Yes	No
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	website is up furifiling	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
			Yes	No
2 Actions to avoid	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	NO
2 Actions to avoid	I SNORTAIIS	No about the defined in this		
		No shortfalls defined in this		l
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	section	NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
Follow-up of STEC	F recommendations			
		For next year, only include		
		the last years of relevant		
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	recommendations	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
List of acronyms a			_	
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?		1	
IX. Comments, sug	gestions and reflections		<u>_</u>	
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?			
X. References			<u>-</u>	
	Is there a complete list of references?		1	
XI. Annexes			_	
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support			
	statements made in the main text?		1	
		·		

VII

VIII IX X XI

STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment			
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		Action needed by MS, please specify task
JRC/DG MARE	Fishing effort	A_CATCH: STECF EWG notes that according to the Latvian National Programme discard data should to be collected for cod only. - B_EFFORT & C_SPETICIF EFFORT: STECF EWG 12-06 noted that 2003 — 2008 data for fleet specific effort for small boats (-8m) were not provided, but 2005-2011 data for fishing activity are provided (if vessel don't have KW that's mean his effort will be zero).	A_CATCH: B_EFFORT & C_SPEFICIF EFFORT	no evident explanation for failure/issues; however, the first issue is not a failure and might therefore not require MS explanation; moreover, Lativa is EU member only since May 2004 - it should be clarified from which time on data had to be collected. Re. Catch data: STECF EWG notes that according to the Lativa in National Programme discard data should be be collected for cod only. Re. effort data: STECF EWG 12-06 noted that 2003 – 2008 data for fleet specific effort for small boats (-8m) were not provided, but 2005-2011 data for fishing activity are provided (if vessel don't have KW that's mean his effort will be zero).	MS to clarify missing data
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: • Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capitals investment • Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings • Recreational catches: catches	- Significant amounts of capacity (GT and kW) data have not been reported in DCF. Conversely, DCF landings data are higher that the figures reported by Eurostat - Vessel tonnage and kilowarts data significantly lower than Eurostat statistics - Investment values and depreciation cost for 2008 not provided	no evident explanation for failure; Capital costs and Investment data were received from Latvian Central Statistic Bureau by state statistical form/questionnaire "1-fisheries". Questionnaire form structure was changed and parameters were added to the form in 2008. The first Capital costs and Investment data in Latvia were collected for 2009. A reason for Vessel tonnage and kilowatts data lack was that the smaller coastal zone vessels (under 10m) were excluded from the provided to JRC data due to the fact that these vessels were not involved in commercial fishing activity, fishing only for family consumption. The data for high sea vessels were not provided due to economic data confidentiality reason Eurostat data included Baltic Sea and high sea landings and should be higher than DCF data. DCF data included only Baltic Sea landings.	MS asked to clarify why DCF the data for 2008 not provided. MS asked to clarify the differences between DCF and Eurostat data.
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock is Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are not fishing in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13-05) "master stock table" indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.	
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock is Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are not fishing in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13-05) "master stock table" indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.	
ICES	Red fish Sebastes mentella Subareas I and II		Landings Age Landings Weight Landings Weight Landings Waturity Landings Katurity Discards Age Discards Age Discards Maturity Commercial Riets Discards Maturity Commercial Fleets	Discarding is prohibited there. Country is not fishing in ICES I&II	None
ICES	Flounder in Subdivisions 22 to 32 Herring in the Gulf of Riga		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sex Ratio Landings Maturity	Concerning requested flounder discard biological variables (Baltic sea), there is no regula sasessment of flounder stock. Some attempts have been made in the past - currently WKFLABA group is working on it, but in general WGBFAST responsible for the Baltic stocks assessment is not requesting discard data, mainly due to problems with age determination and serious age inconsistencies within and between countries.	
				bb.	,

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

	Mem	nber State:	Lithuania		Judg	gement levels
			Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	FWC Anguer	No Partly	<10% 10-50%
			Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly Yes	50-90% >90%
			O'S' an Compilation		NA NA	not applicable
I II	National		on organisation	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	A Nati	onal correspo	ondent and participating institutes Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles		Yes	Action needed? No
			well described? Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination			
			meetings?		Yes	No
			Are derogations listed? If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?		No NA	Yes - list derogations No
	B Regi		ernational coordination e of international meetings		-	
	5.	Attendance	Is Table II.B.1 complete?		Yes	No
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	MS to explain reason fo non attendance	No	MS to explain reason fo non attendance
	B2	Follow-up	of regional and international recommendations		l.	
			Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed? Are the responsive actions described?		Yes Yes	No No
	OUDD A	DEGION D-W	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
III	Module o	of the evaluat	ic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic ion of the fishing sector on of the fishing sector			
			Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?		Yes	No
	_		Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?		Yes	No
	B Eco	nomic variabl	es	-		MS for AR2013: Table should
			In Table III D.4 complete and consistent with AD widelings 0	Table should display clustered segments as clustered	Yes	display clustered segments as
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	clustered
						For AR2013: Data should be
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Data should be displayed for unclustered segments; length class should not be included in column G,	Mostly	displayed for unclustered segments; length class should not be included in column G. MS to follow guidlines
	B1	Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			lu
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?		Yes NA	No No
	B2	Doto quality	Are the deviations justified? y: Results and deviation from NP proposal		NA	No
	DZ	Data quality	Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	No No
	В3	Follow-up o	of Regional and international recommendations		INA	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		Yes NA	No No
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
	В4	Actions to a	avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
	OUDD A	REGION Othe	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
III	Module o	of the evaluat	ion of the fishing sector on of the fishing sector			
			Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?		Yes	No
	B Eco	nomic variabl	Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?		Yes	No
	B ECO	nomic variabl		Table should display clustered segments as clustered	Yes	MS for AR2013: Table should display clustered segments as clustered, MS to amend table
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Data should be displayed for unclustered segments; length class should not be included in column G,	Mostly	MS is advised to follow guidelines in future
	B1	Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	B2	Data quality	Are the deviations justified? y: Results and deviation from NP proposal		NA	No
		4	Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	No
	В3	Follow-up o	of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			No
			Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described?		Yes NA	No No
	D 4	Actions to	Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls		NA	No
	В4	AUTOTIS TO S	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
	REGION	BALTIC SEA	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
			related variables			
	C 1	_	Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
		Actionation	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	•					
	•		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS to clarify 2 lines for Anguilla	Yes Yes	No Yes (see Comment)

Is Table III.C.6	complete and	consistent	with AR	guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal C2

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

REGIONS NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC and NORTH ATLANTIC-RFMO NAFO

Biological metier related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal C2

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls C4

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

REGION OTHER REGIONS - RFMO CECAF and SPRMFO

Biological metier related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

СЗ Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Baltic Sea

Recreational fisheries

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Only species mentioned in III.C.5 are provided by metier in III.C.6. However MS carried out in 2012 concurrent sampling at sea. MS to clarify how concurrent sampling is applied or if there is no other by-catch.	Mostly	MS to clarify how concurrent sampling is applied or if there is no other by-catch.
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Partly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	_	
	NA	No
	NA	No

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
MS to clarify inconsistencies between table III.C.5 and table III.C.6 regarding Pandalus borealis achievements. Only species mentioned in III.C.5 are provided by metier in III.C.6. However MS carried out in 2012 concurrent sampling at sea. MS to clarify.	Mostly	MS to clarify inconsistencies between table III.C.5 and table III.C.6 regarding Pandalus borealis achievements. Only species mentioned in III.C.5 are provided by metier in III.C.6. However MS carried out in 2012 concurrent sampling at sea. MS to clarify.
	Yes	No
	NA NA	No No
	NA Yes Yes Yes	No No No
	NA NA	No No

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
The results should be available from the report of Netherlands.	NA	No
The results should be available from	NIA.	N-
the report of Netherlands.	NA	No
The results should be available from	NA	No
the report of Netherlands.	<u>I</u>	
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	TNIA	INIo
	NA	No
	NA	No

No

Yes

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are obtained derogations mentioned?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations D3

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?

REGION BALTIC SEA

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?
Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations **E3**

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls E4

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

REGIONS NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC and NORTH ATLANTIC-RFMO NAFO

Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

MS to provide references of the studies conducted on the recreational fishery for eels in 2012. Appendix IV of the EU Decision 93/2010 reports also sharks as target group for Recreational Fishery. MS should report the approved derogation or demonstrate (i.e. through appropriate references or eventually carrying out a pilot study) that Sharks are not target species for recreational fishermen.	Mostly	MS to provide references of the studies conducted on the recreational fishery for eels in 2012. Appendix IV of the EU Decision 93/2010 reports also sharks as target group for Recreational Fishery. MS should report the approved derogation or demonstrate (i.e. through appropriate references or eventually carrying out a pilot study) that Sharks are not target species for recreational fishermen.
	NA	No
	NA NA	No No
	NA	No
	Isra	INI-
	NA Yes	No No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
Information given correctly for the		1
Information given correctly for the Baltic Sea and Other Areas, NA and NS@EA merged, without giving explanations	Mostly	MS fo follow guidlines and to separate regions, or give explanations
Table properly filled	Yes	No
For a less than 50% parameters sampled intensities were above those planned. Herring variables appears oversampled	Mostly	No
Partly, but according to Lithuanian AR, deviations are caused by putting to NP. table III E3 in column "Planned minimum No of individuals to be measured at national level" number of fish to measure lenght, not a numbers of variables to be collected. EWG also cannot find in table III.E.3 sprat oversampling		Deviation is caused by a human mistake, so in future NP. MS has to follow the guidlines
Misunderstanding NP. guideline	Partly	No
Yes	Yes	No
Target precision reached for around 50% of parametes updated. Best results were got for weight and maturity parameters. Concerning ALKs, precision achievied only for cod and herring.	Mostly	No
For some species only: cod, eel flounder. Seasoal patterns and for eel high variability in age reading.	Mostly	No
Mostly	Mostly	No
No	NA	No
MS listed reccomendation not	NA NA	No
relevant to this section	IN/A	110
no relevant reccomendations are given by LM	NA	No
NA NA	NA	No
To improve numbers of samples of cod and flounder to reach better CVs.	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
Table properly filled.	Yes	No
Missing information about planned sampling (NP2012) of sebastes spp. In NAFO 3MNO area. More variables listed than in NP. General incosistency beetween NP. and AR in variables. Oversampling occured in most of the collected variables	Partly	MS to clarify oversampling
	· ·	1
Moratorium for Pandalus, missing information about Sebastes in NAFO 3MNO. Reason for oversampling not given	Partly	MS to clarify reason for oversampling Pandalus

F2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? REGION OTHER REGIONS - RFMO CECAF and SPRMFO Biological stock-related variables Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal F2 Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

F1 Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

F2 Effort

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?

Only for 2 parameters on Sebastes.	Mostly	MS to provide CV for
, ,	,	Pandalus
target not reached	No	No
Hight variability in individual weight.	Mostly	No
Yes	Yes	No
No derogation listed in section 1.	NA	NA
3 recommendations of RCM NS&EA 2011 listed.	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
MS is asked to describe which steps have been undertaken to contact age coordinators since 2011	Partly	MS to describe which steps have been undertaken to contact age coordinators since 2011
	-	
MS ask for help to know if sampling such foreign metiers is really usefull for stocks assessments. Subcontracting observers at sea is indeed an expensive action for MS.	Yes	No
Question on interest of the data collected is relevant.	Yes	No
conected is relevant.		
Table complete but without results for 2012. Including multilateral agreements for the two RFMO's areas.	Yes	No
No action in CECAF and SPRFMO carried out by MS in 2012.	Yes	No
As defined by the multilateral agreement set by RCM LDF and coming into force in 2012, Netherlands took initiative to coordinate whole sampling process in CECAF area. No fishing in SPRMO area in 2012.	Yes	No
Multilateral agreement for CECAF joint to MS' AR 2012.	Yes	No
NA	NA	No
No deregation listed in anotice 4	NA	No
No derogation listed in section 1. One recommendation of RCM LDF 2011 on maturity scales in CECAF listed by MS.	Yes	No No
Action by Netherlands.	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
NA	NA	No
NA	NA	No
Table not consistent with the	1	

Table not consistent with the guidelines given that information is not provided by region as requested and as planned in the NP. Table is also incomplete. Several fleet segments are missing for capacity though presented for other variables such effort.	Yes	MS to complete the table by disagregating information by region and add missing fleet segments
--	-----	---

Yes	MS to complete the table by disagregating information by region and add missing fleet segments
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No

The same comment added in the first point should apply.	Yes	MS to complete the table by disagregating information by region and add missing fleet segments
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
		F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls		.,	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
	F3	Landings		100	1110
		F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			1
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	The same comment added in the first point should apply.	Yes	MS to complete the table by disagregating information by region and add missing fleet segments
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
		Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		Yes	No
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
G	Resea G1	rch surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Fish hauls for acoustic surveys should be included in the table; 2. For the future MS should pay attention to report the correct achieved percentage under each column.		MS to add number of fish hauls planned and achieved for the acoustic survey to be included in the table; For AR2013: MS to check if percentage achieved is correct
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?		Yes NA	No No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	No No
			For next year, Maps should be		For AR2013: MS should
			presented in text and not in annex		present maps in text and not in annex according to the AR
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	according to the AR guidelines		guidelines
	G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			<u> </u>
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	G3	Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		NA	No
	GS	ronow-up of Regional and international recommendations	There were no recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	relevant to surveys	NA	No
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls		NA NA	No No
	G4			INA	INO
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
Мо	dule of	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing indus	strv	NA	No
Α		ction of data concerning the aquaculture			
		Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	No data collection executed, as only fresh water species are cultivated, but table IV.A.1 has to be filled in nonetheless.	Yes	No
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		NA	No
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	A2	Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		NA	No
	AZ.	Is respective data quality information given?		NA	No
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	А3	Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		NA	No
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No
	A4	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls	I	NA	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
В	Collec	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
	Collec	Collection of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
			Consequently segment "Companies		
	В1	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	<= 49" was introduced instead "Companies <= 10" and "Companies 11-49"	Mostly	No
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	B2	Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	L	Yes	No
		Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
				NA	No
	В3	Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	ВЗ	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
	В3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			
		Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA NA Yes	No No
		Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls		NA NA	No No
		Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA NA Yes	No No

I۷

,		of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
	1 Achievements: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal	r		
			MS should update the table		
			with the indicators from 1 to 4		MS to update and complete
			(following the last version of the AR	Mostly	table and text according to
			Guidelines 2013)	Wostly	· ·
			2. Indicator 5,6,7 is not mentioned in		updated guidelines
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	the text.		
		Are the relevant derogations listed?		NA	No
	2 Actions to avoid s	hortfalls			
			Sub grouped checked the		
			pre screeners comment and the result	NA	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	is in line with NP proposal		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	io in inic with the proposal	NA	No
/1	Module for managem	ent and use of the data		IVA	140
•		esults and deviation from NP proposal			
	i Acilievelliellis. Ne	suits and deviation nontrive proposal	See general comment on		
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP	datatransmission from SG3		
		proposal?		Yes	No
					MO to more identification
					MS to provide details in
			Not described in text	No	progress in the management
					of data according to the
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?			updated AR guidelines.
					MO to annuide information on
				No	MS to provide information on
		Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?			staus of national DCF website
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
	2 Actions to avoid s	•		1.0.	1.10
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		NA	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
/II	Follow-up of STECF r		L	177	
	1 Show-up of OTEOF	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described?	-	Yes	No
,		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	<u> </u>	Yes	No
/111	List of acronyms and	appreviations			
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?			
Х	IX. Comments, sugge	stions and reflections	r		
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?			
(X. References				
		Is there a complete list of references?			
(I	XI. Annexes				
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support			
		statements made in the main text?			

	STECF & DG MARE - Comments			EWG comment		
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		Action needed by MS, please specify task	
JRC/DG MARE	Fishing effort		 Discards submitted only for cod. STECF EWG 12-06 notes that discards for cod were estimated and provided only. 	no evident explanation for failure/issues;	MS asked to clarify why the data not provided	
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: - Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital & investment - Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings - Recreational catches: catches	- Capacity data for 2012 not provided - Landings data significantly higher than Eurostat statistics - Landings data significantly higher than Eurostat statistics - Landings and income data for 2011 not submitted - Financial position and investment values for 2008 at national level - Fenergy consumption values for 2008 not provided - Forecast figures for 2011 were based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, as the latter was not provided during the data call	no evident explanation for failure/issues; delivery of 2012 data not mandatory	MS asked to clarify why the data not provided	
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock it Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are not fishin in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13-05) "master stock table" indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.		
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock it Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are not fishin in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13-05). "master stock table" indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.		
ICES	Red fish Sebastes mentella Subareas I and II		Landings Age Landings Length Landings Weight Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio Discards Age Discards Length Discards Maturity Commercial Fiets Discards Fieth	According to MS AR 2012, only data collection carried out to update weight@length parameter. But length@age, sex ratio@length and maturity@length were also planned in 2012.	*MS is asked to describe which steps have been undertaken to contact age coordinators since 2011* about redfish age reading	
ICES	Herring in Division IIIa and Subdivisions 22–24 (Western Baltic Spring spawners)		Surveys at Sea		MS asked to clarify why the data not provided	
ICES	Flounder in Subdivisions 22 to 32		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Maturity	Not applicable. Concerning requested flounder discard biological variables (Baltic sea), there is no regular assessment of flounder stock. Some attempts have been made in the past - currently WKFLABA group is working on it, but in general WGFFAST responsible for the Baltic stock assessment is not requesting discard data, mainly due to problems with age determination anserious age inconsistencies within and between countries.		
ICES	Black scabbardfish (Aphanopus carbo) in in Subareas VI, VII, and Divisions Vb, XIIb		Landings Weight Landings Sex Ratio Discards Length Discards Length	This species does not appear in OTM_DEF_100-129_0_0 catch composition provided by MS in table III.C.6. This metier is the only one in which MS was involved in the define NA areas in 2012.	MS asked to clarify why the data not provided	

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

	Member State:	Maita	7	ludgem	ent levels
	Welliber State.	Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal		No Partly	<10% 10-50%
		version of the NF proposal	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	XXX	Yes NA	>90% not applicable
Gen	eral framework			INA	not applicable
Nati	onal data collection	on organisation	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	Action needed? (Yes/No)
Α		ondent and participating institutes		,	,
	Tunona con cope	onaon and participating montates			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles		.,	
		well described? Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination		Yes	No
		meetings?		No Yes	No No
		Are derogations listed? If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?		Yes	No
В		ernational coordination e of international meetings			
	Di Attendano	-			MS to provide complete
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?		No	meeting list.
	B2 Follow-up	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained? of regional and international recommendations		Yes	No
	B2 Follow-up	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
		literranean Sea and Black Sea		163	140
Mod A		ion of the fishing sector on the fishing sector			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP		V	
		implementation well described? Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	NA	Yes Yes	No No
В	Economic variable		TR year should be 2012; information		
			should be provided only for one		
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	reference year (2011)	Yes Yes	No No
		, and a second s	TR year should be 2012; information		
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	should be provided only for one reference year (2011)	Yes	No
	B1 Achieveme	ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Estimation of PCU was provided in special secction	Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	No No
	B2 Data quality	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	See below 50% lower sampling intensity than	Mostly	No
			planned (responses from about 15%		
			of the total fleet); source for value of landings has changed (negligible		MS should in future devote more effort to reach planned
		Are the deviations explained?	issue)	Mostly	sampling intensity.
			Variability within segments low,		
	B3 Follow-up o	Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations	therefore no. of responses sufficient	Yes	No
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no relevant recommendations	Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No No
	B4 Actions to a	avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	yes	Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	yes	Yes	No
	ion Med & Black S Biological metier				
	-	Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?		Yes	No
	C1 Achieveme	ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Sampling years 2011 and 2013 included. Total No. of trips during the		
			Sampling year doesnt't match with		
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	table III.C.4. Names of metiers not always consistent with reference list.	Partly	MS to complete table
		-	Sampling years 2014 and 2012		
			Sampling years 2011 and 2013 included. Total No. of trips during the		
			Sampling year doesnt't match with table III.C.4. Names of metiers not		
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	always consistent with reference list.	Partly	MS to complete table
			Standard tables are not updated to		
			new version. Sampling years 2011 and 2013 included in AR. MS do not		
			consider it possible to plan minimum		
			no of fish to be measured in the metier sampling so there are a lot of		
			NA in the table (but this was already in the NP) which make it difficult to		
			compare planned and achived. Stocks		
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	that have a planned minimum number are usually sampled in excess	Partly	MS to complete table
		•		•	,
			Standard tables are not updated. Metier names not always consistent		
					1
			with metiers in C.3 . Names of metiers		l l
			not always consistent with reference list. Sampling results from 2011		
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	not always consistent with reference list. Sampling results from 2011 included in the table	Partiy	MS to complete table
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	not always consistent with reference list. Sampling results from 2011 included in the table Some metiers are under -sampled, some over are over-sampled:MS do	Partly	MS to complete table
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	not always consistent with reference list. Sampling results from 2011 included in the table Some metiers are under -sampled,	Partly	MS to complete table
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	not always consistent with reference list. Sampling results from 2011 included in the table Some metiers are under -sampled, some over are over-sampled:MS do not consider it possible to plan minimum no of fish to be measured in the metier sampling so there are a lot	Partly	MS to complete table
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	not always consistent with reference list. Sampling results from 2011 included in the table Some metiers are under -sampled, some over are over-sampled/MS do not consider it possible to plan minimum no of fish to be measured in	Partly Partly	MS to complete table MS to clarify (see Comment)

Ш

Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?
C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?
C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? in and Black Sea

Region Mediterranean and D Recreational fisheries

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are obtained derogations mentioned?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal
Were data quality targets provided?
Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Med & Black Sea

E Biological stock-related variables
Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
CV were provided only for 8 stocks	Partly	Yes , provide all missing CVs
	No	No
	Yes	No
MS should provide national CVs at least as long as the regional ones are		
not calculated	Partly	Yes (see Comment)
NA NA	NA	NA NA
	NA NA	NA NA
Some recommendations from RCM Med&BS 2012 are listed. but no recommendations from RCM 2011		Provide missing relevant recommendations from RCM
and LM	Partly	2011 and LM
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Mostly	No

	Yes	No
	103	140
MS reported that derogations for eel		
and BFT have been approved, no		
information are given for sharks	Yes	No
Appendix IV of the EU Decision		
93/2010 reported also sharks as		
target group for Recreational Fishery.		
MS should demonstrate (i.e. through		
appropriate references or eventually		
carrying out a pilot study) that		
Sharksare not target species for		
recreational fishermen.	Mostly	Yes (see Comment)
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	Yes	No
MS has correctly included all the sharks species in the table. However, is very difficult to compare the table III.E.3 of the AR with the ones presented in the NP and there are several inconsistencies with the AR Guidelines. Variables/stock were presented in one row in the NP, now the variables are expressed row by row. All combinations do not appear (e.g. length at age for hake and red mullet are missing). Achievements are not expressed in %. Precision is expressed in %. Table is easier to read if MS write NA instead of "not applicable" in table. Planned minimum No of individuals to be measured at the regional level for Large pelagic is missing. Years 2011 and 2013 should be deleted from the table.	Partly	Yes. MS should resubmit the table following all the comments made plus the AR Guidelines 2013. Table III.E.3 should be consistent with the NP and with table III.E.2
Most of the stocks are sampled in excess of plan. The large pelagics variables should be presented in 2013, but both swordfish and tuna are sampled intensively for weight and length (compared with the minimum plan in PGMED 2012). It would be beneficial if the regional sampling scheme for large pelagics were included in the NP and AR (or at least national targets within the regional programme).	Mostly	No

Are the deviations explained?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

F Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified? F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consiste Are the deviations explained? ith the NP proposal?

Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Malta is obliged to collect stock related variables only for three species since Malta is exempted from sampling the other species as heir landings by weight correspond to less than 10% of the total Community landings from the Mediterranean Sea or less than 200 tonnes Yes Nο Undersampling for some species (Aristeus antennatus and Raja miraletus) is explained, main reasor for sampling in excess is that ampling is taking place at surveys or concurrently. No extra cost involved. NΑ NΑ CV is not reached for any of the es reported in the table (MS say in text that targets are met for some stocks and variables but that is not evident from the table) MS stated that targets are difficult to each on a national level (even for the Mostly Nο stocks sampled in excess) The explanation given by MS is reasonable for certain species (i.e. Merluccius):" the CV is a measure of dispersion of the data and since the dispersion of the lengths of fish Mostly Nο caught is sometimes quite wide it would not be possible to achieve a better CV". But this is not completely true for some other (i.e. Octopus or Mullus). NA No Yes. Following the AR Guidelines 2013, MS should report the appropriate Some recommendations from RCM Med&BS 2012 are listed but these No recommendations from the should be relevant for AR 2013. LM relevant to the AR year Recommendations from RCM 2011 (i.e. 2012) and LM 2011 are missing. Yes. Following the AR Guidelines 2013, MS should report the appropriate recommendations plus a No description of the responsive actions relevant to the AR year. Since the responsive actions are related to RCM 2012 Yes. Following the AR Guidelines 2013, MS should recommendations is not possible to answer to this question. In any case report the appropriate recommendations plus a why does Malta andRCM Med&BS 2012 consider CV a poor indicator of description of the responsive quality? It may be a poor stand alone actions relevant to the AR indicator of quality as the present year. situation but it is for sure an indicator of quality. LM did not agree on this recommendation No Yes Nο It is indicated in the NP that all variables for vessels < 10m are sampled by survey. This survey is not ncluded in the table IIIF1 in AR. Information should be provided only for one reference year (2011); CV should not be given as percentage It is indicated in the NP that capacity for vessels < 10m is sampled by survey. This survey is not included in the table IIIF1 in AR eventhough it is mentioned in the text that "No part of the Maltese fleet was excluded from data collection for Capacity in 2012 Update table. MS should explain deviation MS should justify deviation Yes Yes

		Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
	F14 Actions	s to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
F3	Landings				
	F11 Achiev	ements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	F40 D-1	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	F12 Data q	uality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	Census data	Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?	oonodo data	Yes	No
	=40 = "	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	F13 Follow	-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No
	F44 A - 11	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
	F14 Actions	s to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
G Rese G1	earch surveys	s at sea ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	According to the guidelines different activities during a survey should be clearly stated in the table. For MEDIAS MS is not mentioning any fish hauls in the AR.	Mostly	to be clarified by MS (see
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	iisii iiduis iii tile AiX.	Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	
		Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?		NA Yes	No
G2	Data qualit	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal		100	140
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in			
		gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained?		Yes NA	No No
		Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	No
G3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	No No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	No No
G4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA NA	No No
Module o	of the evalua	tion of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing indu	stry	I NA	140
A Colle	ection of data	concerning the aquaculture			
		Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes Yes	No No
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
A1	Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	No No
A2	Data quality	r: Results and deviation from NP proposal		100	110
		Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
А3	Follow-up o	Are the deviations justified? If Regional and international recommendations		Yes	No
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	No
A4	Actions to a	void shortfalls		NA NA	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
B Colle	ection of data	I concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
B1	Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?		Yes Yes	No No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	No No
B2	Data quality	r: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	-	Yes Yes	No No
В3	Follow-up o	of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA NA	No No
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	-	NA NA	No No
В4	Actions to a	ivoid shortfalls		1973	140
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
Module of	of evaluation	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		Yes	No
		or the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
2 ^ ***	one to overal at	Are the relevant derogations listed?		NA	No
∠ ACTIO	ns to avoid sh	ortrails Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA NA	No
		ent and use of the data			
I Achie	evernents: Ke	sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP			
		proposal?	see general comment SG3 Comparing with the NP, the proposed study on the management of data has	Yes	No
		to account to the Marine of the Control of the Cont	not been carried out. It is not clear if		To be clarified by MS (see
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	any progress has been done.	Partly	Comment) To be clarified by MS (see
		Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?		No	To be clarified by MS (see Comment above)
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
2 Action	ns to avoid sh				
2 Action	ns to avoid sh	ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		NA	No
		ortfalls		NA NA	No No

Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?
Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations
Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

IX IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections
Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?

X X. References

Is there a complete list of references?

XI XI. Annexes

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?

No recommendations from 2011 are		
listed.	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
	No	No
	110	110
	Yes	No

STECF & DG MARE - Comments				EWG comment	
Source	Source Data call/Stock/Fleet Data requested		Missing DCF data*	-	Action needed by MS, please specify task
JRC/DG MARE	Mediterranean & Black Sea	Fisheries' specific landings and discards by species, fishing effort and surveys' data for the years 2008-2012	Discards information available only for years 2009 to 2011. Abundance and biomass tables derived from other surveys covered only the last three years and no data for 2012 was submitted despite a submission on the second deadline	J Concerning survey 2012 data MS reported in the NP that " Data for each namual survey is imputted into ATINS oftware by the end of the same year". So at the period of the data call (November) these data were not available. RCMMeeds 65: 2012 stated that: "RCMMeed865, recalling is 2011 recommendation and also the 5TECF VEX 11-12 recommendation on a harmonized time period required for data to be available for transmission to end-users, recommends that the time period of 6 months following the end of the collection of pransversal on biological data is respected by the data calls and the end users'. Reparding the data of the years before, these should be available. Discards: in the NP and in the AR 2012 is reported that discards has covered 5 meter (Table III.C.1 AR 2012). At least discards data for them emitters should be available. Programme under Module III.G "Research Survey at Sea"; there is a section III.G.3 manely "Data presentation", where each Member State reports the dealine for the available of the AR 2012 also reported that "recalling its 2011 recommendation, and also the STECF EVC 11-20 recommendation, and also the STECF EVC 11-20 recommendation, and also the STECF EVC 11-20 recommendation on a harmonized time period required for data to be available for transmission to end-users, recommends that the time period of 5 months after the sampling year. IRACPLO MARS HOUND HOURS and ATRANSPICAL DISCARD HOURS AND ART AND	
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: Income, Personal costs, * Energy costs, * Raw materia costs, * Other operational costs, * Capital costs, * Extraordinary costs, * Capital value, * Net investments, * Oebt, * Raw material volume, * Total volume, * Employment, * Number of enterprises	- Values for raw material volume: livestock were not available for the years 2008 and 2009 for segment 3.4.	This is a real minor failure having in mind that the sector is quite small and concerning the segment AR 2011 stated: "The one company which makes part of the Sea bass and Sea Bream segment did not cooperate to provide the data requested and therefore no data is available." This can happen and is not reason to blame MS.	No action needed by MS
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.3	Segment: Engine power Employment Salary share % Landing weight Landing value Vessel value of total fleet Working days/year per vessel Working hours/days per vessel Variable costs of fishing/days per vessel % of V.C. from fuel costs Yearly fixed costs per vessel	Segment: Variable costs of fishing/days per vessel - only partially provided Vearly fixed costs per vessel - not provided		MS to clarify why data not provided
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.4	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: - Effort measure - Catch or Landing - CPUE/LPUE - Discard - Bycatch - SSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: - Catch or Landing - CPUE/LPUE - CSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species:	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: • CPUE/LPUE - only partially provided • Discard - not provided • Bycatch - not provided GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: • CPUE/LPUE - not provided GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species		MS to clarify why data not provided MS to clarify why data not provided
		Length average Length average Length average Length average Maturity	Length range of captured species - only partially provided Length average - only partially provided Length average - only partially provided Sex - only partially provided Maturity - only partially provided		The second street doe for more

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

Member State:	Netherlands	Judgement levels			
	Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level	
	Version of the AR reviewed	version 1	No	<10%	
	Version of the NP proposal		Partly	10-50%	
		EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%	
	Overall compliance	XXX	Yes	>90%	
General framewo	nrk		NA	not applicable	
General framewo	лк		1		
National data col	llection organisation	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG	
	rrespondent and participating institutes			Action needed?	
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles				
	well described?		Yes	No	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination				
	meetings?		Yes	No	
	Are derogations listed?		No	To be updated	
. D!	If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines? d International coordination		NA	No	
	d international coordination dance of international meetings				
DI Atten	Is Table II.B.1 complete?		Yes	No	
	io radio india complete.		100	110	
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?		Yes	No	
B2 Follow	w-up of regional and international recommendations			-1	
	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?		Yes	No	
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No	
	Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic				
	valuation of the fishing sector cription of the fishing sector				
. General des	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP				
	implementation well described?		Yes	No	
	Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	yes	Yes	No	
B Economic va				•	
				MO is seen to the state of	
		floot register indicates \$40		MS is required to clarify the	
		fleet register indicates 846 vessels on Jan1, 2011; AR has only 741 (NP		number of vessels in reference year and explain	
		contained even less - 584); should be		the differences from fleet	
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	briefly clarified by MS	Mostly	register	
	to Table III.D. Foothpiete and consistent with Art guidelines.	briefly clarified by MC	Wideliy	register	
				MS needs to clarify the	
		clustering scheme is not in line with		applied clustering scheme	
		guidelines; several segments are		with high number of active	
		included in clusters which contain a		vessels. In the future MS is	
		sufficient number of vessels to be		strictly required to use	
		reported individually (e.g. DTS0010,		clustering scheme according	
		PG0010, etc.); moreover the		to guidlines, separating	
		clustering scheme differs from NP;		segments which have	
		apart from that, the table layout is		sufficient number of vessels	
		misleading (no straight horizontal	5 4	and also to provide data	
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	lines)	Partly	according to NP	
		table contains clusters instead of			
		unclustered segments; for inactive			
		vessels irrelevant variables have		MS should report information	
		been listed; some variable group		according to guidlines	
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	names incorrect (negligible);	mostly	avoiding unnecessary data.	
B1 Achie	vements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Description of the last			
		Description of methods and			
		assumptions made for estimation of			
		capital value and capital costs indivated under IIIB2, but should be		Next year,	
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	provided under III.B.1;	Yes	MS should follow guidlines	
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	Yes	No	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	Yes	No	
B2 Data	quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	•		•	
	Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No	
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	Yes	No	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	Yes	No	
B3 Follov	w-up of Regional and international recommendations		Voc	No	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	Yes NA	No No	
	Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA	NA NA	No	
B4 Action	ns to avoid shortfalls	h	1	P	
/101101	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	NA	No	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	Yes	No	
	a & Eastern Arctic	-			
Biological m	netier related variables				
	Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?		Yes	No	
C1 Achie	evements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
		Dow 15 procentation is and assess			
		Row 15 presentation is not correct.			
		Not used revised standard table, selfsampling trips are planned as			
		rachadilipiinu inpa are Dianneo as		MS to update table. Refer to	
	Is Table III C 3 complete and consistent with AP guidelines?	ashore sampling but reported as sea	Mostly		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Mostly	comment	
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	ashore sampling but reported as sea	Mostly Mostly		

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Are actions to a

Region North Atlantic
C Biological metier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Long distance fisheries- CECAF C Biological metier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

	MS to update table
Partly	accordingly
No	MS to resubmit III.C.6. table
	MS to provide comments (see
Mostly	comment)
No	MS to provide explanations
NA	No
	MS to provide CVs for table
No	III.C.5
NA	No
No	To be clarified
NA	No
Yes	No
•	•
Vaa	No
162	NO
	No Mostly No NA No NA No NA No NA No NA Yes Yes Yes

		MS to update table. Refer to
Not used revised standard table	Mostly	comment
		MS to update table. Refer to
Revised table not used.	Mostly	comment
Not used revised standard table, CVs		
not provided, information on		
achieved number of fish measured at		MS to update table
national level" missing	Partly	accordingly
	Yes	No
No comments on over- and under-		MS to provide comments (see
sampling	Mostly	comment)
		MS to update text
Deviations by stock not explained	Mostly	(see comment)
	Mostly	No
	1	MS to provide CVs for table
	No	III.C.5
	NA	No
	No	To be clarified
	NA	No

Derogation to be listed		To be updated
in III.C.2 section	Mostly	by MS
		MS to provide the relevant
		recommendations and
	No	responses
	NA	No
	NA	No
-		
		MS to provide actions to avoid
	No	shortfalls especially on CVs
	NA	No

		MS to update table. Refer to
Not used revised standard table	Mostly	comment
		MS to update table
Revised table not used.	Mostly	accordingly
Not used revised standard table, CVs not provided, information on	:	
"achieved number of fish measured a	t	MS to update table
national level" missing	Partly	accordingly
	Yes	No
	Partly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	INIS to provide CVS for table
No	III.C.5
NA	No
Yes	No
No	To be clarified by MS
NA	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
	NA Yes No NA Yes Yes Yes Yes

MS to provide CVs for table

Region North Sea & Eastern Arctic

D Recreational fisheries

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are obtained derogations mentioned?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?

Were data quality targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

E Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?

Region North Sea & Eastern Arctic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

NA	No
Mostly	MS to provide releavant information on the sharks issue
NA	No
NA	No
NA	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
Mostly Yes	To be clarified by MS No
ΙΝΑ	No
	No
	No
	No
1	1
Yes	No
Yes	No
•	•
	NA N

Table not consistent with NP, rows have been added as discards have been included and samples from commercial fisheries and surveys split. It makes comparisons difficult between the two data sources. It is probably done to correct mistakes but some content in the NP cells defining targets are changed as well (eg target cod length@age NP 100, AR 1000)	Partly	MS should only report the species planned in NP Proposal
Yes, exept for a few stocks	Yes	No
Yes, except for Tachurus trachurus (46%)	Mostly	MS to provide explanation about the shortfall of Trachurus trachurus
Yes	Yes	No

For some stocks. No CV calculated for maturity in any stocks but explained "difficult to interpret and are poorly defined, since for most species 100% of all sampled individuals of older ages are mature"	Partly	No
For some of the stocks/parametres for which CVs were calcullated	Partly	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

No and table III.E.3 not complete making it difficult to assess were exemption rules are in place	No	Ms should follow the guidelines and provide an updated list of derogations in section I of AR texts.	
---	----	--	--

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Atlantic

Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Long distance fisheries CECAF

Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

No.Tthere are at least two recommendations from LM about stock variables (RCMNS&EA_SV_01 and RCMNS&EA_SV_03)	No	Ms should follow the guidelines and list the recommendations from LM and its follow up
-	NA	see above
-	NA	see above
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

Table not consistent with NP, rows have been added as discards have been included and samples from commercial fisheries and surveys split. It makes comparisons difficult between the two data sources. Errors have been corrected in the NP part of the table (eg. region for Micromesistius)	Partly	MS should only report the species planned in NP Proposal
Yes, exept for one stock. Stock boundaries do not always match regions. (There seems to be a mistake with trachurus trachurus, the stock Ila, IVa, Vb, Vla, Vlla-c, e-k VIllabde does not belong to North Sea and Eastern Arctic). Some stocks are undersampled in the atlantic region but sampled in excess in the	Yes	No
NS region.		
NS region.	Yes	No

For most stocks/parameters. No CV calculated for maturity in any stocks but explained "difficult to interpret and are poorly defined, since for most species 100% of all sampled individuals of older ages are mature"	Mostly	No
For some of the stocks/parametres for which CVs were calcullated	Partly	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

No and table III.E.3 not complete making it difficult to assess were exemption rules are in place	No	Ms should follow the guidelines and provide an updated list of derogations in section I of AR texts.
No.Tthere are at least 3 recommendations from LM about stock variables (LM 33, LM 35 and LM 38)	No	Ms should follow the guidelines and list the recommendations from LM and its follow up
-	NA	see above
-	NA	see above

-	Yes	No	
-	Yes	No	

MS should follow the naming convention defined in RCM LDF. the name of the fishing ground should be "from Morocco to Guinea Bissau"	Yes	MS should follow the naming convention according RCM LDF in future NP and AR.
Most stocks/parameters undersampled	Partly	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations **E**3

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls E4

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

F2 Effort

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations explained?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

F3 Landings

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?

sampling requirements for biological parameters are trieval as c, there is no need to estimate the CV every year. They have to be calculated at the end of period. NA NA NA NO Yes. Sampling was interrupted since lisheries were terminated (no EU-third country agreement) Yes No No Ms should follow the guidelines and list the deregations, if any, in section I ecommendation about stock arrabbes. Related to "Methodology on No see above No see above Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No No see above Yes No No To be clarified by MS Yes No Ye			
sampling requirements for biological parameters are trieval as c, there is no need to estimate the CV every year. They have to be calculated at the end of period. NA NA NA NO Yes. Sampling was interrupted since lisheries were terminated (no EU-third country agreement) Yes No No Ms should follow the guidelines and list the deregations, if any, in section I ecommendation about stock arrabbes. Related to "Methodology on No see above No see above Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No No see above Yes No No To be clarified by MS Yes No Ye			
sampling requirements for biological parameters are trieval as c, there is no need to estimate the CV every year. They have to be calculated at the end of period. NA NA NA NO Yes. Sampling was interrupted since lisheries were terminated (no EU-third country agreement) Yes No No Ms should follow the guidelines and list the deregations, if any, in section I ecommendation about stock arrabbes. Related to "Methodology on No see above No see above Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No No see above Yes No No To be clarified by MS Yes No Ye			
sampling requirements for biological parameters are trieval as c, there is no need to estimate the CV every year. They have to be calculated at the end of period. NA NA NA NO Yes. Sampling was interrupted since lisheries were terminated (no EU-third country agreement) Yes No No Ms should follow the guidelines and list the deregations, if any, in section I ecommendation about stock arrabbes. Related to "Methodology on No see above No see above Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No No see above Yes No No To be clarified by MS Yes No Ye			
No no need to estimate the CV every year. They have to be calculated at the end of period. NA NA No	NA . According Commission Decision		
no need to estimate the CV every year. They have to be calculated at the end of period. NA NA NO Yes Sampling was interrupted since instruction of EU-third country agreement) Yes No We should follow the guidelines and list the derogations, if any, in section was allowed to the derogations, if any, in section was allowed to the commendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on No see above No See above No See above No See above Yes No	sampling requirements for biological		
No. There are at least 1 No. No. See above 1 No. See above 1 No. See above 1 No. See above 1 Yes No. No. Yes No.	parameters are triennial so, there is	NA	No
NA NA NA NO Yes. Sampling was interrupted since insheries were terminated (no EU-third country agreement) Yes No No Ms should follow the quidelines and list the derogations, if any, in section I was should follow the quidelines and list the derogations about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on No see above No see above No Yes No Yes No		TVA	
Yes Sampling was interrupted since insheries were terminated (no EU-third Yes No			
Yes. Sampling was interrupted since insheries were terminated (no EU-third Yes No No Ms should follow the guidelines and list the derogations, if any, in section I No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock avariables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No No See above No Yes	the end of period.		
Yes. Sampling was interrupted since insheries were terminated (no EU-third Yes No No Ms should follow the guidelines and list the derogations, if any, in section I No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock avariables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No No See above No Yes			
Yes. Sampling was interrupted since insheries were terminated (no EU-third Yes No No Ms should follow the guidelines and list the derogations, if any, in section I No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock avariables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No No See above No Yes			
Yes. Sampling was interrupted since insheries were terminated (no EU-third Yes No No Ms should follow the guidelines and list the derogations, if any, in section I No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock avariables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No No See above No Yes			
Yes. Sampling was interrupted since insheries were terminated (no EU-third Yes No No Ms should follow the guidelines and list the derogations, if any, in section I No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock avariables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No No See above No Yes	NA	NA	No
In the AR there's a reference to a letrogation for the collection of Yes No Yes No No Hes should follow the guidelines and list the derogations, if any, in section is recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Nethodology on biological sampling" No See above See above See above No See above See above No See No No See No No See No No See No No No See No No No See No No No No See No			
In the AR there's a reference to a letrogation for the collection of Yes No Yes No No Hes should follow the guidelines and list the derogations, if any, in section is recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Nethodology on biological sampling" No See above See above See above No See above See above No See No No See No No See No No See No No No See No No No See No No No No See No			
In the AR there's a reference to a letrogation for the collection of Yes No Yes No No Hes should follow the guidelines and list the derogations, if any, in section is recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Nethodology on biological sampling" No See above See above See above No See above See above No See No No See No No See No No See No No No See No No No See No No No No See No	Yes. Sampling was interrupted since		
No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No. see above No. see above Yes No. Yes No. Yes No.		Yes	No
No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No. see above No. see above No. see above No. Yes No. Yes Clarification regarding the derogation of the collection of No. No. Yes Clarification regarding the derogation of rigs, but has not present in the compiled derogation of present in the compiled derogation of the collection of No. No. Yes No. Yes Clarification regarding the derogation of the derogation is not present in the compiled derogation of the collection of No. Yes No. Yes No. Yes No. Yes No. Yes No. No. To be clarified by MS. No. Yes No.	country agreement)		
No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No. see above No. see above No. see above No. Yes No. Yes Clarification regarding the derogation of the collection of No. No. Yes Clarification regarding the derogation of rigs, but has not present in the compiled derogation of present in the compiled derogation of the collection of No. No. Yes No. Yes Clarification regarding the derogation of the derogation is not present in the compiled derogation of the collection of No. Yes No. Yes No. Yes No. Yes No. Yes No. No. To be clarified by MS. No. Yes No.			
No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No. see above No. see above No. see above No. Yes No. Yes Clarification regarding the derogation of the collection of No. No. Yes Clarification regarding the derogation of rigs, but has not present in the compiled derogation of present in the compiled derogation of the collection of No. No. Yes No. Yes Clarification regarding the derogation of the derogation is not present in the compiled derogation of the collection of No. Yes No. Yes No. Yes No. Yes No. Yes No. No. To be clarified by MS. No. Yes No.			
No. There are at least 1 No. There are all are all are are all are are all are all are are all are are all are all are all are	-	Yes	No
No. There are at least 1 No. There are all are all are are all are are all are all are are all are are all are all are all are			
No. There are at least 1 No. There are all are all are are all are are all are all are are all are are all are all are all are			
No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No see above No see above Yes No Yes Clarification regarding the derogation for the collection of No Hard the foreignt on is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. Parity see above Yes No No Yes No			
No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No see above No see above Yes No No Yes Clarification regarding the derogation is not present in the compiled derogation on "specific gear variables", such as (number of grigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F. I where for every fleet segments these variables are dentified as Not Available. Yes No No Yes No Ye		No	
recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No			derogations, if any, in section
recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No			
recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No			
recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No			
recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling" No	No. There are at least 1		Me should follow the
variables. Related to "Methodology on No recommendations from LM and its follow up holological sampling" and its follow up No see above No see above			
In the AR there's a reference to a derogation for the collection of house and number of fines, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of rigs, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of rigs, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are dentified as Not Available. Parity see above Parity see above Parity see above Yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Ves No Yes No		No	
No see above Yes No No Yes Clarification regarding the derogation is not processent in the compiled derogation of "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigotyostyraps), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are dentified as Not Available. Parity See above Yes No No To be clarified by MS Yes No Yes			
No See above	o.o.ogioai oampiing		and no ronow up
No See above			
No See above		No	see above
Yes No No Yes No No Yes No No Yes Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Y			
Yes			
Yes No Yes Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes No Yes		Yes	No
Yes No Yes No No The AR there's a reference to a derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and ength, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not oresent in the compiled derogation is not oresent in the compiled derogation of "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are dentified as Not Available. Mostly partly see above Partly see above Yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Yes No		Yes	No
Yes No In the AR there's a reference to a derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of trops, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on 'specific gear variables', such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly partly see above Partly see above Partly see above			
Yes No In the AR there's a reference to a derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of trops, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on 'specific gear variables', such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly partly see above Partly see above Partly see above			
Yes No In the AR there's a reference to a derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of trops, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on 'specific gear variables', such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly partly see above Partly see above Partly see above			
Yes No In the AR there's a reference to a derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of trops, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on 'specific gear variables', such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly partly see above Partly see above Partly see above		Vos	No
Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No No Yes No No Yes No No In the AR there's a reference to a derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and tength, Number of hosks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are dentified as Not Available. Mostly partly see above Partly see above Yes No No To be clarified by MS No Yes No			
Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No No Yes No No Yes No No No Yes No			-
In the AR there's a reference to a derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hess and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Partly Partly See above Partly See above Partly See above Pes No No To be clarified by MS No Yes No No Yes No No Partly Read of the right particular information on the future actions is needed. No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No No No No No No No No No N			1
In the AR there's a reference to a derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/raps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly planned in the NP. Partly see above Partly see above Partly see above			
derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly planned in the NP. Partly see above Partly see above yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Yes No		Yes	No
derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly planned in the NP. Partly see above Partly see above yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Yes No			
derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly planned in the NP. Partly see above Partly see above yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Yes No			
derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly planned in the NP. Partly see above Partly see above yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Yes No			
derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly planned in the NP. Partly see above Partly see above yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Yes No			
derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly planned in the NP. Partly see above Partly see above yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Yes No			
Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of filnes, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly planned in the NP. Partly see above Partly see above Partly see above yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Further information on the future actions is needed. No Yes No			
length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly planned in the NP. Partly see above Partly see above Partly see above Partly see above Yes No No To be clarified by MS Yes No	In the AR there's a reference to a		
of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation becoment. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly partly see above Partly see above Partly see above yes No No No To be clarified by MS No Yes No			
of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation becoment. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly partly see above Partly see above Partly see above yes No No No To be clarified by MS No Yes No	derogation for the collection of		
time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly planned in the NP. Partly see above Partly see above yes No No To be clarified by MS No Yes No Yes No Yes No Further information on the future actions is needed. No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and		
present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly planned in the NP. Partly see above Partly see above Partly see above yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Yes No No Yes No Yes No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number		
document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Partly see above Partly See	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking		
Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly planned in the NP. Partly see above Partly see above Partly see above yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not		
from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly Partly Partly See above Partly See above yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS No Yes No Yes No Yes No Further information on the future actions is needed. No Yes	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation		
on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly planned in the NP. Partly see above Partly see above Partly see above Partly Partly Partly	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document.		
(number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Partly see above Further information on that was planned in the NP. Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that		
Decome available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly planned in the NP. Partly see above Yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information		No
in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostly planned in the NP. Partly see above Partly see above yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as		No Yes. Clarification regarding
segments these variables are identified as Not Available. Mostty Partly Partly See above Partly See above yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Yes No Yes No Further information on the future actions is needed. No Yes	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would		Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and
Identified as Not Available. Mostly Partly See above Partly See above Partly See above Partly See above yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Further information on the future actions is needed. No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified		Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further
Partity	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet		Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the
yes No No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Further information on the future actions is needed. No Yes. Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Yes	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP.
No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Further information on the future actions is needed. No Yes Yes No Yes No No No Yes.	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above
No To be clarified by MS No To be clarified by MS Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Further information on the future actions is needed. No Yes Yes No Yes No No No Yes.	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above
No To be clarified by MS	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and ength, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking ime however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above see above
Yes No Yes No Yes No Interpretation on the future actions is needed. No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly yes	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above see above
Yes No Yes No Further information on the future actions is needed. No Yes. Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and ength, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking ime however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly yes No	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above see above
Yes No Yes No Further information on the future actions is needed. No Yes. Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly yes No	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above see above
Yes No Further information on the future actions is needed. No Yes. Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly Pertly yes No	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above see above No To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS
No the future actions is needed. No Yes. Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly yes No No	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above see above No To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS
No the future actions is needed. No Yes. Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly Partly yes No No Ves Yes	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above see above No To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS No
No Yes. Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly Partly yes No No Ves Yes	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above see above No To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS No No No No
Yes No Yes No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly yes No No Yes Yes Yes	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above No To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS No
Yes No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly Partly yes No No Ves Yes Yes Yes	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above see above No To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS No
Yes No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly Partly yes No No Ves Yes Yes Yes	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above see above No To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS No
Yes No Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and ength, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking ime however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly Partly yes No No Ves Yes Yes Yes	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above see above No To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS No
Yes No	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly Partly yes No No Ves Yes Yes Yes No No	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above No To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS No No No No No No No No No Further information on the future actions is needed. Yes.
	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and ength, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking ime however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly Partly yes No No No Ves Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above see above No To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS No
Yes INo	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly Pertly yes No No No Ves Yes Yes Yes	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above see above No To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS No No No No Further information on the future actions is needed. Yes.
	derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are	Mostly Partly Partly Pertly yes No No No Ves Yes Yes Yes	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above see above No To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS No No No No Further information on the future actions is needed. Yes.
	In the AR there's a reference to a derogation for the collection of Number of rigs, Number of nets and length, Number of hooks and number of lines, Number of traps, Soaking time however this derogation is not present in the compiled derogation document. Anyway in the NP MS states that from 2012, at least some information on "specific gear variables", such as (number of rigs/pots/traps/), would become available. This is not verified in table III.F.1 where for every fleet segments these variables are identified as Not Available.	Mostly Partly Partly Pertly yes No No No Ves Yes Yes Yes	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP. see above see above No To be clarified by MS To be clarified by MS No No No No Further information on the future actions is needed. Yes.

Are the deviations explained? Yes Nο Are the deviations justified? Yes No F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Yes Nο Yes No Are the responsive actions acceptable? Yes No F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Yes Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? No Yes Research surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? No Yes Only for the NS Herring Acoustic Survey, 56 % of planned hauls have been achieved. However, as stated by MS the planned number of trawl hauls during an acoustic survey is Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? indicative. Yes No As stated by the MS the few deviations had minor influence on the Are the deviations explained? quality of the survey indices Are the deviations justified? NA No Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ? Yes G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? NA No Are the deviations justified? NA Nο Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations G3 In the future MS should clearly report the relevant recommendations under Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Yes No Are the responsive actions acceptable? Yes No Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Yes Nο Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Yes Nο Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry Collection of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR cons stent with table IV.A.1? Yes Νo MS is reminded to make use of Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes No Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal **A1** Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? No Yes Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Yes Yes Ŋς Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?
Are the deviations explained? Yes Yes Nο Are the deviations justified? Yes No Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? NA Nο Are the responsive actions described? NA No Are the responsive actions acceptable? No Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Yes No Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Yes No Collection of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? No Yes Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal В1 In NP MS promised a model for data estimation. Nothing is said in AR. MS MS is also asked to clarify maybe asked for clarification, if model whether in 2012 data for 2010 is available. MS is also asked to or 2011 have been colleted clarify whether in 2012 data for 2010 and/or data for 2010/2011 or 2011 have been colleted and/or have been processed. In data for 2010/2011 have been other countries final results processed. In other countries final from SBS are available with a results from SBS are available with a 1.5 year time lag, and 1,5 year time lag, and calculation and calculation and data collectio takes place already the year data collection takes place already the year after the reference year. MS after the reference year. MS Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? iust asked to clarify. iust asked to clarify mostly Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Yes No Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal B2 Is respective data quality information given? Yes Are the deviations explained? No

	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			1.10
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
	B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
V	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	1 / to the to the time and a contained the property	MS should update the table with the		
		indicators from 1 to 4 (following the		
		last version of the AR Guidelines		L
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	2013).	Mostly	Table to be updated
	Are the relevant derogations listed?		NA	No
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
VI	Module for management and use of the data			
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP			
		and managed commant CC3	Vac	No
	proposal?	see general comment SG3	Yes	No
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?		Yes	No
		[
		Information is not given in this section		
		but a link is given in section VII		
		(STECF EWG 11-08 recommendation		
	Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?	topic 10)	Yes	No
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	·	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls		100	110
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No shortfalls	NA	No
		NO SHORIANS	NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	NO
VII	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		V	I
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
		Note to 07505 5W0 44 00 Tools 0		
		Note to STECF EWG 11-08 Topic 6:		
		Derogations Table: The guidelines		
		have been adjusted in the version		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	available for the pre-viewer.	Yes	No
VIII	List of acronyms and abbreviations			
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?			
IX	IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections			
-	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?			
Х	X. References			
•	Is there a complete list of references?			
χı	XI. Annexes			
ΛI	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support	Г		
	statements made in the main text?			
	statements made in the main text?			

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

NETHERLANDS

STECF & D.G. MARE - Comments		EWG comment			
Source	Data and franch franch		Ministra per duna	EWG comment	Author and discount of the same
JRC/DG MARE	Data call/Stock/Fleet Fishing effort	Data requested	Missing DCF data* - Catch information available for years 2003-2008 only for 3 species, comparing to approximate 40	no quidant avalantion for failure liceurs	Action needed by MS, please specify task
			for 2009-2011.		
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: - Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital & investment - Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings - Recreational catches: catches	Capacity data lower than Eurostat statistics - Available landings usule data significantly lower than Eurostat figures - Completeness of landings data questionable. The data suggests that significant amounts of data were not reported on landings (in weight for 2008 in the DFI all other years cannot be evaluated due to insufficient information) - Financial position value for 2010 at national level not provided		MS to provide missing data available through the DCF
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the yean; 2008.2010, including: *Income, *Personal costs, *Energy costs, *Raw materia costs, *Other operational costs, *Capital costs, *Enorginary costs, *Capital costs, *Englate losts, *Englat	The 2010 data templates were uploaded with no data. - For DCF data, the following parameters were not submitted: Number of enterprises (2008),	AR 2011: "However since all junels in the sub-segment exist of too few firms it proved impossible or reliably aggrages the results for the entire segment." If their is a two year time lag and accepted by Commission, no action necessary, maybe checked with this year data call results. For mossil/oyster segment on unpaid below and raw material volume is plausible, ably foreign cost maybe zero? Does should have in mind that freshwater species data collection is not mandatory, and MS does not reacher reliable data from that sector, even if tried according to Ark Missing number of sufficiency in the property of the contribution of of the	MS to provide missing data available through the DCF
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock in Subarses I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are not feithing in the area, KEC has provided to the last STEC meeting (13.05) "master stock table" indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore an information in needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is potabilistic by a Norwegian law.	None
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock in Subraers I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are not fishing in the area, KEC has provided to the last STECF meeting (13-69) "master stock table" indiscating that cod and haddock stocks in ICESI and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore an information in accold. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.	None
ICES	Sole in Division IIIa and Subdivisions 22–24 (Skagerrak, Kattegat, and the Belts)		Landings Age Landings teigh Landings Weight Landings Meight Control Signer Control Signer Control Signer Control Signer Commercial Fleets Surveys at Sea	Not applicable. Sole in Division IIIa and Subdivision 22-24 is not included in the NP. M5 has <10% of EU share of quota.	
ICES	Spurdog (Squalus acanthias) in the Northeast Atlantic		Landings Maturity Discards Maturity	Not appilicable. Spurdog not included in the NP.	
ICES	Demersal elasmobranchs in the North Sea, Skagerrak and eastern English Channel		Discards viacuity Discards Age	Not applicable. Only Rajidae nei included for sampling of biological parameters in the NP. For this stock is age determination not included.	
ICES	Cargoin Collaboration VIII abd and Subarea VII		Landings, Age Landings, Length Landings, Maturity Landings, Sex Ratio Discards, Age Discards, Age Discards Weight Discards Weight Discards Sex Ratio Six Ratio	Not applicable. Biological sampling for this stock is not included in the NP.	
ICES	Greater silver smelt in other areas		Landings Age Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Commercial Fleets Surveys at Sea	Applicable. Argentina is included in the NP. Sampling should be carried out for all biological parameters except fecundity.	
ICES	Brill in Subarea IV and Divisions IIIa and VIId,e		Landings Maturity	Applicable. Sampling of maturity included in NP and carried out.	
ICES	Dab in Subarea IV and Division IIIa		Discards Sex Ratio	Applicable. Biological sampling of dab included in NP.	
ICES	Lemon sole in Subarea IV and Divisions IIIa and VIId		Landings Length Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio Surveys at Sea	Applicable. Biological sampling of lemon sole included in NP (triannual). Data from DYFS not uploaded into DATRAS. In table on datatransmissions is it stated that survey data is provided.	
ICES	Cod in Subarea IV, Divison VIId & Division IIIa (Skagerrak)		Discards Age Discards Length	Applicable. Discardsampling of relevant metiers in NP.	
ICES	Nephrops in Division IVbc (Botney Gut - Silver Pit, FU 5)		Discards Weight Landnigs Weight Landnigs Maturity Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Katurity Discards Katurity	Applicable: Included in NP.	
ICES	Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)		Landings Kalurity Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Weight Discards Weight	Applicable included in NP:	
ICES	Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb, VIa,, VIIa-c, e-k, VIIIa-e (Western stock)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight	Applicable. Discard data is collected. Biological parameters included in NP.	
ICES	Blue whiting in Subareas I-IX, XII and XIV (Combined stock)		Landings Maturity	Applicable. Maturity data collected within NP	

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

				_		
	Men	nber State:	Poland Reference year	2012	Judgeme Compliance class	nt levels Compliance level
			Version of the AR reviewed		No	<10%
			Version of the NP proposal	EWG Answer	Partly Mostly	10-50% 50-90%
			Overall compliance	XXX	Yes	>90%
	0 1	6			NA	not applicable
	General	framework				
			on organisation	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	A Nati	ional correspo	ondent and participating institutes Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles			Action needed?
			well described?		Yes	No
				No coordination meeting was held.		
			Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	National coordination meeting is an obligation.	Partly	No
			Are derogations listed?	obligation.	Yes	No
	B Rea	ional and Into	If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?		Yes	No
	B1		e of international meetings			
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?		Yes	No
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?		Yes	No
	B2	Follow-up	of regional and international recommendations			
				Incomplete list provided. No general		
				recommendations of RCM NA 2011 ? Only relevant 2011 recommendations	Mostly	MS to update list
			Are the general recommendations from Liginar Meeting listed?	were to be provided in AR 2012.		
			Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed? Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
	01155	DEGICH TO	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
			ic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic ion of the fishing sector			
			on of the fishing sector			
			Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?		Yes	No
			Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?		Yes	No
ı	В Есо	nomic variabl	es	Official name and two is not "domested!		
				Official nomenclature is not "demersal trawlers", but "demersal trawlers and		
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	seiners"	Yes	No
				Clustering of DTS1012 and DTS1218 would not be necessary, but is in line		
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	with NP	Yes	No
			In Table III D Committee and apprint with AD middle and	Some variable group names not in		
	B1	Achievemer	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal	line with 93/2010 (negligible)	Yes	No
		71011101011101	The residue and acreation from the proposal	MS does not apply PIM for capital		
				value estimation; therefore figures as requested in guidelines (e.g. PCU,		
				price index, lifetimes) are not		
			And design and arbitrary and a consistent with the NID and a self-	provided; MS desribes a different		
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	approach	Yes NA	No No
			Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
	B2	Data quality	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		NA NA	No
	В3	Follow up o	Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations		NA	No
	БЭ	rollow-up o	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
			Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	No
	В4	Actions to a	Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls		NA	No
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		NA	No
	SUPR A-	REGION Other	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
			ion of the fishing sector			
	A Gen	eral descripti	on of the fishing sector Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP		Т	1
			implementation well described?		Yes	No
	р г		Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?			
	В Есо	nomic variabl	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	O and a similar manual manual in	Yes	No
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Some variable group names not in line with 93/2010 (negligible)	Yes	No
	B1	Achievemer	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
				MS does not apply PIM for capital value estimation; therefore figures as		
				requested in guidelines (e.g. PCU,		
				price index, lifetimes) are not provided; MS desribes a different		
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	approach	Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		NA NA	No
	В2	Data quality	Are the deviations justified? y: Results and deviation from NP proposal		NA	No
		40011)	Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	No No
	В3	Follow-up o	of Regional and international recommendations		INC	140
		•	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No No
			Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	No No
	B4	Actions to a	avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA NA	No No
			. 25 designo to avoid oriornalis in the future acceptable:		ING	INO

I II

II

Region Baltic

Biological metier related variables

Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal C2

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Biological metier related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Other regions; CECAF and South Pacific

Biological metier related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal
Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
table properly filled and complete	Yes	No
table properly filled and complete. Numbers of trips sampled different in III.C.4 (187) and III.C.3 (186).	Yes	No
table properly filled and complete	Yes	No
table properly filled	Yes	No
For metiers, 81% of the planned sampling achievied. For the sea sampling were approx half of the frames sampled accordance to plan, 3 were not sampled at all and 5 undersampled. The metier were the sea sampling failed were sampled ashore. Length sampling is done in accordance or in excess of plan for all stocks except turbot, plaice and salmon.	Mostly	No
Deviations are explained by metier and by stock. Mean reasons: changes in fishing patterns and some declining fisheries. Sampling in excess of targets for lengths is due to difficulties to foresee how many fish that will be encountered in seasampling. Shortcomings due to low catches/quota utalization.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Cvs provided	Yes	No
In around 50% cases for the landings, for discards not	Partly	No
only for discards	Mostly	No
	Mostly	No
	.,	
Only 2011 recommendations were to	Yes	No
Only 2011 recommendations were to be provided	Yes	No
	Yes	No No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

table properly filled and complete	Yes	No
table properly filled and complete.	Yes	No
table properly filled and complete	Yes	No
table properly filled	Yes	No
Number of trips achievied. Planned stock oversampled	Yes	No
Biological oversampling by observer at sea has no financial consequence	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Cvs provided for retained catch	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No

table properly filled and complete.	Yes	No
table properly filled and complete.	Yes	No
No information provided on CECAF chievements but a multilateral agreement is mentioned in Column B.	Mostly	MS to mention which MS were in charge for metier variables collection
table properly filled	Yes	No
No, MS did not have any fisheries in south pacific 2012. There is a clear reference to the NL AR regarding the joint sampling programme in CECAF.	No	No
There is a clear reference to the NL AR regarding the joint sampling programme in CECAF. This sampling programme were only partly fulfilled due to termination of the fishery in april.	Yes	No
	Yes	No

C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?		NA NA	No No
	Are the deviations explained?		NA NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	<u> </u>	NA	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
C4	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls		Yes	No
U4	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
Region B	ealtic Sea reational fisheries			
D Reci	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?		Yes	No
D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Only cod was reported, as MS keeps derogations for eel and salmon. Appendix IV of the EU Decision 93/2010 reports also sharks as target group for Recreational Fishery. MS should report the approved derogation or demonstrate (i.e. through appropriate references or eventually carrying out a pilot study) that Sharks are not target species for recreational fishermen.	Mostly	MS to clarify issue regarding the shark recreational fishery (see Comment)
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	derogations for eel and salmon are	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	reported	NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	No
D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided?		V	NI _n
	Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met?		Yes NA	No No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
D3	Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		Yes	No
D3	Were the relevant derogations listed?		Yes	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
D4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	LL	163	NO
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
Region B	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
•				
E Biolo	ogical stock-related variables			
	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?		Yes	No
E Biolo	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	The integrity of the NP table is not completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been changed	Yes Mostly	No No
	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been changed Targets have been met or been exceeded for all stocks except 3 (salmon, western baltic cod and western baltic herring). Two stocks (Eastern Baltic cod and trout) is sampled in excess of plan. Sampling of maturity for all of species are planed in table III_E_2 but in table III_E_3 maturity have only been collected for cod and herring. It seems to be a mistake in NP proposal. Yes, failure to meet sampling targets primarely due to decrease in fisheries.	Mostly Mostly	MS should clarify if the planning of collection of sexual maturity in most of species is a mistake in NP (and table III_E_2) or if it is actually not collected
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been changed Targets have been met or been exceeded for all stocks except 3 (salmon, western baltic cod and western baltic herring). Two stocks (Eastern Baltic cod and trout) is sampled in excess of plan. Sampling of maturity for all of species are planed in table III_E_3 maturity have only been collected for cod and herring. It seems to be a mistake in NP proposal.	Mostly	MS should clarify if the planning of collection of sexual maturity in most of species is a mistake in NP (and table III_E_2) or if it is actually not collected
E1	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations institute and deviation from NP proposal. Were CV estimates provided?	completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been changed Targets have been met or been exceeded for all stocks except 3 (salmon, western baltic cod and western baltic herring). Two stocks (Eastern Baltic cod and trout) is sampled in excess of plan. Sampling of maturity for all of species are planed in table III_E_3 maturity have only been collected for cod and herring. It seems to be a mistake in NP proposal. Yes, failure to meet sampling targets primarely due to decrease in fisheries. Yes	Mostly Mostly Yes Yes	No MS should clarify if the planning of collection of sexual maturity in most of species is a mistake in NP (and table III_E_2) or if it is actually not collected No No MS to explain what CV 0 means or clarify if this is an error.
E1	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been changed Targets have been met or been exceeded for all stocks except 3 (salmon, western baltic cod and western baltic herring). Two stocks (Eastern Baltic cod and trout) is sampled in excess of plan. Sampling of maturity for all of species are planed in table III_E_2 but in table III_E_3 maturity have only been collected for cod and herring. It seems to be a mistake in NP proposal. Yes, failure to meet sampling targets primarely due to decrease in fisheries. Yes Yes, what does CV 0 mean?	Mostly Mostly Yes Yes	No MS should clarify if the planning of collection of sexual maturity in most of species is a mistake in NP (and table III_E_2) or if it is actually not collected No No MS to explain what CV 0 means or clarify if this is an
E1	Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been changed Targets have been met or been exceeded for all stocks except 3 (salmon, western baltic cod and western baltic herring). Two stocks (Eastern Baltic cod and trout) is sampled in excess of plan. Sampling of maturity for all of species are planed in table III_E_3 maturity have only been collected for cod and herring. It seems to be a mistake in NP proposal. Yes, failure to meet sampling targets primarely due to decrease in fisheries. Yes Mostly not MS considers some of the targets unrealistic. Sampling (and costs) will have to increase substantially if they	Mostly Mostly Yes Yes	No MS should clarify if the planning of collection of sexual maturity in most of species is a mistake in NP (and table III_E_2) or if it is actually not collected No No MS to explain what CV 0 means or clarify if this is an error.
E1	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations institute and deviation from NP proposal. Were CV estimates provided?	completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been changed Targets have been met or been exceeded for all stocks except 3 (salmon, western baltic cod and western baltic herring). Two stocks (Eastern Baltic cod and trout) is sampled in excess of plan. Sampling of maturity for all of species are planed in table III_E_3 maturity have only been collected for cod and herring. It seems to be a mistake in NP proposal. Yes, failure to meet sampling targets primarely due to decrease in fisheries. Yes Mostly not MS considers some of the targets unrealistic. Sampling (and costs) will	Mostly Mostly Yes Yes Yes No	No MS should clarify if the planning of collection of sexual maturity in most of species is a mistake in NP (and table III_E_2) or if it is actually not collected No No MS to explain what CV 0 means or clarify if this is an error. No Targets need to be revised in
E1	Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations provided? Were CV targets met?	completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been changed Targets have been met or been exceeded for all stocks except 3 (salmon, western baltic cod and western baltic herring). Two stocks (Eastern Baltic cod and trout) is sampled in excess of plan. Sampling of maturity for all of species are planed in table III_E_3 maturity have only been collected for cod and herring. It seems to be a mistake in NP proposal. Yes, failure to meet sampling targets primarely due to decrease in fisheries. Yes Mostly not see above	Mostly Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes	No MS should clarify if the planning of collection of sexual maturity in most of species is a mistake in NP (and table III_E_2) or if it is actually not collected No No MS to explain what CV 0 means or clarify if this is an error. No Targets need to be revised in future NPs
E1	Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations provided? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been changed Targets have been met or been exceeded for all stocks except 3 (salmon, western baltic cod and western baltic herring). Two stocks (Eastern Baltic cod and trout) is sampled in excess of plan. Sampling of maturity for all of species are planed in table III_E_3 maturity have only been collected for cod and herring. It seems to be a mistake in NP proposal. Yes, failure to meet sampling targets primarely due to decrease in fisheries. Yes Yes, what does CV 0 mean? Mostly not MS considers some of the targets unrealistic. Sampling (and costs) will have to increase substantially if they should be met see above	Mostly Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes	No MS should clarify if the planning of collection of sexual maturity in most of species is a mistake in NP (and table III_E_2) or if it is actually not collected No No MS to explain what CV 0 means or clarify if this is an error. No Targets need to be revised in future NPs
E1	Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations provided? Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations provided? Are the deviations provided? Are the deviations pustified?	completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been changed Targets have been met or been exceeded for all stocks except 3 (salmon, western baltic cod and western baltic herring). Two stocks (Eastern Baltic cod and trout) is sampled in excess of plan. Sampling of maturity for all of species are planed in table III_E_3 but in table III_E_3 maturity have only been collected for cod and herring. It seems to be a mistake in NP proposal. Yes, failure to meet sampling targets primarely due to decrease in fisheries. Yes Yes, what does CV 0 mean? Mostly not MS considers some of the targets unrealistic. Sampling (and costs) will have to increase substantially if they should be met see above	Mostly Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes	No MS should clarify if the planning of collection of sexual maturity in most of species is a mistake in NP (and table III_E_2) or if it is actually not collected No No MS to explain what CV 0 means or clarify if this is an error. No Targets need to be revised in future NPs No No
E1	Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been changed Targets have been met or been exceeded for all stocks except 3 (salmon, western baltic cod and western baltic herring). Two stocks (Eastern Baltic cod and trout) is sampled in excess of plan. Sampling of maturity for all of species are planed in table III_E_3 maturity have only been collected for cod and herring. It seems to be a mistake in NP proposal. Yes, failure to meet sampling targets primarely due to decrease in fisheries. Yes Yes, what does CV 0 mean? Mostly not MS considers some of the targets unrealistic. Sampling (and costs) will have to increase substantially if they should be met see above	Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes	No MS should clarify if the planning of collection of sexual maturity in most of species is a mistake in NP (and table III_E_2) or if it is actually not collected No No MS to explain what CV 0 means or clarify if this is an error. No Targets need to be revised in future NPs No No No
E1	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been changed Targets have been met or been exceeded for all stocks except 3 (salmon, western baltic cod and western baltic herring). Two stocks (Eastern Baltic cod and trout) is sampled in excess of plan. Sampling of maturity for all of species are planed in table III_E_3 maturity have only been collected for cod and herring. It seems to be a mistake in NP proposal. Yes, failure to meet sampling targets primarely due to decrease in fisheries. Yes Yes, what does CV 0 mean? Mostly not MS considers some of the targets unrealistic. Sampling (and costs) will have to increase substantially if they should be met see above no derogation applied (list in chapter 1) Recommendations from RCM and LM	Mostly Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	No MS should clarify if the planning of collection of sexual maturity in most of species is a mistake in NP (and table III_E_2) or if it is actually not collected No No MS to explain what CV 0 means or clarify if this is an error. No Targets need to be revised in future NPs No No No No No No No No No
E1	Are design and achievements consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been changed Targets have been met or been exceeded for all stocks except 3 (salmon, western baltic cod and western baltic herring). Two stocks (Eastern Baltic cod and trout) is sampled in excess of plan. Sampling of maturity for all of species are planed in table III_E_3 maturity have only been collected for cod and herring. It seems to be a mistake in NP proposal. Yes, failure to meet sampling targets primarely due to decrease in fisheries. Yes Yes, what does CV 0 mean? Mostly not MS considers some of the targets unrealistic. Sampling (and costs) will have to increase substantially if they should be met see above no derogation applied (list in chapter 1) Recommendations from RCM and LM	Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes	No MS should clarify if the planning of collection of sexual maturity in most of species is a mistake in NP (and table III_E_2) or if it is actually not collected No No MS to explain what CV 0 means or clarify if this is an error. No Targets need to be revised in future NPs No No No
E2	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been changed Targets have been met or been exceeded for all stocks except 3 (salmon, western baltic cod and western baltic herring). Two stocks (Eastern Baltic cod and trout) is sampled in excess of plan. Sampling of maturity for all of species are planed in table III_E_3 maturity have only been collected for cod and herring. It seems to be a mistake in NP proposal. Yes, failure to meet sampling targets primarely due to decrease in fisheries. Yes Yes, what does CV 0 mean? Mostly not MS considers some of the targets unrealistic. Sampling (and costs) will have to increase substantially if they should be met see above no derogation applied (list in chapter 1) Recommendations from RCM and LM	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	No MS should clarify if the planning of collection of sexual maturity in most of species is a mistake in NP (and table III_E_2) or if it is actually not collected No No MS to explain what CV 0 means or clarify if this is an error. No Targets need to be revised in future NPs No No No No No No No No No N
E2 E3	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls	completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. According to guidelines the content of the table have not been changed Targets have been met or been exceeded for all stocks except 3 (salmon, western baltic cod and western baltic herring). Two stocks (Eastern Baltic cod and trout) is sampled in excess of plan. Sampling of maturity for all of species are planed in table III_E_3 maturity have only been collected for cod and herring. It seems to be a mistake in NP proposal. Yes, failure to meet sampling targets primarely due to decrease in fisheries. Yes Yes, what does CV 0 mean? Mostly not MS considers some of the targets unrealistic. Sampling (and costs) will have to increase substantially if they should be met see above no derogation applied (list in chapter 1) Recommendations from RCM and LM	Mostly Yes Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS should clarify if the planning of collection of sexual maturity in most of species is a mistake in NP (and table III_E_2) or if it is actually not collected NO NO MS to explain what CV 0 means or clarify if this is an error. NO Targets need to be revised in future NPs NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO

Е Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Other regions CECAF and south pacific

Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

F2 **Effort**

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

F3 Landings

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Research surveys at sea

G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

The integrity of the NP table is not completely respected. In the NP was several biological parameters included in one row. These have now been split. Further, greenland halibut have been included in the AR with the result no fishery, PL have a derogation for Greenland halibut. The		
cerrect naming for the region is North Atlantic, although the coordination is made in RCM NS&EA and the fishig ground is Va+XII+XIV acording RCM NS&EA naming conventions	Mostly	MS to follow the naming conventions in future NP and AR
Yes (MS sample only on stock)	Yes	No
NA	NA	No
NA	NA	No
	Yes No	No No
Yes, variability higher than expected. Difficult to achieve targets	Yes	No
- man a dama	Yes	No
Vas chanter 1	Yes	No
Yes, chapter 1 Recommendations from RCM and LM	Yes	No
are listed.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
NA	NA	No
NA NA	NA	No
No fishing activity of polish vessels in South Pacific. In CECAF area the multilateral agreement and the NL program are mentioned.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
·		
	Yes Yes	No No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes Yes	No No
	Yes Yes	No No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Vaa	Nia
+	Yes Yes	No No
	Yes	No
	Yes Yes	No No
		·
	Yes Yes	No No
	100	140
Т	Yes	No
	Yes NA	No
	NA	

				For next year, maps should be in text		
				and		
				not in annex according to the AR		
	G2	Data qualit	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ? y: Results and deviation from NP proposal	guidelines	Mostly	No
		Zutu quunt	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in			
			gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	No No
	G3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	No specific RCM recommendation	NA NA	No No
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	No
	G4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA NA	No No
IV			ion of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing indus	stry		
	A Colle	ection of data	concerning the aquaculture	MS has deleted cells from IV.A.1, MS		
				should be reminded that this is not in		
				line with the guidelines, also if		
				production is happening but no data collection takes place, MS should		
				indicate that by NS. Table shouldbe		MS to fill tables according to
			Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	resubmitted	Yes Yes	guidelines and resumbit.
			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	A1	Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	4.0	Doto accella	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	A2	Data quality	r: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	А3	Follow-up o	Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations		Yes	No
	AS	rollow-up c	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
			Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No
	A4	Actions to a	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
	7.4	7 totiono to c	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
	D Calla	ation of data	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
	B Colle	ection of data	I concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
			3	For no. Of enterprises the source		
				seems to not allow for the given		
				sample and response rate: How can the register have a response rate of		
				the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from		MS should clarify why number
			Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Mostly	of enterprises in register is
	B 1	Achieveme	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? hts: Results and deviation from NP proposal	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from	Mostly	
	B1	Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	•	of enterprises in register is less than 100 %
	B1	Achievemen		the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Mostly Yes Yes	of enterprises in register is
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Yes	of enterprises in register is less than 100 %
	B1 B2		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Results and deviation from NP proposal	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Yes Yes Yes	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No No No
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Yes Yes	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No No
	В2	Data quality	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Yes Yes Yes	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No No No No No
		Data quality	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ?: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No No No No No No No No
	В2	Data quality	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
	В2	Data quality	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations justified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
	B2 B3	Data quality	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations prom NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? word shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes ANA NA NA Yes	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
V	B2 B3 B4	Data quality Follow-up of	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? *Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
v	B2 B3 B4 Module of	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations prom NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? word shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes ANA NA NA Yes	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
V	B2 B3 B4 Module of	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? word shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
v	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a fevaluation events: Res	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes ANA NA NA Yes Yes	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
V	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a sevements: Reserved and the seven are to avoid should be a seven and the seven are to avoid should be a seven and the seven are to avoid should be a seven and the seven are to avoid should be a seven and the seven are to avoid should be a seven and the seven are to avoid should be a seven are to avoid should be a seven and the seven are to avoid should be a seven and the seven are to avoid should be a seven and the seven are to avoid should be a seven	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the relevant recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Foortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Yes	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
V	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie 2 Action	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a several dependent service and service	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? International consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be	Yes	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie 2 Action	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a several dependent service and service	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? **Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? woid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? sortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the relevant derogations listed? sortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be clarified?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie 2 Action	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a several dependent service and service	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? *Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ff Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? vioid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be clarified?	Yes	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie 2 Action	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a several dependent service and service	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations systified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? vioid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be clarified?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie 2 Action	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a several dependent service and service	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? *Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be clarified?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie 2 Action	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a several dependent service and service	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations systified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? vioid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be clarified?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes Yes NA	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie 2 Action	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a several dependent service and service	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Invoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Invoitalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Is and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be clarified? See general comment on data transmission from SG3	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes Yes NA	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie 2 Action	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a several dependent service and service	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? **Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? fregional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? woid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? interpretations to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? interpretations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the deviations explained?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be clarified? See general comment on data transmission from SG3	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes NA	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie 2 Action Module fo 1 Achie	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a several dependent service of the action of the	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? *Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be clarified? See general comment on data transmission from SG3	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes Yes NA	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie 2 Action Module fo 1 Achie	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a fewaluation of evenents: Reservements: Reservements: Reservements: Reservements: Reservements: Reservements: Reservements	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Fortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Fortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be clarified? See general comment on data transmission from SG3	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
VI	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie 2 Action Module fo 1 Achie	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a fewaluation of evenents: Reservements: Reserve	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? **Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? woid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section III.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations is explained? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations of avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations of avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be clarified? See general comment on data transmission from SG3	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes Yes NA	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
VI	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie 2 Action Module fo 1 Achie	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a fewaluation of evenents: Reservements: Reserve	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? Fortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Fortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be clarified? See general comment on data transmission from SG3	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	of enterprises in register is less than 100 % No
VI	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie 2 Action Module fo 1 Achie	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a fewaluation of evenents: Reservements: Reserve	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? **Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? **Results and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? **woid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? **of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? **of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? **of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? **ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations justified? **ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations justified? **ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? **Are the deviations justified? **ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? **Are the deviations justified? **ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be clarified? See general comment on data transmission from SG3 In section II.A	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	No
VI	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie 2 Action Module fo 1 Achie	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a fewaluation of evenents: Reservements: Reserve	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? **Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? **Results and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? **woid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? **of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? **of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? **of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? **ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations justified? **ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations justified? **ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? **Are the deviations justified? **ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? **Are the deviations justified? **ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be clarified? See general comment on data transmission from SG3	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	No
VI	B2 B3 B4 Module of 1 Achie 2 Action Module fo 1 Achie	Data quality Follow-up of Actions to a fewaluation of evenents: Reservements: Reserve	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? *Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? If Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? woid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? contails Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section III.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? accommendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	the register have a response rate of 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be clarified? See general comment on data transmission from SG3 In section II.A	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA Yes Yes NA	No

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations
Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

IX IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections
Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?

X X. References

Is there a complete list of references?

XI XI. Annexes

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?

It's not clear what kind of action the MS is planning for the recommendation for 2011, and		
therefore hard to justify	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
	No	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

POLAND

		STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment	
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*	11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Action needed by MS, please specify task
JRC/DG MARE	Fishing effort		- Discards information for herring, sprat and flounder submitted only for 2011. For earlier years	no evident explanation for failure/issues;	MS needs to clarify why data were not submitted to enduser
			only discards on cod reported.		
			 A_CATCHES: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 351 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types. 		
			- Comparison of 2011 mesh size data with 2004-2010 shows that they are not consistent and		
			significantly different.		
			- Neither mesh size nor SPECON (BACOMA window, T90) information were available from the		
			database for 2004-2010.		
			- B EFFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 549 records with missing mesh		
			size information for various gear types.		
			- STECF EWG 12-06 notes that a different method of estimation of mesh size ranges in 2011		
			(compared to the previous years) caused inconsistent mesh size classes, which used to be "110-		
			156" in 2004-2010 period. This mostly concerns vessels under 10 meters.		
			- C_SPECIFIC EFFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 1469 records with		
			missing mesh size information for various gear types.		
			 Mesh size data breakdown for 2011 is not comparable with previous years because of different aggregation method used (as described above). 		
			- E LANDINGS: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 3730 records with missing		
			mesh size		
			information for various gear types.		
			- Comparison of 2011 mesh size data with 2004-2010 shows that they are not consistent and		
			significantly different. Neither mesh size nor SPECON (BACOMA window, T90) information were		
			available from the database for 2004-2010.		
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including:	- Landings income data for 2011 not provided	no evident explanation for failure/issues;	MS needs to clarify why data were not submitted to enduser
		Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure	- Fleet segment level capacity data for 2012 not submitted	delivery of 2012 data not mandatory	
		(costs), capital & investment	- Landings weight data significantly higher than figures reported in Eurostat		
		Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings	- Forecast figures for 2011 were based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income,		
		Recreational catches: catches	as the latter was not provided during the data call		
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010,	- There were missing employment and economic parameters for 2008. All data was mostly	MS obviously delivers data on all parameters for all years, only some data for 2008 are missing.	MS needs to clarify why no 2008 data were not submitted to enduser
		including:	provided by segments.		
		• Income, • Personal costs, • Energy costs, • Raw materia costs, • Other	- For DCF data, the following parameters were not submitted: Wages and salaries 2008, Imputed		
		operational costs, • Capital costs, • Extraordinary costs, • Capital value, •	value of unpaid labour 2008, Repair and maintenance 2008, Capital costs 2008, Extraordinary cost	S	
			2008, Capital value 2008, Employment 2008 (except total employees)		
		Employment, • Number of enterprises	- Data were registered directly by producers for the first time in 2010, which is an important		
			measure for the sector. However, some inconsistencies were found and the MS is currently		
			checking some of the questioners with producers. The data for 2010 should be analysed with		
			caution - The data for 2010 is based on a sample of 597 establishments, which cover 41% of the total		
			population of 1459 establishments		
			- It is obligatory for all aquaculture producers in Portugal to annually report production in volume		
			and value as well as economic and social data by species and type of production system		
			- The large number of segments constitute some confidentiality issues and aggregations were		
			needed. The techniques used in the production and the species were taken into account for		
			segmentation:		
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast		Discards Age	Applicable. MS perform in accordance with the NP a sea-sampling programme in the area.	
ices	Arctic)		Discards Length	However were no discarded cod measured in 2012.	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock in
	,		Discards Weight		Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are not
			Discards Maturity		fishing in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13-05) "master stock table"
					indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore
					no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information
					cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II		Discards Age	Partly applicable. MS perform in accordance with the NP a sea-sampling programme in the area.	
	(Northeast Arctic)		Discards Length	However were no discarded haddock measured in 2012. MS do not (NP) sample biological	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock in
1			Discards Weight	parameters (age, maturity) for this stock	Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are not
			Discards Maturity		fishing in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13-05) "master stock table"
1					indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore
1					no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information
					cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.
ICES	Salmon in the Main Basin and Gulf of		Landings Maturity	Applicable. MS collect maturity data on salmon (NP), problem with the quality of the commercial	
	Bothnia (Salmon in Subdivisions		Commercial Fleets	fleet data (species misreporting? Is this DCF?) that needs to be adressed	Not applicable. Maturity of salmon from Main Basin and Gulf of Bothnia Salmon in Subdivisions
1	22–31)				22-31) is requested from some counties. Maturity data would be relevant for assessment, however,
1	- 1				there is no method available at the moment, which could be used to discriminate between salmon that
					will mature later in autumn and salmon that will stay on the feeding grounds for at least one more
					year. This is why the ICES WGBAST did not use maturity data for assessments and Baltic countries are not providing such a data. Only relevant maturity information could be obtained from salmon
					are not providing such a data. Only relevant maturity information could be obtained from salmon actively migrating or spawning in rivers.
ICES	Sea trout in Subdivisions 22–32		Commercial Fleets	Probably Applicable. Problem with the quality of the commercial fleet data (species misreporting	, MS needs to clarify why data were not submitted to enduser
ICES	(Baltic Sea)			is this DCF) that needs to be adressed.	
	Flounder in Subdivisions 22 to 32		Discards Age	(Probably) Not applicable -depending on the purpose with analysing failures. The present	Not applicable. Concerning requested flounder discard biological variables (Baltic sea), there is no
ICES			Discards Length	assessment method is based on surveys implying that discard data is not needed for the	regular assessment of flounder stock. Some attempts have been made in the past - currently
ICES				the state of the s	regular assessment of fromther stock, bothe attempts have been made in the past currently
ICES			Discards Weight	assessment. MS collect the data and made it available- if the quality of data is poor this need to b	WKFLABA group is working on it, but in general WGBFAST responsible for the Baltic stocks
ICES				assessment. MS collect the data and made it available- if the quality of data is poor this need to be discussed at a regional level since all participating MS get the same comment	WKFLABA group is working on it, but in general WGBFAST responsible for the Baltic stocks assessment is not requesting discard data, mainly due to problems with age determination and serious age inconsistencies within and between countries.

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

Men	nber State:	Portugal	1	Judgement levels	
		Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal		No Partly	<10% 10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	XXX	Yes	>90%
I General	framework			NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		on organisation ondent and participating institutes			Antina mandada
A Nau	ional correspo	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?		Yes	Action needed?
		Its there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?		Yes	No
		Are derogations listed?		Yes	No
		If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines? renational coordination		Yes	No
B1	Attendance	e of international meetings Is Table II.B.1 complete?		Yes	No
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?		Yes	No
B2	Follow-up	of regional and international recommendations	Only 2 recommendations from RCM	<u> </u>	MS to provide complete
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed? Are the responsive actions described?	NS&EA are listed.	Partly	recommendations list
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
		ic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic ion of the fishing sector			
A Gen	neral descripti	on of the fishing sector Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP		V	N
		implementation well described?		Yes	No
В Есо	nomic variabl	Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? es		Yes	No
					MS is asked to provide
				Mostly	missing data and clarify the issue about significantly lowe
			Table contains no inactive vessels; total no. of vessels (4866) only half of	iviostiy	population compare to fleet
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no. from fleet register (8441)		register.
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
B1	Achieveme	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
			Assumptions made for estimation of		In the future MS is advised to report information in correct
			capital value and capital costs are not	Mostly	section and to follow the
			reported in specific section as it is	,	requirements listed in
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	required in guidlines.	Yes	guidlines No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
B2	Data quality	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		NA NA	NA NA
D2	Followup	Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations		NA	NA
В3	rollow-up c	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		NA	NA
В4	Actions to a	Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls		NA	NA
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
SUPRA-	REGION Othe	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
III Module o	of the evaluat	ion of the fishing sector on of the fishing sector			
	-	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?		Yes	No
5 -		Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?		Yes	No
B Eco	nomic variabl	es			MS is asked to provide
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	table contains no inactive vessels	Mostly	missing data by resubmitting table.
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Yes	No
B1	Achieveme	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
			Accumptions made for a time time		In the future MS is advised to
			Assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs are not	Mostly	report information in correct section and to follow the
			reported in specific section as it is		requirements listed in
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	required in guidlines.	NA	guidlines NA
		Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	NA NA
B2	Data quality	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Response rate is lower than	T	
		Is respective data quality information given?	expected, still the coverage (38%) looks sufficient	Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
В3	Follow-up o	Are the deviations justified? of Regional and international recommendations		Yes	No
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	NA NA
			L	Į. ··· ·	1
В4	Actions to a	avoid shortfalls		Ta	L
В4	Actions to a	avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA NA	NA NA

REGION NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC

С	Biological	motion	ralatad	variables
	Diviouicai	mener	relateu	variables

Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations C3

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - NAFO and adjacent areas

Biological metier related variables

Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations C3 Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - ICES areas

Biological metier related variables

Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations C3

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

REGION OTHER REGIONS - RFMOs ICCAT, IOTC, CECAF

Biological metier related variables

Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	100	
Only species listed in III.C.5 are reported in III.C. 6	Mostly	MS to clarify how concurent sea is apply on board
Only one métier was sampled in 2012 stocks appear undersampled	Partly	No
For OTM_DEF no fish sampled at all	Mostly	MS to clarify achievement ra for métier OTM_DEF
	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
		<u>.</u>
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	100	No
	Yes	No
	-	
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Only species listed in III.C.5 are	Moothy	MS to clarify how concurent
reported in III.C. 6	Mostly	sea is apply on board
	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
	Mostly	No
		÷
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	V	Int.
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Mostly	MS to provide number of To Nuùber of trip during the
	moony	sampling Year for Iberian
		fishing ground
	Yes	fishing ground No
	Yes Yes	fishing ground No No
	Yes	fishing ground No No No
	Yes Yes	fishing ground No No No
	Yes Yes Mostly	fishing ground No No No No No No No No No MS to aggregate area X wi
	Yes Yes Mostly	fishing ground No No No No Mo Ms to aggregate area X wii the other ICES fishing
	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes	fishing ground No No No No MS to aggregate area X wi the other ICES fishing grounds in the text No
	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes	fishing ground No No No No MS to aggregate area X with the other ICES fishing grounds in the text No No
	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	fishing ground No No No No MS to aggregate area X will the other ICES fishing grounds in the text No No No No No
	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	fishing ground No No No No MS to aggregate area X withe other ICES fishing grounds in the text No No No No No No
	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	fishing ground No No No No MS to aggregate area X will the other ICES fishing grounds in the text No No No No No
	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA	fishing ground No No No No MS to aggregate area X withe other ICES fishing grounds in the text No No No No No No
	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA Yes	fishing ground No No No No MS to aggregate area X wi the other ICES fishing grounds in the text No No No No No No No No No
	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA	fishing ground No No No No No MS to aggregate area X with the other ICES fishing grounds in the text No
	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes	fishing ground No No No No No MS to aggregate area X wi the other ICES fishing grounds in the text No No No No No No No No No N
	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Mostly	fishing ground No No No No No MS to aggregate area X with the other ICES fishing grounds in the text No Ino No Ino Ino Ino Ino Ino Ino Ino Ino Ino In
	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Mostly Mostly	fishing ground No No No No MS to aggregate area X wi the other ICES fishing grounds in the text No No No No No No No No No N
	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA Mostly Mostly Mostly Yes	fishing ground No No No No No MS to aggregate area X with e other ICES fishing grounds in the text No No No No No No No No No N
	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Mostly Mostly Yes Mostly	fishing ground No No No No No MS to aggregate area X with the other ICES fishing grounds in the text No
	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA Mostly Mostly Mostly Yes	fishing ground No No No No No MS to aggregate area X with e other ICES fishing grounds in the text No No No No No No No No No N
	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes Mostly Mostly Yes Mostly	fishing ground No No No No No MS to aggregate area X with the other ICES fishing grounds in the text No

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal C2

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?
Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations СЗ

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable? C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Atlantic

Recreational fisheries

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations D3

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?
REGION NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC

Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Table mostly fullfilled. Some cells missing (total numbers of trips in 2012 for LPF metiers, splitting at sea / on shore for CECAF sampling frames). Inconsistensies between III.C.3 and III.C.4 (CECAF appears almost as not sampled in III.C.3 but details on trips carried out by sampling frames are provided in III.C.4).	Partly	MS to provide new updated table
RFMO not fullfilled	Mostly	No
Confusing section names for RFMO's column. Some inconsistensies with table III.C.5 (e.g. for example how to explain for IOTC that 6406 swordfish were measured in III.C.5 and only 1990 in III.C.6), MS to explain.	Mostly	Yes
Inconsistensies between III.C.4 and III.C.3. MS to clarify the good data	Mostly	MS to clarify the inconsistencies
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
For around 33% of planned stocks, with better chievement in ICCAT region.	Partly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
		,
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
No data collected for sea bass, in	1	1

	Yes	No
	•	•
No data collected for sea bass in 2012, and no information provide for eel.MS to clarify if all species of sharks are forbiden for recreational fisheries or if only Salmon shark (Lamna spp.)	Partly	MS to clarify eel and sharks
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Table properly complete.	Yes	No
Sampling occured only for cod with two parameters missing. Numbers of fish to be sampled are sharply lower than those planned. No result can be provided for ALK because age reading is not yet performed. No sampling for redfish in 2012.	Partly	Yes, MS should take into account EWG comments
Budgetary and administrative constraints not allowing to implement observers at sea programme as planned. Declining capacity of MS to read otoliths. Portugal is trying to solve the inability to read otoliths through the training of specialized resources and seeking to establish international agreements.	Yes	No
	Partly	MS should better clarify how to solve the logistic problem in the future

Only for cod weigth@length	Partly	No
	Partly	No

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - NAFO and adjacent areas

Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations **E**3

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? **REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - ICES areas**

Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Budgetary and administrative constraints not allowing to implement observers at sea programme as planned. Declining capacity of MS to read otoliths. Portugal is trying to solve the inability to read otoliths through the training of specialized resources and seeking to establish international agreements.	Yes	No
	NA	No
No derogation listed in section 1	NA	No
One of RCM NS&EA 2011 on age readind task sharing, and some other older and a 2012 one.	Yes	No
Portugal is labeled as a possible "leading country" only for the redfish (Sebastes mentella) in ICES DIV. I,II. For the moment Portugal has no experts on redfish aging available.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
·	•	
Proposals to improve sampling programmes by involving move vessels, mainly at sea. To avoid shortfalls Portugal is always trying to reach a wide participation of vessels which have not been sampled by observers before.	Yes	No

Table properly filled. According to table III.E.2, 10 to 12 stocks were plannned to be sampled in 2012 according to parameters listed	Yes	No
10 stocks sampled, half of them with NP target planned in numbers of fish to be sampled. For this parameter, only achievement for two stocks of redfish and for plaice and halibut	Partly	No
Budgetary and administrative constraints not allowing to implement observers at sea programme as planned. Declining capacity of MS to read otoliths. Data collection for maturity or sexratios cannot be carried on board the concerned vessels.	Yes	No
	Mostly	No

Only for 12 on 28 parameters updated.	Partly	No
For only 6 parameters on 12 provided.	Partly	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No

2 derogations listed in section 1 concerning stock variables collection for Pandalus.	Mostly	Yes, MS should take into account the EWG comment and clarify if it is operating in NAFO shrimp fisheries.
4 recommendations of RCM NA 2011 are listed, with some other older or related to 2013 actions. MS is reminded that AR 2013 guidelines strictly defined reference year and reports to be examined for AR 2012.	Mostly	No
For 3 only. Not for the one concerning Regional data base.	Mostly	Yes, MS should describe all responsive actions
	Mostly	No

MS is trying to improve its sampling protocoles on board and to involve more vessels in sampling programmes. Ms is ready also to improve task sharing on otoliths reading.	Yes	No
	Vac	No

Table mostly complete. CVs not	Mostly	No
provided for sub-area X (Azores).	Wostry	140

	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Numbers of fish sampled for biological parameters are achieved for less than 50%. Heavily undersampled stocks are in lberian waters. Very few species appears as oversampled.	Partly	No
	Are the deviations explained?	MS states that it is trying to solve the inability to read otoliths through the training of specialized resources and seeking to establish international agreements. Financial issues not allowing to buy samples as planned in NP. Explanations given for main undersampled stocks.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	Yes for most of the stocks in Iberian	Mostly	No
	·	areas, no at all for area X. For 40% of parameters in Iberian		
	Were CV targets met?	waters.	Partly	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Budgetary and administrative constraints not allowing to implement observers at sea programme as planned. Declining capacity of MS to read otoliths. Portugal is trying to solve the inability to read otoliths through the training of specialized resources and seeking to establish international agreements. Main problem is also to cover the entire range of sizes for big species.	Yes	No
F2	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
E3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed?	One derogation for 7 species listed in	Yes	No
	Word the followant dellogations indeed.	section 1.	100	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes. RCM NA 2011 recommendation on John dory is missing.	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes	No
E4	Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls	Yes	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	MS remains focused on providing high-quality data to stock assessment working groups. Other stocks or parameters that are not directly relevant will have a lower priority.	Yes	No
E Biole	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? OTHER REGIONS - RFMOs ICCAT, IOTC, CECAF		Mostly	No
E1	ogical stock-related variables Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
E1		Table mostly fulfilled. Some incoherences for CECAF (CV cells with numbers in grey even when no fish sampled). Stock variables were to be collected mainly for LPF in ICCAT and IOTC region. MS gives reference to CVs at regional level but without mentionned multilateral agreements in column B. MS to clarify?	Mostly	No
E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	incoherences for CECAF (CV cells with numbers in grey even when no fish sampled). Stock variables were to be collected mainly for LPF in ICCAT and IOTC region. MS gives reference to CVs at regional level but without mentionned multilateral agreements in	Mostly	Yes, MS should improve data collection in CECAF areas in the future.
E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	incoherences for CECAF (CV cells with numbers in grey even when no fish sampled). Stock variables were to be collected mainly for LPF in ICCAT and IOTC region. MS gives reference to CVs at regional level but without mentionned multilateral agreements in column B. MS to clarify? Data collection took place for more than 50% of parameters planned to be sampled in 2012 in ICCAT and IOTC. But achievement in terms of numbers of fish sampled is correct for around 40% of them. No data	Partly	Yes, MS should improve data collection in CECAF areas in
E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	incoherences for CECAF (CV cells with numbers in grey even when no fish sampled). Stock variables were to be collected mainly for LPF in ICCAT and IOTC region. MS gives reference to CVs at regional level but without mentionned multilateral agreements in column B. MS to clarify? Data collection took place for more than 50% of parameters planned to be sampled in 2012 in ICCAT and IOTC. But achievement in terms of numbers of fish sampled is correct for around 40% of them. No data collection in CECAF. Difficulty to plan observers work once they are onboard for long trips. Some parameters impossible to collect on board (maturity, sex-ratios. For a few stocks, the achieved number of individuals well exceeded the planned and requested minimum number.	Partly	Yes, MS should improve data collection in CECAF areas in the future.
E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	incoherences for CECAF (CV cells with numbers in grey even when no fish sampled). Stock variables were to be collected mainly for LPF in ICCAT and IOTC region. MS gives reference to CVs at regional level but without mentionned multilateral agreements in column B. MS to clarify? Data collection took place for more than 50% of parameters planned to be sampled in 2012 in ICCAT and IOTC. But achievement in terms of numbers of fish sampled is correct for around 40% of them. No data collection in CECAF. Difficulty to plan observers work once they are onboard for long trips. Some parameters impossible to collect on board (maturity, sex-ratios. For a few stocks, the achieved number of individuals well exceeded the planned and requested minimum number. Yes considering that fisheries are LDF.	Partly	Yes, MS should improve data collection in CECAF areas in the future.
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	incoherences for CECAF (CV cells with numbers in grey even when no fish sampled). Stock variables were to be collected mainly for LPF in ICCAT and IOTC region. MS gives reference to CVs at regional level but without mentionned multilateral agreements in column B. MS to clarify? Data collection took place for more than 50% of parameters planned to be sampled in 2012 in ICCAT and IOTC. But achievement in terms of numbers of fish sampled is correct for around 40% of them. No data collection in CECAF. Difficulty to plan observers work once they are onboard for long trips. Some parameters impossible to collect on board (maturity, sex-ratios. For a few stocks, the achieved number of individuals well exceeded the planned and requested minimum number. Yes considering that fisheries are LDF.	Partly	Yes, MS should improve data collection in CECAF areas in the future.
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	incoherences for CECAF (CV cells with numbers in grey even when no fish sampled). Stock variables were to be collected mainly for LPF in ICCAT and IOTC region. MS gives reference to CVs at regional level but without mentionned multilateral agreements in column B. MS to clarify? Data collection took place for more than 50% of parameters planned to be sampled in 2012 in ICCAT and IOTC. But achievement in terms of numbers of fish sampled is correct for around 40% of them. No data collection in CECAF. Difficulty to plan observers work once they are onboard for long trips. Some parameters impossible to collect on board (maturity, sex-ratios. For a few stocks, the achieved number of individuals well exceeded the planned and requested minimum number. Yes considering that fisheries are LDF. Yes for ICCAT and IOTC when samples sizes permtted to calculate CVs. No. Samples are also small for some	Partly Yes Yes	Yes, MS should improve data collection in CECAF areas in the future. No
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided?	incoherences for CECAF (CV cells with numbers in grey even when no fish sampled). Stock variables were to be collected mainly for LPF in ICCAT and IOTC region. MS gives reference to CVs at regional level but without mentionned multilateral agreements in column B. MS to clarify? Data collection took place for more than 50% of parameters planned to be sampled in 2012 in ICCAT and IOTC. But achievement in terms of numbers of fish sampled is correct for around 40% of them. No data collection in CECAF. Difficulty to plan observers work once they are onboard for long trips. Some parameters impossible to collect on board (maturity, sex-ratios. For a few stocks, the achieved number of individuals well exceeded the planned and requested minimum number. Yes considering that fisheries are LDF.	Partly Yes Partly	Yes, MS should improve data collection in CECAF areas in the future. No

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Transversal variables

Effort

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified? F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Landings

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Research surveys at sea

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? G1

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ?

High CVs are expected for the highly migratory pelagic species, due to the wide size range of the catch. On the other hand, it is difficult to increase sampling, as the fishing trips last for months (up to 4/5 months). Another reason for such high CVs is the change on the size classes used for the calculations. In the past 5cm size classes were used, but currently these were changed to 2cm, as requested by the relevant RFMOs.	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
N	The	ls:
No derogation listed.	No	No Yes, MS should clarify why
MS states "Not applicable"	No	recommandations are "not applicable"
NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA
MS states "Not applicable"	No	Yes, MS should clarify why shortfalls are "not applicable"
NA	NA	NA
	Is .	
Perfect	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	1	
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
For budgetary reasons only energy consumption is collected for vessels <10m; information in text provided only for mainland, MS should specify	Mostly	Information and data should be given for each areas
whether the information provided refers also to other areas.		separately
Yes for mainland. Not for other areas	Partly	MS should clarify the situatio in other areas.
Budgetary restrictions is not an	no	MS should persuit the solutio already stated in the AR and continue the collection of effort various measures from
acceptable justification		vessels <10m
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	Vos	No action by MC
	Yes Yes	No action by MS No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	100	ן זיט מטווטוז שין ועוט
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	•	
	Yes	No action by MS
		No action by MS

	Yes	No
Western IBTS 4th quarter , Sardine, Anchovy Horse Mackerel Acoustic Survey and the Nephrops TV Survey Offshore Portugal have not been carried out	No	In future, MS should try to ensure the conduction of all planned surveys
Due to technical problems (i.e. vessel broken) and financial constraints surveys could not be conducted	Yes	No
•	Yes	No
Only for the survey carried out	Yes	No

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes Yes

Yes

All census data

No action by MS

No action by MS No action by MS

No action by MS

No action by MS

No action by MS

No action by MS

No action by MS

No action by MS

	G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	<u>-</u>	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in	Due to the fact that three survey have not been performed, the survey	No	In future, MS should try to ensure the conduction of all
		gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	indices are likely to be compromised		planned surveys
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	see above	Yes Yes	No No
	G3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		•	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	NA NA
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	NA
	G4	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		The delicate to droid enormalies in the radiate decompose.	Portugal plans for a new research	100	110
			vessel in order replace RV Noruega, which has several operational	Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	problems.		
IV		the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industion of data concerning the aquaculture	stry		
	A COLLEC	Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?		Yes	No
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	
			Order of variables shall follow the	Moothy	MS is asked to provide the
		In Table IV A 2 complete and consistent with AD avidelines?	guidelines, enterprises of different	Mostly	data according to guidlines only for variables listed.
	A1	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	sizes are no variables.		
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	No No
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?		Yes Yes	No No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	А3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	NA
		Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	NA NA
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	NA
	A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
	B Collec	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Some data are not collected (FTE by gender/unpaid labour and epreciation of capital). SBS as datasource was	Mostly	MS is asked to clarify whether really a Census was conducted, even for the small
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	used even for small size enterprises	.,	enterprises
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	No No
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?		Yes Yes	No No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	В3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		INA	NA
		Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	NA
	D4	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	NA
	В4	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
			NO:		MS is aked to clarify whether
v	Module of	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem	MS is aked to clarify whether depriciation is really not collected under SBS	Mostly	depriciation is really not collected under SBS
•		rements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Cells for indicator 5, 6, 7 are not filled in, it is not clear why the time gap for		
			the availabilty for the indicator 1-4 is	Mostly	MS to clarify
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	3 years	11	
	2 Action	Are the relevant derogations listed? s to avoid shortfalls		NA	
		Are estimated as a valid about falls in the fature described 2	Indicator 9 is given only for vessels with overall length > 10 metres. For vessels < 10 m MS couldn't calculate	Mostly	MS to clarify
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	it due to the budget restrictions	Yes	No
VI		management and use of the data			
	1 Achiev	rements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP		Yes	No
		proposal?	see general comment Due to financial constraints there is	163	INO
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?		No	No
		Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?		Yes	No
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No No
	2 Action	Are the deviations justified? s to avoid shortfalls	<u> </u>	Yes	UNU
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
	Falla	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of STECF recommendations		Yes	No
VII	FOIIOW-UN				
VII	rollow-up	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?		Yes	No

Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations
Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

IX IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections
Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?

X X. References
Is there a complete list of references?

XI Annexes

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?

Yes	No
Yes	No

STECF & DG MARE - Comments			EWG comment		
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		Action needed by MS, please specify task
RC/DG MARE	Fishing effort		- A CATCH: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 18 records with missing mesh	no evident explanation for failure/issues;	
			size information for various gear types. Discards and age information for 2003-2011 submitted in an inconsistent format as compared with the definitions of the official data call format. A note on the estimation of discards was submitted from Portugal. Landings appear to be submitted in Kg and not in tonnes as requested in the data call. B_EFFORT: More issues identified in the submitted data set were 13 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types. No data on allowed activity were provided. C_SPEDIFIC EFFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 12 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types. E_LANDINGS: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 18 records with missing E_LANDINGS: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 18 records with missing		
IRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including:	mesh size information for various gear types. - Financial position values not submitted	no evident explanation for failure/issues;	MS to provide missing data available through the DCF
ncy bo ware.	ree commis	Continue and restricted as a load of the peak 5 0000-2022, including the Economic data. fishing enterprise, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital & investment - Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings - Recreational catches: catches	Only partial effort data for 2011 Some issue on landings data were encountered; such as landings income data for 2011 not provided, only partial effort data for 2011 not provided, only partial landings weight submitted for several species (landings in weight did not correspond to landings in value). Unpaid labour costs not submitted for 2008 and 2009 Fleet segment clustering information not submitted Landings value data significantly higher than figures reported in Eurostat Forecast figures for 2011 were based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, as the latter was not provided during the data call.	по еписи съровници по навигузове,	not to provide insoring uses a senious in rough title UCF
JRC/OG MARE	Aquaculture	Employment, • Number of enterprises	-There were missing employment and economic parameters for 2008. All data was mostly provided by segments For DCF data, the following parameters were not submitted: Wages and salaries 2008, Imputed	Same jr. comment as for Poland. To be checked first for which country it is meant. If valid for Portugal, only mising data for 2008 and quality for the flowing years seems to be problematic. Maybe MS just set up a data collection programme and therefor no data for 2008 are available? 4 MS should clarify the mentioned issues.	
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeas		Discards Age	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock in	None
	Arctic)		Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not appreade, or a vessel to continue descard upe, length, weign and mutually occur and madels in Softwared I and II are requested by the add user. Beside of fact, this must of continues are not failing in the ora, ACE has provide to the CEST of the fact that the continue (12-20) "muster stock table" indicating the continues of the continues of information is needed. Additionally if country is fixing actively the stock of identification cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Noweegan two.	
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock in Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are not fishing in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECT meeting [13-05] "master sock table" indicating that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.	None
ICES	Red fish Sebastes mentella Subare I and II	35	Landings Age Landings Weight Landings Weight Landings Maturity Discards Age Discards Length Discards Maturity Discards Maturity Commercial Refets	According to MS AR 2012, no stock variables data were collected on Sebastes mentela in Eastern Arctic region. Budgetarly and administrative constraints did not allow to implement observers at sea programme as planned.	
ICES	Kitefin shark (Dalatias licha) in the		Commercial Fleets		
ICES	Northeast Atlantic Jack mackerel (Trachurus picturati in the waters of the Azores	s)	Surveys at Sea Discards Age Discards Maturity	According to MS AR 2012, data collection for updating stock variables for this species has been carried out. But only 133 fish could be sampled. No mention if they were collected from landings or discards or both.	
ICES	Megrim (Lepidorhombus boscii) in Divisions VIIIc and Ixa		Landings Age Landings Maturity Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight	According to MS AR 2012, data collection for updating stock variables for this species was planned for 2012. MS should sample 300 fish for every parameter. Data on around 350-400 individuals have been colected with good precision when calculating biological relationships. Concerning metiers variables on discards, only 24 fish were measured in 2012. But no mention in AR 20122 if fish sampled were collected from landings or discards or both.	
ICES	Megrim (Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis) in Divisions VIIIc and		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight	According to MS AR 2012, data collection for updating stock variables for this species was planned for 2012. MS should sample 50 fish but only 3 were collected.	
ICES	Black scabbardfish (Aphanopus		Landings Length	According to MS AR 2012, landings were sampled and 12254 fish measured.	
ICES	carbo) in all the other areas Blue whiting in Subareas I-IX, XII as XIV (Combined stock)	id .	Landings Maturity	According to MS AR 2012, data collection for updating stock variables for this species has been carried out. 1396 fish have been sampled allowing to achieve precision target for maturity@length	

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

Member State:				ment levels
	Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
	Version of the AR reviewed		No	<10%
	Version of the NP proposal		Partly	10-50%
		EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
	Overall compliance	XXX	Yes	>90%
eral framework	,		NA	not applicable
erai irailiework	·			
onal data collec	ction organisation	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	spondent and participating institutes			Action needed?
National corre	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles		V.	
	well described?		Yes	No
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?		Yes	No
	Are derogations listed?		No	No
	If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?		NA	No
	International coordination			
B1 Attendance	ce of international meetings			L. L. C. C. A.D. MO.
				In future ARs, MS is requested to include the
				list of eligible meeting as
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?		Mostly	quidelines
	10 Table III.B.T complete.		Woodly	guidelliles
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?		Yes	
B2 Follow-up	of regional and international recommendations			
		This section should only contain the		
		general recommendations. The		
		specific recommednations should be	Yes	No
	And the control of th	highlighted under the relevant		
	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	modules	V	
	Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
RA-REGION	And the responsive actions acceptable!		res	INU
	uation of the fishing sector			
	iption of the fishing sector			
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP			
	implementation well described?		Yes	No
	Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?	NA	Yes	No
Economic vari	ables		I	
				MS needs to clarify why t
				fleet population in AR diff
		fleet register contains 476 vessels,		from fleet register. Missir
		MS reports only 200; no inactive		information need to be
		vessels listed (unlikely);		clarified and resubmited.
		MS should use segment names		segment names MS is
		according to 93/2010, appendix III		required to follow the 93/
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	(minor)	Mostly	appendix III.
	13 Table III.B. I complete and consistent with Art guidelines:	MS should use segment names	IVIOSTIY	аррених п.
		according to 93/2010, appendix III		
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	(minor)	Yes	
		table incomplete, substantial revision		
		required; no response information, no		
		CV;		
		data are not provided by fleet		Table needs to be
		segment;		resubmitted with correct
		no. of enterprises must not be		named segments respec
	In Table III D 2 complete and consistent with AD at 15 Page 2	described per size class	NI-	to III.B.1 and III.B.2 Stan
R1 Achieveme	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal		No	tables according to guidl
- Achievellie	one. Results and deviation nominal proposal			
		description of methods and		
		assumptions made for estimation of		
		capital value and capital costs should		
		be provided in chapter III.B.1, not		
		III.B.2; even there some of the		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	related information is missing	mostly	No
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	
D2 Data	Are the deviations justified?	NA	Yes	No
D∠ Data qualit	ty: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	no comment	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?	NA NA	NA NA	140
B3 Follow-up o	of Regional and international recommendations			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no relevant recommendations	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No
D4 A=4!= : : 1	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No
B4 Actions to	avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA NA	Yes Yes	No No
	ATO GOLDONO TO AVOID STIDITIBLE IN THE TUTULE ACCEPTABLE.	LN/A	162	INU
ION				
<mark>ION</mark> Biological met	tier related variables Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?		NA	

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified? C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

D Recreational fisheries

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are obtained derogations mentioned?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?

Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

One new sampling source have been added in the AR for the gillnet fishery.		
Sampling frame codes do not match		
between NP and AR (there is also an		
inconsistency between the tables in		MS to update table according
the NP)	Mostly	to comments
NP table not completely respected.		
One new sampling source have been		
added in the AR for the gillnet fishery.		
Sampling frame codes do not match		
between NP and AR (there is also an		
inconsistency between the tables in		MS to update table according
the NP)	Mostly	to comments
uio i ii j	Woody	MS to update sampling year.
		MS to clarify whether sample
		numbers are from unsorted
		catches or from retained
Sampling year is 2011.	Mostly	catches.
camping year to zer tr	moony	editorios:
		MS to clarify whether
		concurrent sampling was
		actually done, in which case
		the additional species should
	Mostly	be reported in table IIIC.6
All metiers/frames are sampled in acc	Mostly	No
Yes, low effort in trawl fishery which als	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
	. 00	110
	Yes	No
	Yes	1 140
	NA NA	No
	NA NA	No
l .	11/1	140
	NA	
Very extensive list given	Yes	No
very extensive list given	Yes	140
	Yes	No
	103	140
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
<u>'</u>		
Rec fishery is not not relevant due to		
the absence of the target species		
(Bluefin tuna and Eels) in the area.		
However, Appendix IV of the EU		
Decision 93/2010 reported also		
sharks as target group for		
Recreational Fishery. MS should		
demonstrate if all Sharks species are		
not present in the area or eventually		
are not target species for recreational		
fishermen (i.e. through appropriate		
references or eventually carrying out		MS to provide supporting
a pilot study).	Mooth	information on sharks
	Mostly	MS to clarify whether the
	NΙΛ	derogation mentioned was
	NA NA	accepted
		No No
		No
•	NA	
	NA	No
	NA NA	No No
	NA NA NA	No No No
	NA NA	No No
	NA NA NA	No No No No
	NA NA NA NA	No No No No No Yes, MS should provide a full
	NA NA NA NA	No No No No Yes, MS should provide a full list of derogations.
	NA NA NA NA	No No No No No Ves, MS should provide a full list of derogations. No
	NA NA NA NA NO NA	No Yes, MS should provide a full list of derogations. No No
	NA NA NA NA	No No No No No Ves, MS should provide a full list of derogations. No
	NA NA NA NA NO NA	No No No No No No No No Ves, MS should provide a full list of derogations. No No
	NA NA NA NA NO NA	No No No No No No No No Ves, MS should provide a full list of derogations. No No
	NA	No No No No No Ves, MS should provide a full list of derogations. No No No
	NA	No No No No No Yes, MS should provide a full list of derogations. No No No No
	NA	No No No No No Yes, MS should provide a full list of derogations. No No No No

NP table not completely respected.

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

F Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

F1 Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

F2 Effort

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Sampling year is wrong (2011). It is unclear if it is the entity of the year column that is wrong or if the data is from 2011.	Yes	No, for the future MS should take more attention to the indication of the year. Both countries (Bulgaria and Romania) should clarify the exactly latin name of turbot.
Assuming that is the entity in the year column that is wrong; whiting is sampled although not present in NP, maturity, sex-ration and weight sampled although not present in NP. Sprat undersampled for 3 variables, all other stocks*variables sampled in excess or at target. For all species the achieved length and age sampling has exceeded the required and planned levels	Mostly	No
MS explained that the excess sampling has taken place due to continuation of the previous sampling practices because the data series are used for analytical assessment purposes. Excess sampling has been realised on the national expense of Romanian NIMRD Constanta.	Mostly	No
	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
Mostly not (despite excess sampling). The regional coordination in the sampling and the calculation of CVs		No
with Bulgaria do not exist.	Partly No	MS should better explain the deviations on CV.
	NA	No
	NA	No
MS list several recommendations		
from RCM Med&BS (2009-2012) incl. LM comments	Yes	No
` ,	Yes	No
` ,		
` ,	Yes	No
Yes. MS indicates that In next RCM 2013, it is absolutely necessary to realize a new bilateral agreement	Yes Yes	No No
Yes. MS indicates that In next RCM 2013, it is absolutely necessary to realize a new bilateral agreement between the two Member States Yes, there are almost no shortfalls. MS noticed that for Romania, all the time was a problem to have in due	Yes Yes Yes	No No
Yes. MS indicates that In next RCM 2013, it is absolutely necessary to realize a new bilateral agreement between the two Member States Yes, there are almost no shortfalls. MS noticed that for Romania, all the time was a problem to have in due time the financial support. Fleet segment nomenclature confusing, not in line with NP nor with tables IIIB1-3; unclear why segments are listed separately; to be redesigned by MS using either NP approach or a setting which clearly displays differences between	Yes Yes Yes	No No No The table IIIF1 should be re-
Yes. MS indicates that In next RCM 2013, it is absolutely necessary to realize a new bilateral agreement between the two Member States Yes, there are almost no shortfalls. MS noticed that for Romania, all the time was a problem to have in due time the financial support. Fleet segment nomenclature confusing, not in line with NP nor with tables IIIB1-3; unclear why segments are listed separately; to be redesigned by MS using either NP approach or a setting which clearly displays differences between	Yes Yes Yes	No No No The table IIIF1 should be re-
Yes. MS indicates that In next RCM 2013, it is absolutely necessary to realize a new bilateral agreement between the two Member States Yes, there are almost no shortfalls. MS noticed that for Romania, all the time was a problem to have in due time the financial support. Fleet segment nomenclature confusing, not in line with NP nor with tables IIIB1-3; unclear why segments are listed separately; to be redesigned by MS using either NP approach or a setting which clearly displays differences between segments The variable "" is clearly a copypaste mistake from the template. How this could be sampled as census	Yes Yes Yes Yes No	No No No No The table IIIF1 should be redone according to guidelines. The table IIIF1 should be re-
Yes. MS indicates that In next RCM 2013, it is absolutely necessary to realize a new bilateral agreement between the two Member States Yes, there are almost no shortfalls. MS noticed that for Romania, all the time was a problem to have in due time the financial support. Fleet segment nomenclature confusing, not in line with NP nor with tables IIIB1-3; unclear why segments are listed separately; to be redesigned by MS using either NP approach or a setting which clearly displays differences between segments The variable "" is clearly a copypaste mistake from the template. How this could be sampled as census	Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly	No No No No No The table IIIF1 should be redone according to guidelines. The table IIIF1 should be redone according to guidelines.
Yes. MS indicates that In next RCM 2013, it is absolutely necessary to realize a new bilateral agreement between the two Member States Yes, there are almost no shortfalls. MS noticed that for Romania, all the time was a problem to have in due time the financial support. Fleet segment nomenclature confusing, not in line with NP nor with tables IIIB1-3; unclear why segments are listed separately; to be redesigned by MS using either NP approach or a setting which clearly displays differences between segments The variable "" is clearly a copypaste mistake from the template. How this could be sampled as census	Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes	No N
Yes. MS indicates that In next RCM 2013, it is absolutely necessary to realize a new bilateral agreement between the two Member States Yes, there are almost no shortfalls. MS noticed that for Romania, all the time was a problem to have in due time the financial support. Fleet segment nomenclature confusing, not in line with NP nor with tables IIIB1-3; unclear why segments are listed separately; to be redesigned by MS using either NP approach or a setting which clearly displays differences between segments The variable "" is clearly a copypaste mistake from the template. How this could be sampled as census	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y	No N
Yes. MS indicates that In next RCM 2013, it is absolutely necessary to realize a new bilateral agreement between the two Member States Yes, there are almost no shortfalls. MS noticed that for Romania, all the time was a problem to have in due time the financial support. Fleet segment nomenclature confusing, not in line with NP nor with tables IIIB1-3; unclear why segments are listed separately; to be redesigned by MS using either NP approach or a setting which clearly displays differences between segments The variable "" is clearly a copypaste mistake from the template. How this could be sampled as census	Yes Yes Yes Yes Mostly Yes Yes	No N

In general the fleet segmentation in table IIIF1 is not consistent ("Pelagic trawwers" is in part of "Vessels using active and passive gears") and not in accordance with the guidelines (neither is the NP). As the data collected is census data, it probably covers all segments and the it is just the reporting which is not according to specifications.	Mostly	Guidelines should be read more carefully in future
--	--------	---

The table III F1 should be re-Nο done according to guidelines. Are the deviations explained? The table III F1 should be re-No done according to guidelines. Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Yes No action by MS Are the deviations explained? Yes No action by MS Are the deviations justified? Yes No action by MS Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Yes No action by MS Yes Are the responsive actions described? No action by MS Are the responsive actions acceptable? Yes No action by MS Actions to avoid shortfalls F14 No action by MS Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Yes Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Yes No action by MS F3 Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal In general the fleet segmentation in table IIIF1 is not consistent ("Pelagic trawlwers" is in part of "Vessels using active and passive gears") and Guidelines should be read not in accordance with the guidelines Mostly more carefully in future (neither is the NP). As the data collected is census data, it probably covers all segments and the it is just the reporting which is not according Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? to specifications The table III F1 should be re-No done according to guidelines. Are the deviations explained? The table III F1 should be re-Nο done according to guidelines. Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Yes No action by MS Are the deviations explained? Yes No action by MS Are the deviations justified? Yes No action by MS **F13** Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Yes No action by MS Are the responsive actions described? Yes No action by MS Are the responsive actions acceptable? Yes No action by MS Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Yes No action by MS Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Yes No action by MS Research surveys at sea G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Mostly MS should report the relevant international planning groups both for Yes Nο the demersal and acoustic surevys (PGMed is not the relevant one) Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Only 55% of the planned hauls for the acoustic survey has been achieved. As the MS refers in the report and To be clarified by MS (see Mostly table only on fish trawls it is not clear Comment). if the MS has also conducted the acoustics. MS refers to the financial problems Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Mostly Nο Are the deviations explained? for the acoustic survey Are the deviations justified? Deviation are not caused by MS. Mostly No Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ? No Yes G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Due to the fact that only 55% of the acoustic survey has been achieved, the quality of the acoustic survey in Mostly No Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in the Black sea area could be compromised MS refers to the financial problems gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Yes No Are the deviations explained? for the acoustic survey Are the deviations justified? Mostly No G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Yes No Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? NA NA G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Yes No Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Yes No Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry Collection of data concerning the aquaculture Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1? Yes No Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes MS needs to resubmit table CV is missing in most necessary with CV for segments less Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? than 70% of response rate. cases, MS to resubmit Partly A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Yes No Are the deviations explained? Yes No Are the deviations justified? Yes No

Α

		MS shall be reminded that AR 2012 is for 2012 actions and that information requested in the tables shall be		MS i to provide information in particular section following guidlines, without unnecessary data which is
	Is respective data quality information given?	reported there and not in the text	Mostly	submitted in Standard tables
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
A3 Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations			
		MS maybe reminded that LM		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	recommendations are requested.	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
A4 Actions to	avoid shortfalls		res	INO
A4 ACTIONS TO	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
Collection of	data concerning the processing industry			
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
B1 Achievem	ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
B2 Data aud	Are the deviations justified? ity: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
bz Data qual	Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
B3 Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations			
•	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
B4 Actions to	avoid shortfalls	<u> </u>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
odule of evaluati	on of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
	Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	Are the relevant derogations listed?		NA	No
2 Actions to avoi				
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA NA	No No
odule for manag	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ement and use of the data		INA	INO
	Results and deviation from NP proposal		Mostly	
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP			
	proposal?	see general comment SG3	Yes	No
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?		Yes	No
				MS to provide information or the status of establishing a national DCF website
	Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A) ?		No	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	No No
2 Actions to avoi			r es	NO
- AUGUIS IU AVOI	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	I	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	+	Yes	No
ollow-up of STEC	CF recommendations		Yes	
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
st of acronyms a	and abbreviations	1		- 1
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?		Yes	No
Comments, suc	ggestions and reflections		Voc	No
. References	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?		Yes	NO
References	Is there a complete list of references?		Yes	No
I. Annexes	to thore a complete not or references.		100	
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support			
	statements made in the main text?			

		STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment		
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*	1	Action needed by MS, please specify task	
RC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: • Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital & investment • Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings • Recreational catches: catches	Significant amounts of missing data Some capacity and landings data were not reported -Clustering information incomplete -Significant differences were observed in gross tonnage and kilowatts for 2010 and landings weight for 2009 - Capital values and investments data not submitted - Capacity data (CIT) higher than Eurostat statistics for 2008-2009, but lower for 2010	no evident explanation for failure; contradictory to the AR information where it was indicated tha all data have been collected exhaustively for 2011		
RC/DG MARE	Mediterranean & Black Sea	Fisheries' specific landings and discards by species, fishing effort and surveys' data for the years 2008-2012	- Table D: The numbers of fisheries covered indicate that the quantitative information is scarce.	As reported in the NP and in the AR, for biological sampling have been selected only 4 metiers: see table III.C.3 of the AR 2012. Those are the fisheries that should be covered by MS and for which data should be avalai	MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not provided	
RC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: including: income, Personal costs, • Energy costs, • Raw materia costs, • Other operational costs, • Capital costs, • Extraordinary costs, • Capital value, • Net Investments, • Debt, • Raw material volume, • Total volume, • Employment, • Number of enterprises	- No data submitted for 2008	MS shall be asked for, maybe set up of DCF has just begun and so that year is not covered? Member of EU since 2007.	MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not provided	
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.1	Segment: - Fleet segment - Vessel number - Capacity (measure, value) GSA-Segment: - Geographical Sub-Area - Fleet segment - Vessel number - Capacity (measure, value)	All Task 1.1 data - not provided		MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not provided	
SFCM	GFCM - Task 1.2	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup: - Fishing gear class - Group target species - Vessel number GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: - Fishing period month (start-end) - Fishing gear class - Vessel number - Species	All Task 1.2 data - not provided		MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not provided	
FCM	GFCM - Task 1.3	Segment: • Engine power • Engine power • Employment • Salary share % • Landing weight • Landing weight • Landing value • Worsking days/year per vessel • Working hours/days per vessel • Working hours/days per vessel • Working to V.C. from fuel costs • Yearly fixed costs per vessel	All Task 1.3 data - not provided		MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not provided	
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.4	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: • Effort measure • Catch or Landing • CPUE/LPUE • Discard • Bycatch GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: • Catch or Landing • CPUE/LPUE	All Task 1.4 data - not provided		MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not provided	
FCM	GFCM - Task 1.5	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: • Length range of captured species • Length average • Sex • Maturity	All Task 1.5 data - not provided		MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not provided	

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

Reference year 2012 Compliance class Compliance level Version of the AR reviewed Nο <10% Version of the NP proposal Partly 10-50% **EWG Answer** 50-90% Mostly Overall compliance >90% Yes NA not applicable General framework National data collection organisation **EWG COMMENTS** EWG judgement EWG Action needed? National correspondent and participating institutes Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles Roles are not well described Mostly Nο well described? No coordination meeting was held. Partl No Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination National coordination meeting is an meetings? obligation. Yes Are derogations listed? If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines? Yes Regional and International coordination Attendance of international meetings В1 Is Table II.B.1 complete Yes No Yes No Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained? B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations LM 2011 recommendations are not NΩ MS to update list Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed? isted Are the responsive actions described? NA Are the responsive actions acceptable? SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector General description of the fishing sector Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described? yes no Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? no yes Economic variables segments should be named according MS is advised to follow the to appendix III; inactive vessels guidelines in future AR Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? should not be listed twice Mostly MS has to justify why clustering scheme confusing: segmensts with more than 10 1. some segments are too big for being clustered (DTS0010, vessels were clustered DTS1012): 2. passive gears <12m can be merged into "PG" anyway, no need for including them in clustering scheme (major issues which were displayed properly in the NP); Table IIIB2 should not contain inactive seaments: segments should be named according to appendix III; clusters not marked with asterisk; Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Seaments should be named Yes according to appendix III; "all segments" was not provided in list of segment names in the template. but it should be permitted to use it Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal **B1** Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? No Yes NΑ Are the deviations explained NΑ Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal B2 Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? NA NA Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations **B3** Yes No Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? NA Are the responsive actions described? NA Are the responsive actions acceptable? **B4** Actions to avoid shortfalls Yes No Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acc Yes Nο **REGION BALTIC SEA** Biological metier related variables Yes No Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes No

Sweden

Member State:

		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	inconsistencies bettween III.C.3 and III.C.4 (total numbers of trips in 2012, even excluding metiers with derogation; sampling frames KBN1, KBN2, KBN3, KBN4, KBEE2, KBEE3, KBWE1, KBWWE2 etc.). Fishing groud codes not homogeneous with III.C3, III.C.5 and III.C.6.	Mostly	MS to clarify inconsistencies between tables III.C.3 and III.C.4
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table complete. But table difficult to analyse because not compiling only species planned in the NP (49 species listed in NP, 100 in AR). Most of the "new" specie in AR have low occurencies and often only in discards. Could provision of results concerning these species not be more accurate in table III.C.6 only? Note that MS provides also CV on discards volumes in an extra column.	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table correctly filled. But inconsistensies with table III.C.5. Total No of fish sampled in III.C.6 is 75649, in IIIIC.5 88643. Difficult to understand, particularly when MS applies concurrent at sea sampling strategy.	Mostly	MS to explain why there are more fish sampled in III.C.5 than in III.C.6.
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Around 50-60% of metiers sampled consistently with NP targets. Other metiers undersampled (achievement rates around 50-67%) but fyke nets not sampled at all. Concerning stocks, achievement rates are correct for half of them. Main defficiencies are for sprat, eel, turbot and Coregonus.	Mostly	
		Are the deviations explained?		Mostly	MS to provide explanation for deviations on stocks
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	deviations on stocks
C2	Data qualit	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Were CV estimates provided?	When sample sizes permitted	Yes	No
		Were CV targets met?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	
	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	T
C3					
C3		Were the relevant derogations listed?	MO to provide LM 0044	Yes	NIA.
C3		Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	·	No	NA
СЗ		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	recommendations		NA
С3			recommendations	No	NA
C3 C4		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	recommendations	No NA	NA
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	recommendations	No NA NA Yes	No
C4	Actions to	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	recommendations	No NA NA	
C4	Actions to	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? & EASTERN ARCTIC	recommendations	No NA NA Yes	No
C4	Actions to	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? & EASTERN ARCTIC related variables	recommendations	No NA NA Yes Yes	No No
C4 REGION N C Biolo	Actions to NORTH SEA ogical metier	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? & EASTERN ARCTIC related variables Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	recommendations	No NA NA Yes	No
C4	Actions to NORTH SEA ogical metier	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? & EASTERN ARCTIC related variables Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal	recommendations	No NA NA Yes Yes	No No
C4 REGION N C Biolo	Actions to NORTH SEA ogical metier	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? & EASTERN ARCTIC related variables Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	recommendations	No NA NA Yes Yes	No No
C4 REGION N C Biolo	Actions to NORTH SEA ogical metier	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? & EASTERN ARCTIC related variables Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? ents: Results and deviation from NP proposal	recommendations	No NA NA Yes Yes Yes	No No No

		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	should report the approved derogation or demonstrate (i.e. through appropriate references or eventually carrying out a pilot study) that Sharks are not target species for recreational fishermen. Recreational fishery for eel is not allowed in the country. Re cod fishery; MS should consider widening the sampling to better represent recreational fisheries activity for cod.		
			Appendix IV of the EU Decision 93/2010 reports also sharks as target group for Recreational Fishery. MS	Mostly	MS to explain the shark fishery situation
necre D1	eational fishe Achieveme	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region? nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
	ALTIC SEA		•		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
C4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		NA	,
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	2011 LM recommendations not listed	Yes No	No MS to update list
C3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations		Voc	INo
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	
		Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?		Yes NA	No
		Were CV estimates provided?		Yes	No
C2	Data quality	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal		<u> </u>	
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	No No
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	2012. All other are undersampled. Concerning stocks, achievement rates are correct for less than half of them. Main defficiencies are for Coryphaenoides rupestris and Merlangius merlangius.		
			33% only of the metiers and sampling frames were sampled as planned for 2012. All other are undersampled.	Partly	no
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	correctly filled. Ssome inconsisencies found between III.C.6 and III.C.3. Only 8 metiers detailed in III.C.6 against 10 in III.C.3. Metiers coding in III.C.6 not consistent with NS&EA reference metier list (for example OTM_SPF_HERSPR).		III.C.6

- D Recreational fisheries
 - D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

			For the North Sea only cod are to be reported. Recreational fishery for eel is not allowed in the country. Appendix IV of the EU Decision 93/2010 reports also sharks as target group for Recreational Fishery. MS should report the approved derogation or demonstrate (i.e. through appropriate references or eventually carrying out a pilot study) that Sharks are not target species for recreational fishermen.	Mostly	MS to clarify as regards the shark recreational fishery
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		NA	
		Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained?		NA	
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	
D2	Data quality	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal		I NIA	T
		Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met?		NA NA	
		Are the deviations explained?		NA NA	
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	
D3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations			
		Were the relevant derogations listed?		NA NA	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	
D4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA NA	
E Biolo	nical stock-r	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? elated variables		INA	
	g.ou. 0.00	Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Yes	Yes	No
	BALTIC SEA		•	•	,
E1	Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Table properly filled with relevant	Yes	No
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	footnotes.	res	INO
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Over and under sampling reported in	Mostly	No
			most of species Expolanation is given to all of the	Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?	stocks	· ·	N.
E2	Data quality	Are the deviations justified? y: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Full justification	Yes	No
		Were CV estimates provided?			survey sampling, MS is asked to submit CVs and/or explain why they were not delivered. MS to explain missing sampling for Maturity@age and sexratio@age in some species
		Were CV targets met?	From the total 61 parameters 27 reached precision target, and 16 were not presented at all	Partly	Yes, provide 16 missing cv's
		Are the deviations explained?	Information is very limitted with no emphasis on explanations of deviations	partly	provide more detailed explanation about deviations in quality
		Are the deviations justified?	No informartion is given	NA	No
E3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations	Yes, 2 derogations relevant to the	Yes	Ma
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	Baltic stock listed	res	No
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Relevant recommendation is missing (task sharing of ageing eel and salmon)	No	Yes, provide recommendation with follow up action
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No
E4	Actions to	Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls	NA	NA	No
	Actions to		Yes for pelagic stocks, salmon and	Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	eel Yes	Vaa	No
REGION N	NORTH SEA	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? & EASTERN ARCTIC	162	Yes	No
	gical stock-r	elated variables nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal	<u> </u>	I.,	1
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly filled with relevant footnotes.	Yes	No
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	From the total 64 variables ,19 were undersampled and 25 oversampled	Mostly	No
		Are the deviations explained?	Not all explanations are provided.	Partly	MS to update information on deviations of sampling witch flounder, haddock,northern shrimp,norway pout,sprat and pollock
		Are the deviations justified?	Logistic difficulties, changes in fishing seasons, low landings, deficiencies in protocoles. Need to update on species listed above	Mostly	No

E2	Data quality	r: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Were CV estimates provided?	In most of the cases. Information is missing in case of some variables of eel, plaice, pout, pollock, nehrops and pandalus	Mostly	No
		Were CV targets met?	Targets met in 24 of the total 43 presented variables.	Mostly	29 variables are marked as NA and this need to be updated or explained
		Are the deviations explained?	Short explanation only about weight@a	Partly	Yes, provide more detailed info about deviations
		Are the deviations justified?	Agreed in weight@age variable, but there are no other explanations	Partly	No
E3	Follow-up o	of Regional and international recommendations			
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	3 derogations listed	Yes	No
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes, one relevant recommendation is listed	Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No
E4	Actions to a	avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes, for all the undersampled species	Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No
F Trans	sversal variab	les			
		Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
F1	Capacity				
	F11 Achieve	ements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
		to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
F2	Effort				
	F11 Achieve	ements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Van	Na
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?		Yes Yes	No No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
		ality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	F13 Follow-	up of Regional and international recommendations		Vaa	Na
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		Yes Yes	No No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
		to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
F3	Landings				
	F11 Achieve	ements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	F12 Data qu	ality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	E40 E-II	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	FI3 FUIIOW-I	up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
	F14 Actions	to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
G Rese G1	arch surveys	at sea nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Gi	Acilieveille	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Assistant deviations evaluing 40	79% of achieved targets for the UWTV surveys were due to the bad	Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	weather conditions	Yes	No
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?			
G2		r: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?		NA	
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	
		Are the deviations justified?			
G3	Follow-up o	of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA NA	
		Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	

^			ninial also suffalla			
G	4 д	actions to a	avoid shortfalls	concerning permission for Sweden to visit Danish waters", for this not all the 90 stations planned have been carried out, but no future actions are	Mostly	No
				described		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Mostly	MS should ensure that in
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			future this "agreement" will be solved in advance
Modu	le of t		ion of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing indi	ustry		
A C	ollecti	on of data	concerning the aquaculture	•		
			Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?		Yes	No
			Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
				The reference year is uncorrect. The n	Partly	MS should resubmit table with CV indicator where non- probability sample survey was
			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			applied
A	1 A		tts: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
A	2 D	i Data quality:	Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	_	,	Is respective data quality information given?		yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
A	3 F	ollow-up of	Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	
			Are the responsive actions described?		NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	
A	4 A		void shortfalls	1	Vaa	Ma
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes Yes	No No
	- 11 41		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		res	INO
в с	onecti	on or data	concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
			Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
В	1 Δ		Its: Results and deviation from NP proposal	<u> </u>	1.55	<u> </u>
В	2 C		Are the deviations justified? Results and deviation from NP proposal	AR text: "One variable where collected through questionnaires by Statistics Sweden based on PPS-selection in the Statistical Business Register. The variable collected through questionnaires is subsidies. The questionnaires are the base for estimating an allocation key to allocate costs and income to variables not included in the company/financial accounts." This is not reflected in table IV.B.2, which variables are affected, as in the table IV.B.2 all seems to be collected by census and 100% response rate, which contradicts the text. To be clarified by MS.	Yes	MS has to clarify data collection method for each method
			Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?		Mostly No	MS needs to explain deviatios MS needs to justify deviatios
			Are the deviations justified?			
В	3 F	ollow-up of	Regional and international recommendations		INIA	Т
	•				NA	
	•		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			
	•		Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	
			Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
В		actions to a	Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	MS should focus more on reference year rather than on the previous years in future AR MS should focus more on

V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem

¹ Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

	2 Actions to avoid sh	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Minor issues: MS should keep the standard format of presentation for all indicators (e.g. don't split in several rows indicator n. 8); is not completely clear why indicator number 9 (fuel) is presented every two years	Yes	No
M		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
VI	Module for manageme	ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	see general comment	Yes	No
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?		Yes	No
		Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?		Yes	No
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	2 Actions to avoid sh	ortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
VII	Follow-up of STECF re			G	1
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
VIII	List of acronyms and				
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?			
IX	IX. Comments, sugges				
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?			
Х	X. References				
		Is there a complete list of references?			
ΧI	XI. Annexes	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support			
		statements made in the main text?			

SWEDEN

		STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment		
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*	- Evid comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task	
IRC/DG MARE	Fishing effort	Dota requested	- A CATCH: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 173 records with no gear	no evident explanation for failure	MS asked to clarify why the data not provided	
,			information and 553 records with missing mesh size information for mainly for pots.			
			- B EFFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 16 records with no gear			
			information and 65 records with missing mesh size information for mainly for pots.			
			- C SPECIFIC EFFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 38 records with no			
			gear information and 75 records with missing mesh size information for mainly for pots.			
			- E_LANDINGS: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 1090 records with no gear			
			information and 4052 records with missing mesh size information for mainly for pots.			
IRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including:	- Fleet segment level capacity data for 2012 not submitted	no evident explanation for failure;	MS asked to clarify why the data not provided	
INC/DG IVIANE	Fleet economics	Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure	- Landings income data for 2011 not provided	delivery of 2012 data not mandatory	ivis asked to clarify why the data not provided	
		(costs), capital & investment	- Although Sweden has extensively used the guidelines on clustering, some issues on the clustering			
		Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings Recreational catches: catches	approach remain.			
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast	Recreational catches: catches	Discards Age		No action needed	
ICES	Arctic)		Discards Length	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock i	n action needed	
	Arctic)			Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are not fishing		
			Discards Weight	in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13-05) "master stock table" indicating		
			Discards Maturity	that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no		
				information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard informatio	n	
				cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.		
ICEC	Under de la Colonia de la colonia		Discoule Ass		No anti-a secolari	
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II		Discards Age	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddock i	No action needed	
	(Northeast Arctic)		Discards Length	Subareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are not fishing	g	
			Discards Weight	in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13-05) "master stock table" indicating		
			Discards Maturity	that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no		
				information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard informatio		
				cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.		
ICES	Cod in Subdivisions 22 to 24		Communication and Communicatio	The Conditional of DITC	NAC and and an about the sales about an accordance	
ICES	Cod in Subdivisions 22 to 24		Surveys at Sea	The Swedish part of BITS survey with DANA is not covering SD22-24 according to the WGBIFS. Only 2 hauls are done in sd23 using the small vessel Hålabben.	MS asked to clarify why the data not provided	
ICES	Flounder in Subdivisions 22 to 32		Landings Age	According to MS AR 2012, 1060 fish were measured for landings and 2785 for discards (metiers	MS asked to clarify why the data not provided	
ICES	Flourider III Subdivisions 22 to 32		Landings Age Landings Length	variables - table III.C.5).	ivis asked to clarify wify the data not provided	
			Landings Weight	Although this species was planned for updating stock variables for 2012, no data were collected		
			Landings Maturity	for that issue. No explanation provided in AR text by MS on that deviation. MS should provide		
			Landings Sex Ratio	metier-related variables collected through the DCF		
			Discards Age			
			Discards Length			
			Discards Weight			
			Discards Maturity			
	<u> </u>		Discards Sex Ratio			
ICES	Sole in Division IIIa and Subdivisions		Surveys at Sea	Sole is sampled and data is collected in IBTS survey in area IIIa, and data is available. Only few	MS asked to clarify why the data not provided	
	22–24 (Skagerrak, Kattegat, and the			individuals are collected		
	Belts)					
ICES	Demersal elasmobranchs in the		Discards Age	Age reading is not apllicable for Elasmobranchs in the DCF regulation!	No action needed	
	North Sea, Skagerrak and eastern					
	English Channel					
ICES	Whiting in Division IIIa (Skagerrak -		Surveys at Sea	Whiting is sampled and data is collected in IBTS survey in area IIIa, and data is available.	MS asked to clarify why the data not provided	
	Kattegat)					

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

Member State: Reference year Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal Overall compliance General framework National data collection organisation National correspondent and participating institutes Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described? Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings? Are derogations listed? If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines? Regional and International coordination Attendance of international meetings Is Table II.B.1 complete? Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained? Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed? R2 Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector General description of the fishing sector Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described? Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? B Economic variables Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?
	Are the deviations explained?
	Are the deviations justified?
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal
	Is respective data quality information given?
	Are the deviations explained?
	Are the deviations justified?
B 3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
	Are the responsive actions described?
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?
В4	Actions to avoid shortfalls
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?
	lad 9 Disak Cos

Ne	gion wea a b	ieu a biack sea			
С	Biological n	netier related variable	e		

Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Judgement levels				
2012	Compliance class	Compliance level		
	No	<10%		
	Partly	10-50%		
EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%		
XXX	Yes	>90%		
	NA	not applicable		

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	Action needed Yes/No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	No	No
	NA	No

MS included only meetings they attended	Partly	MS to update table with all eligible meetings
Not possible to check whether all planned meetings were attended	NA	No
	No	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Inactive vessels should be separated by length class; segments should be named according to appendix III (minor issue); supra-region should be named according to 93/2010 (minor)	Mostly	Inactive vessels should be separated by length class; segments should be named according to appendix III (minor issue); supra-region should be named according to 93/2010 (minor). MS should resubmit table IIIB1.
Segments should be named according to appendix III (minor issue); supra-region should be named according to 93/2010 (minor)	Mostly	Segments should be named according to appendix III (minor issue); supra-region should be named according to 93/2010 (minor);
segments should be presented unclustered; segments should be named according to appendix III (minor issue); supra-region should be named according to 93/2010 (minor)	Mostly	Segments should be named according to appendix III (minor issue); supra-region should be named according to 93/2010 (minor).MS should resubmit table IIIB3.
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	NA	No
MS have left sampling years 2011	Yes	No
and 2013 in the table MS have left sampling years 2011 and 2013 in the table. 1 sampling frame should be represented by only 1 row.	Yes	No
Table is shorter than in NP. MS have only reported two stocks. Sampling years 2011 and 2013 remain in the AR table. MS only reported stocks for which they sample biological variables. In metier related sampling all stocks should be measured.	Partly	MS to clarify whether concurrent sampling is carried out, in which case the table needs to be updated to include additional sampling.
Only Small Pelagic Fish data given	Partly	MS to submit all sampled data
All metiers undersampled, both stocks undersampled	Partly	No

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal C2

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls C4

> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Mediterranean and Black Sea

Recreational fisheries

СЗ

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are obtained derogations mentioned?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?

Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region Med & Black Sea

Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal E2

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?

Text is confusing since it refers to transversal variables issues	Yes	No
transversar variables issues	Yes	No
	V	NI-
	Yes No	No No
Text is confusing since it refers to	No	No
transversal variables issues		
	NA	No
	No	No
	No No	No
	No NA	No No
	No	MS to update text and provide relevant actions to avoid shortfalls
	NA	No
	NA	No
Eel is protected under National legislation. There is no recreational fishery for bluefin tuna as stated in the NP, but no information are given for sharks. MS should report it. MS should demonstrate if all Sharks species are not present in the area or eventually are not target species for recreational fishermen (i.e. through appropriate references or eventually carrying out a pilot study)	Partly	MS to clarify issue re shark recreational fishing (see Comment) and to confirm that there is no recreational fishery for BFT and eel.
	No	No
	Partly	MS to clarify better the situation regarding recreational fishery sampling
	NA	No
Text is contradicatory and confusing. It is difficult to follow	No	MS to amend text
It is difficult to follow	NA	No
	No	No
	NA	No
	No	MS to provide list of
		derogations
	No	MS to provide list of recomme MS to provide actions
	No	required
	NA	No
Actions to take place from 2014	.,	l
onwards	Yes	No
	Mostly	MS to provide more information on how this will be achieved
	Yes	No. For the future MS should always report the name of the Region as requested in the AR Guidelines 2013
Ves but MO has a fig		
Yes but, MS have left sampling years 2011 and 2013 in the table III.E.3. For the future MS is requested to keep only the year of the AR	Yes	No
All stocks are sampled for all variables but the number of individuals for all variables are undersampled in respect to the planned ones.	Partly	No
It is not clear if the problems were mainly linked to lack of appropriate authorizations for the observers or to strictly economic reasons "Purse seiners started to fish in June and performed far less fishing trips than years before".	Mostly	Yes. MS should better clarify the deviations (i.e. low number of specimens for the two species collected) from the NP
	Mostly	Yes. MS should better clarify the deviations from the NP
<u> </u>	Yes	No
CVs are very low to this stock	100	
CVs are very low. Is this stock	Yes	Yes. MS should better explain the methods to calculate CV

NA

No

	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
E3				
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		No	No Yes. MS should report any
		No but MS comment upon some	No	recommendations relevant for
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	recommendations		the AR year
				Yes. MS should clearly report
			Partly	the recommendation (that is
			· u.u,	only mentioned in the text)
	Are the responsive actions described?			with the responsive action
				Yes. MS should clearly report
			Partly	the recommendation (that is
			,	only mentioned in the text)
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?			with the responsive action
E4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Г		Yes. MS should explain the
		No, MS claims that there will be no		actions to avoid shortfalls in
		reasons for shortfalls 2010	No	the future (i.e. low number of
	Are estimate assist aboutfalls in the future described 2	onwards		indivdiuals collected during
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			2012) Yes. MS should explain the
				actions to avoid shortfalls in
			NA	the future (i.e. low number of
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			individuals collected during 2012)
F Tra	ansversal variables			2012)
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
F1				
	F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal	12	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
F2				1222
	F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	10		T
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposa Are the deviations explained?	117	Yes Yes	No No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	No No
	F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			į. to
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
	F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls		163	INO
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
F2	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
F3	Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposa	al?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
	Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		Yes	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	T	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Г	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
G Re G1	search surveys at sea Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
G1	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Т	Yes	No
		Reading the text it seems that there		
		are no deviations in the achieved		
		target. However, table III.G.1 reports		
		different information. MS should pay	Yes	No
		attention reporting the correct achieved target and the correct		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposa	porcontago undor oach column		
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
G2	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	37	Yes	No
GZ	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no	change in		
	gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
G3	Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	<u> </u>	NA	No
3	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described?		NA	No
~4	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	<u> </u>	NA	No
G4	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA NA	No
Module	e of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and proc	essing industry		·

	A C	onection of date	a concerning the aquaculture			
			Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?		Yes	No
			Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	Α	Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	Α	2 Data qualit	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal			To a second
			Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	Α	3 Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations	1		To a second
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
			Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	No
		A	Are the responsive actions acceptable? avoid shortfalls		NA	No
	A	A Actions to	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		V	INI-
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
	ь с	alloation of date	a concerning the processing industry		res	NO
	в с	onection of data	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Van	Ne
			Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	-	Yes Yes	No No
	В	11 Achieveme	nts: Results and deviation from NP proposal		res	INO
		Acilieveille	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?	+	Yes	No
			Are the deviations justified?	+	Yes	No
	В	32 Data qualit	y: Results and deviation from NP proposal	1	162	IIAO
		- Data qualit	Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
			Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	В	3 Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations	L	100	1:
	_		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
			Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
	В	Actions to a	avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
V	Modu	le of evaluation	of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
	1 A	chievements: Re	sults and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
			and the second s			
			Are the relevant derogations listed?		NA	No
	2 A	ctions to avoid sl				No
	2 A	actions to avoid sl			NA NA	No No
			nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
VI	Modu	le for managem	nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data		NA	No
VI	Modu	le for managem	nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal		NA NA	No No
VI	Modu	le for managem	nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		NA	No
VI	Modu	le for managem	nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP	see general comment SG3	NA NA Yes	No No
VI	Modu	le for managem	nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	see general comment SG3	NA NA	No No
VI	Modu	le for managem	nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP	The existing data storage is	NA NA Yes	No No No
VI	Modu	le for managem	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	The existing data storage is described but no description on	NA NA Yes	No No No MS to provide information on
VI	Modu	le for managem	nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP	The existing data storage is	NA NA Yes	No No No
VI	Modu	le for managem	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	The existing data storage is described but no description on	NA NA Yes Yes	No No No MS to provide information on data storage.
VI	Modu	le for managem	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?	The existing data storage is described but no description on	NA NA Yes Yes Partiy Yes	No No No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage.
VI	Modu	le for managem	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	The existing data storage is described but no description on	NA NA Yes Yes Partly Yes Yes	No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No No
VI	Modu	le for managem	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	The existing data storage is described but no description on	NA NA Yes Yes Partly Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No No No
VI	Modu 1 A	le for managem chievements: Re	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section III.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations instified?	The existing data storage is described but no description on	NA NA Yes Yes Partly Yes Yes	No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No No
VI	Modu 1 A	le for managem	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls	The existing data storage is described but no description on	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partiy Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No No No No No
VI	Modu 1 A	le for managem chievements: Re	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are that of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	The existing data storage is described but no description on	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No No No No No No
	Modu 1 A	le for managem cchievements: Re	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	The existing data storage is described but no description on	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partiy Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No No No No No
	Modu 1 A	le for managem cchievements: Re	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are that of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given.	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No No No No No No
	Modu 1 A	le for managem cchievements: Re	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	The existing data storage is described but no description on	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No No No No No No
	Modu 1 A	le for managem cchievements: Re	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given. Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No No No No No No No
	Modu 1 A	le for managem cchievements: Re	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given. Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group name.MS also lists recommendations	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No No No No No No
	Modu 1 A	le for managem cchievements: Re	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section III.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ecommendations	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given. Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No No No No No No No
	Modu 1 A	le for managem cchievements: Re	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ecommendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given. Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group name.MS also lists recommendations	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No
	Modu 1 A	le for managem cchievements: Re	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ecommendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described?	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given. Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group name.MS also lists recommendations	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes	No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No
VII	Modu 1 A 2 A Follov	le for managements: Restrictions to avoid standard w-up of STECF r	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ecommendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given. Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group name.MS also lists recommendations	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No
VII	Modu 1 A 2 A Follov	le for managem cchievements: Re	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section III.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ecommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given. Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group name.MS also lists recommendations	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes	No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No
VIII	Modu 1 A 2 A Follow	le for managements: Restrictions to avoid since we have a section of STECF restrictions and facronyms and	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section III.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ecommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given. Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group name.MS also lists recommendations	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes	No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No
VII	Modu 1 A 2 A Follow	le for managements: Restrictions to avoid since we have a section of STECF restrictions and facronyms and	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section III.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ecommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given. Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group name.MS also lists recommendations	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	No No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No
VIII VIIII IX	Modu 1 A 2 A Follow	le for managements: Restrictions to avoid since we have a section of STECF restrictions and facronyms and	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section III.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ecommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given. Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group name.MS also lists recommendations	NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes	No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No
VIII	Modu 1 A 2 A Follow	le for managements: Resolutions to avoid since we see the way of STECF resolutions for acronyms and somments, suggestimates.	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section III.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ecommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? stions and reflections Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given. Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group name.MS also lists recommendations	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes	No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No
VIII IX X	Modu 1 A 2 A Follow	le for managements: Resolutions to avoid si w-up of STECF reforments, suggeferences	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section III.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ecommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given. Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group name.MS also lists recommendations	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye	No No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No
VIII VIIII IX X	Modu 1 A 2 A Follow List o IX. Co	le for managements: Resolutions to avoid si w-up of STECF reforments, suggeferences	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section III.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ecommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? stions and reflections Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given. Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group name.MS also lists recommendations	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes	No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No
VIII IX X	Modu 1 A 2 A Follow List o IX. Co	le for managements: Resolutions to avoid si w-up of STECF reforments, suggeferences	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section III.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ecommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? stions and reflections Are there a complete list of references?	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given. Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group name.MS also lists recommendations	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes	No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No
VIII VIIII IX X	Modu 1 A 2 A Follow List o IX. Co	le for managements: Resolutions to avoid si w-up of STECF reforments, suggeferences	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ent and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section III.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? nortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? ecommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations? Stions and reflections Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections? Is there a complete list of references? Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support	The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given. Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group name.MS also lists recommendations	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Partly Yes	No No No No No MS to provide information on data storage. No

SLOVENIA

	STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment		MS - Comments	
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		Action needed by MS, please specify task	ws - comments
RC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (cost), capital & investment *Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings *Recreational catches: catches	Significant amount of expenditure parameters not submitted for most of the years requested. Lependiture data for 2008 and 2009 not provided. -Peet significant cultering information not provided -Economic performance indicators not estimated for 2008 and 2009 due to insufficient data (no cost terms provided for those years). -Effort data submitted only for 2010 -Reported landings value data higher than Eurostat statistics	no evident explanation for failure	MS asked to clarify why the data for 2008 and 2000 not provided. MS asked to clarify the differences between DCF and Eurostat data. MS asked to clarify the differences between DCF and Eurostat data.	
rc/og mare	Mediterranean & Black Sea	Fisheries' specific landings and discards by species, fishing effort and surveys' data for the years 2008-2012	-MEDITS 2012 data was not submitted, MEDITS TD file not submitted.	Data could be available, but may be MS followed the output of the RCM Med& 85 2012: RCMMed&R, receiling is 2011 recommendation and also the 5TEC EVEN 11-20 recommendation on a harmonized time grain dequeled pot data to be available for transmission to extract the control of the control of the control following the end of the collection of control of the control following the end of the collection of control of the control following the end of the collection of control of the control of the control following the end of the collection of control of the cont		
SFCM	GFCM - Task 1.1	Segment: - Fleet segment - Vessel number - Capacity (measure, value) GSA-Segment: - Geographical Sub-Area - Fleet segment - Vessel number	All Task 1.1 data - not provided		MS to explain missing data	
SFCM	GFCM - Task 1.2	Capacity (measure, value) (GSA-Segment-Geardiass-SpeciesGroup:	All Task 1.2 data - not provided		MS to explain missing data	
SFCM	GFCM - Task 1.3	Segment Engine power Engine power Engine power Engine power Engine power Engine power Engine power Engine power Landing weight Vessel value of total fleet Vessel value of total fleet Vooring daylyar per vessel Vooring hours/days per vessel Vorable cost of fishing/days per vessel Sof VC. From fluel cost Yearlify leed cost per vessel	All Task 1.3 data - not provided		MS to explain missing data	
SFCM	GFCM - Task 1.4	- Yearly Ined costs per vesser - Sids-Segment-Genaricas SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: - Effort measure - Cattor of Landing - GPUL/INUE - Biscard - Biscard - Biscard - Biscard - Sids-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: - Catdor of Landing - CPUL/INUE - CPUL/	All Tack 1.4 data - not provided	MS should provide the available data collected through the DCF	MS to explain missing data	
SFCM	GFCM - Task 1.5	SA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: • Length range of Captured species • Length average • Sear • Maturity	All Task 1.5 data - not provided	MS should provide the available data collected through the DCF	MS to explain missing data	

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

Member St	tate:	Spain	<u> </u>		lgement levels
	'	Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
		Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal		No Partly	<10% 10-50%
		Total of the first proposal	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Overall compliance	XXX	Yes	>90%
eneral framev	work		L	NA	not applicable
		n organisation	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
National C	orrespo	ndent and participating institutes Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles			
		well described?		Yes	No
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination		Yes	No
		meetings? Are derogations listed?		Yes	No
		If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?		Yes	No
		rnational coordination			
B1 Atte	endance	of international meetings Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Give information about attendance on planned meetings. Example: WKMSEL-2, WKAMDEEP should have information on attendance or not.	Mostly	Yes. Give information about attendance on planned meetings.
		•	Reason for non participation needs to	Mostly	Yes. MS should clarify reason for non
B2 Foll	ow-up	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained? of regional and international recommendations	be clarified by meeting.	•	attendance
	o up (Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?		Yes	No
		Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
JPRA-REGIO	N Balti	Are the responsive actions acceptable? c Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic		Yes	No
odule of the e	evaluati	on of the fishing sector on of the fishing sector			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP		Yes	No
		implementation well described? Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?		Yes	No
Economic	variable	, , ,		100	
			fleet register indicates 10850 vessels (over all supraregions), table has 9456 (13% less); to be briefly clarified	Mostly	MS to clarify number of vessels
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	0-300 (1070 leas), to be briefly clarified	V	NI-
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	table IIIB3 should contain information on unclustered segments	Mostly	MS should to provide information on unclustered segments
B1 Ach	ievemer	its: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
		Are the deviations explained?	is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	uie text is iii spanisn	Yes	No
B2 Data	a quality	: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
		10 100p000170 data quality information given:	is not possible to evaluate because		1
		Are the deviations explained?	the text is in spanish		
		Are the deviations justified?	is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
B3 Follo	ow-up of	f Regional and international recommendations	une toxt is in spanish		_1
			is not possible to evaluate because		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	the text is in spanish		
		Are the responsive actions described?	is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
			is not possible to evaluate because		
B4 Actio	one to c	Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls	the text is in spanish		1
D4 ACTIO	ons to a	voiu snortialis	is not possible to evaluate because		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	the text is in spanish		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	is not possible to evaluate because		
odule of the	evaluati	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? terranean Sea and Black Sea on of the fishing sector on of the fishing sector	the text is in spanish		1
ut		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP		Yes	No
		implementation well described?			
Economic	variable	Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?		Yes	No
			fleet register indicates 10850 vessels (over all supraregions), table has 9456 (13% less); to be briefly clarified; supra-region should be named	Mostly	MS to clarify number of vessels (see Comments)
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	"Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea" (negligible) supra-region should be named "Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea"	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	(negligible)		
B1 Ach	ievemer	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	table IIIB3 should contain information on unclustered segments	Mostly	MS should to provide information on unclustered segments
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
			is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
		Are the deviations explained?	ILIE IEVI IS III SDOIIISII		
		Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		

II

Ш

Ш

Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations В3 Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? SUPRA-REGION Other regions Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector General description of the fishing sector Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?
Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? Economic variables Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? ВЗ Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

REGION NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC Biological metier related variables

Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

C3

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - RFMO NAFO and areas ICES V-XII-XIV

is not possible to evaluate because		
the text is in spanish		
is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
is not possible to evaluate because		
the text is in spanish		
<u> </u>		•
is not possible to evaluate because		
the text is in spanish		
is not possible to evaluate because		
the text is in spanish		
is not possible to evaluate because		
the text is in spanish		
is not possible to evaluate because		
the text is in spanish		
is not possible to evaluate because		
the text is in spanish		
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
•		•
fleet register indicates 10850 vessels		
(over all supraregions), table has	Mostly	MS to clarify number of vessels
9456 (13% less); to be briefly clarified	,	2 12 12 12 12 12 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13
, ,,		
table IIIB3 should contain information	Mostly	MS should to provide information on
on unclustered segments	woody	unclustered segments
	Yes	No
is not possible to evaluate because		
the text is in spanish		
is not possible to evaluate because	-	
the text is in spanish		
"	V	AI.
is not possible to evaluate harries	Yes	No
is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
is not possible to evaluate because		
the text is in spanish		
and task to in openion		
is not possible to evaluate because		
the text is in spanish		
is not possible to evaluate because		
the text is in spanish		
is not possible to evaluate because		
the text is in spanish		
is not possible to evaluate because		
is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
is not possible to evaluate because		
the text is in spanish		
	Yes	No
	V	N.
	Yes	No
No real inconsistensies between		
III.C.3 and III.C.4. However L2		
sampling frame seems concerns only		
North Atlantic region. So coherence		
between the two tables can be only		
verify at NAFO-Eastern Arctic scale. If total numbers of trips operated in	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify (see Comments)
2012 are consistent between III.C.3		
and III.C.4, total planned numbers of		
trips to be sampled and achieved		
numbers are not equal between the		
two tables.		
	Yes	No
	Yes	No No
Oversampling on Sebastes mentella.	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
Low level of discards for Sebastes	Mostly	No
mentella.	iviosity	INU
T	V	A1.
OV/a mat fan una sata destado de la	Yes	No
CVs met for unsorted catches but not	Maath	Ne
for cod discards. No Cvs for Sebastes mentella discards.	Mostly	No
mentella discards.	Voc	No
Low level of discard sampling.	Yes Mostly	No No
Low level of discard sampling.	iviosily	I INU
	NA	NA
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	No	No
·	NA	NA
	INA	INA

C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Į
	In Table III C 4 complete and consistent with AD widelings	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	•
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	,
	Were CV estimates provided?	
	Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	ŀ
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	ŀ
C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	,
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	[
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	
	Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	ŀ
C4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	L
•	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Ī
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Ţ
REGION C1	NORTH ATLANTIC - ICES areas VI, VII (excl. VIId), VIII, IX Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Ī
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
	Are the deviations explained?	
	Are the deviations justified?	
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
	Were CV estimates provided?	ļ
	Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	}
	Are the deviations justified?	ŀ
C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
	Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	ŀ
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	ŀ
	Are the responsive actions accentable?	}

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

REGION MEDITERRANEAN SEA & BLACK SEA C1 Achievements: Results and deviation

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

	Yes	No
No real inconsistensies between III.C.3 and III.C.4. However L2 sampling frame seems concerns only North Atlantic region. So coherence between the two tables can be only verify at NAFO-Eastern Arctic scale. If total numbers of trips operated in 2012 are consistent between III.C.3 and III.C.4, total planned numbers of trips to be sampled and achieved numbers are not equal between the two tables.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify.
Gadus morhua, Pandalus borealis, Sebastes spp. sampling intensities are spilt in different lines.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify why sampling intensities are spilt in different lines.
MS to clarify why for several species the sampling intensities are spilt in different lines.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify why sampling intensities are spilt in different lines.
Inconsistencies on L3 sampling frame between tables III.C.3 and III.C.4. No sampling achievements on OTB_CRU_40-59_0_0.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify the inconcistencies
	Yes	No
	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
	Mostly	No No
	Yes	No.
	Mostly	No
	•	
	NA	NA
	Yes	No
-	Yes	No No
	169	INO
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
22 stocks were planned to be sampled in NP but 26 documented in AR table III.C.5.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify changes between NP and AR tables.
Inconsistencies in number of sampled metiers between tables III.C.3 and III.C.6	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify
Target planned by metiers partly achieved. Some metiers are not sampled (DRB_MOL, GTR_DEF, LLS_DWS). Most stocks are oversampled.	Partly	Yes. MS to clarify
	Yes	No
	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify if oversampling has resulted in additional costs.
•		•
	Yes	No
	Partly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	l NA
	Yes	No
MS could review the number of fish to		No. MS could review the number of fish to be sampled to find better

Same metiers for same fishing ground split in different lines. Inconsistencies between some metiers and footnotes provided on characteristics of their sampling frames (M3, M5).	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify (see Comment)
Same sampling frames for same fishing ground split in different lines.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify (see Comment)
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Mostly

coherence between planned and

achieved targets. Are you saying the MS should do this and resubmit? Or is

this just a suggestion that the MS could do in future?

MS could review the number of fish to

be sampled to find better coherence

between planned and achieved targets.

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal C2

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

REGION OTHER REGIONS - RFMOs CECAF, ICCAT, IOTC, IATTC+WCPFC

C Biological metier related variables

Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal C2

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

СЗ Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Inconsistency between Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in tables III.C.3 and III.C.4. Target planned by metiers mostly achieved. Metiers undersampled: OTB_DWS and OTB_DEF in several GSAs, PS_SPF GSA07, metiers targeting BFT (LLS and PS_LPF). Metiers oversampled: metiers tarrgeting swordfisf and albocore highly oversampled. Most stocks are oversampled. No discard sampling.	Partly	Yes. MS to clarify (see Comment)
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
<u>.</u>		<u> </u>
	Yes	No
	Partly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	NA
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
		T
	Yes	No
As oversampling is not yet enough to achieve target precision for most of the stocks.	Partly	Yes. MS to review the numbers of fish to be sampled to find better coherence between planned and

achieve target precision for most of the stocks.	Partly	to be sampled to find better coherence between planned and achieved targets.
Region information split by RFMO.	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
Inconsistencies between tables III.C.3 and III.C.4.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify (see Comments)
Table filled but not consistent with NP table. 37 species/stocks were listed in NP but 50 found in AR tables.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify (see Comments)

Table filled but not consistent with NP table. 37 species/stocks were listed in	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify (see Comments)
NP but 50 found in AR tables.		
Inconsistensies in fishing ground codes between table III.C.6 and other tables. Some inconsistensies with table III.C.5: for example how to explain for CECAF that 270 octopus were sampled for landings in III.C.5 and 360 for landings in III.C.6.	Mostly	No
	Partly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

res	INO
Mostly	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
NA	NA
No	No
NA	NA
NA	NA

	Yes	No
No fully acceptable action is proposed. Shortfalls due to "force majeure" cases in CECAF (fishing rights, exclusion of MS vessels, etc.) MS cannot planned such difficulties. For tropical LPF fisheries, MS considered that difficulties met are usual when implenting monitoring programme in these regions.	Mostly	No

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No recreational fishery is declare in		
	Delite One and Newth One Desites		N.
Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Baltic Sea and North Sea Regions	Yes	No
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained?		NA NA	No No
Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	No
Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided?		Yes	No
Were data quality targets met?		NA	No
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		NA NA	No No
Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		NIA	No
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No No
Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes Yes	No No
Actions to avoid shortfalls			
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No No
editerranean and Black Sea eational fisheries	·		
Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned?		Yes NA	No
Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No No
Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
Were data quality targets met?		Yes NA	No No
Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
·		Mostly	No
Were the relevant derogations listed?		NA NA	No No
Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described?		NA NA	No No
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
		NA	No
Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?		Yes	No
gical stock-related variables			
Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			No. For the future, MS should report
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly complete following the NP proposal. MS add a column for relevant comments.	Yes	the comments in the text or to the bottom of the tables, not adding column at the end of the standard tables.
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Numbers of fish to be sampled are achieved except for cod sex-ratio@length. Oversampling for 6 parameters.	Yes	No
Are the deviations explained?	Data collection is done by observers on board industrial vessels, from the beginning to the end of long trips. So oversampling has no extra costs. Deviations for co sex-ratio explained by a wrong implementation of protocoles during one trip.	Yes	No
Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
	Yes when samples sizes and compositions permitted to calculate	Mostly	No
· ·	CVs. Target precision achieved for	,	
•	weight@length and for cod ALK. Variability in samples, too many	·	No
· ·	immature fish in som samples, redfish otoliths not yet read.		No
Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		Yes	No
Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation listed in section 1	NA	NA
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	2011 and 8th LM on task sharing are listed by MS.	Yes	No
Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No No
Actions to avoid shortfalls		162	INU
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Better collaboration with the Industry on durations of trips. Improvement of training of observers for better application of protocoles on board.	Yes	No
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
gical stock-related variables			
Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Table properly complete MS add a		No. For the future, MS should report
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	column for relevant comments. According to III.E.2 13 stocks were planned to be updated in 2012. 15	Yes	the comments in the text or to the bottom of the tables, not adding column at the end of the standard tables.
	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations lustified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets provided? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations is pusified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are information on ill.E.1-4 given for each respective region? ORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC gical stock-related variables Are information on ill.E.1-4 given for each respective region? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets met? Are the deviations sexplained? Are the deviations explained? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations isself? Are the responsive actions becomed? Are the responsive actions obsorbed? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the deviation of avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the deviation of acceptable? Are the deviation explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Are the deviation explained? Are the deviation in the future acceptable? Are the relevant recommendations Were the relevant recommendations Were the relevant recommendations Were the relevant recommendations from LM issued? Are the relevant recommendation in the future acceptable? Are the deviation acceptable? Are the deviation acceptable? Are the deviation of the future acceptable? Are the deviation solition from NP proposal Are the deviations acceptable? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations plusified? Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV targets mer? Are the deviations plusified? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations plusified? Are the responsive accines described? Are the responsive	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant disciplation issee? Are the responsive actions described? Are the deviations to avoid softward in the future described? Are the deviations or patient? Are the deviation spatient? Are the deviation spatient? Are the deviations appliance? Are the deviations or patient? Are the deviations patient?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - ICES areas VI, VII (excl. VIId), VIII, IX Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal E2 Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Data collection targets in numbers of fish were planned only when carried out by observers on board. Achievement rates are mostly reached. Stocks are either oversampled or lightly undersampled. In other cases updating of biological paramaters was performed during scientific surveys, without planned targets.	Mostly	No
Data collection is done by observers on board industrial vessels, from the beginning to the end of long trips. So oversampling has no extra costs. Deviations for biological sampling are also explain when vessel skipper decides changes in fishing areas or target species.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Yes for the two types of data collection, surveys as observers.	Yes	No
Mostly. Achievement rates are in general obtained for weight@length and maturity@length, but never for sex ratio@length.	Mostly	No
Variability with fish sizes in samples, difficulties for planning efficient sampling plans for these industrial fisheries.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
No derogation listed in section 1	NA	NA
2 recommendations of RCM NS&EA 2011 and 8th LM on task sharing are listed by MS.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Better collaboration with the Industry on durations of trips. Improvement of training of observers for better application of protocoles on board.	Yes	No
But for surveys, it is impossible to change the protocoles only to collect more biological samples.		

Table properly complete. MS add a column for relevant comments. According to III.E.2 13 stocks were planned to be updated in 2012. 15 found in III.E.3 AR table.	Yes	No. For the future, MS should report the comments in the text or to the bottom of the tables, not adding column at the end of the standard tables.
Most of time, stocks were oversampled. But heavy undersampling for Nephrops and Pagellus bogaravero in IXa.	Yes	No
All deviations are explained in AR, stock by stock and for every parameter. Main reasons are the following: imperfect coverage of all the length sizes in samples available; sampling plans are built in numbers of samples and not in numbers of individuals; when oversampling, there is no additional costs, mostly when samples are collected at sea; for some stocks, low landings and too high prices could cause in final undersampling; shorter fishing seasons than expected also.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
For most of parameters updated, when samples sizes permuitted to calculate CVs.	Mostly	No
Precision target achieved for less than 50% parameters. Best achievement rates for weight@length and maturity@length, bad for sex- ratios@length.	Partly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Yes

Yes

No

Nο

2 derogations listed in section 1 for

stocks variables of whiting and for

maturity of blue whiting.

3 relevant recommendations of RCM

NA 2011 and 8th LM listed.

Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? REGION MEDITERRANEAN SEA & BLACK SEA

Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal F1

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

REGION OTHER REGIONS - RFMOs CECAF, ICCAT, IOTC, IATTC+WCPFC

Biological stock-related variables Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal E2

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
MS remains focused on providing high-quality data to stock assessment working groups. Further steps will be : better age reading for difficult species, improve processing and reading of pieces collected, review maturity scales etc.	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Table properly fiiled and consistent with III.E.2. 15 stocks were to be updated. Parameters are provided for 20 stocks in AR III.E.3 table (initially not planned stocks are well identified in the table). Task sharing on LPF is Iso correctly documented. An extra column added for comments.	Yes	No. For the future, only for the Med&BS Region, MS should report data (both in the NP and in the AR) at GSA level (not all GSA togheter), as GFCM and RCM promote this issue. MS should report the comments in the text or to the bottom of the tables, not adding column at the end of the standard tables.
Yes for practically all pararameters.	Yes	No
MS provided details on ligthly oversampling of sardine, anchovy, monkfish and Nephrops, and lightly undersampling of red mullet.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
=		
Yes for stocks sampled on yearly basis.	Yes	No
Yes for most of parameters.	Mostly	No
Explanations is given for deviations concerning length@age for 4 species : too big sizes range by age class.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
No derogation listed in section 1	NA	NA
One relevant recommendations of RCM Med&BS 2011 and 8th LM listed.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
To increase numbers of samples for stocks and parameters for which CVs were note achieved.	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Table fulfilled. 10 stocks planned to be updated in CECAF, only BFT,		No. For the future, MS should report the comments in the text or to the
albacore and swordfish in LDF LPF	Yes	bottom of the tables, not adding
fisheries. An extra column added for		column at the end of the standard
comments.		tables.
Good achievement rates for SPF and squid. Other Cephalopods appear as undersampled, hake as not sampled t all, and pink shrimp as partially sampled. Achievement is good in tunas fisheries, except for maturity@length of swordfish.	Mostly	No
Deviations are explained stock by stock. Operational difficulties for sampling on board, changes in fishermen behaviour, no reniewing of fishing agreements between EU and third countries are the more important reasons given for CECAF. Difficulties for buiding efficient sampling plans for LDF fisheries. For swordfish maturity, few females were fished and not during the spawning season.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Aaccording to DCF regulation, CVs of		
concerned stocks shall be provided	NA	NA
on triennal basis, ie in the 2013 AR.		
	NA	NA
	NA	NA
	NA	NA

Comparison between designations larged					
Are the reference incommendations and sall lives of the second and commendations are stored all referred to the second and commendations are stored all referred to the second and commendations are stored all referred to the second and commendations are stored and commendations. Are stored to a conditions in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advance is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advance is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failure accordance of the second and commendations. For advances is and discretion in the failu		Were the relevant derogations listed?	fisheries, and more precisely exemptions for sex ratio and maturity in ICCAT and IOTC and all stock related variables in IATTC+WCPFC	Yes	No
E4 Actions to word abortful in the Name described T E4 Actions to word abortful in the Name described T F5 Transverset virtibles F7 Transverset virtibles F7 Transverset virtibles F8 Transverset Results and deviced into Int Pip proposal As in design and adviseration or consistent with Pip proposal As in the deviction or particular virtibles and deviced into Int Pip proposal As in the deviction or particular virtibles and transverset virtibles F8 Transverset Results and deviced into Int Pip proposal As in the deviction or particular virtibles and transverset virtibles F8 Transverset Results and deviced into Int Pip proposal As in the deviction or particular virtibles and transverset virtibles F8 Transverset Results and deviced into Int Pip proposal As in the deviction or particular virtibles and transverset virtibles F8 Transverset Results and deviced into Int Pip proposal As in the deviction or particular virtibles and transverset virtibles F8 Transverset Results and deviced int Int Pip proposal As i		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	LDF 2011 and 8th LM listed	Yes	No
An excisor to world storidate in the future described? Are scrown to avoid storidate in the future described? Are scrown to avoid storidate in the future described? For the future and in include storidate and in the future described and included storidate and in the future and in included storidate and in the future and included storidate and in the future and included storidate and i		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	concorning 020/ii .		
An action to anoth dortholis in the latent occapitals? F. Transversal variables F. Transversal	E4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Difficulties met are usual for LDF		
F Transversal variables Table III F 1 compress and consistence with AR guistiness* Table III F 1 compress and consistence with AR guistiness*			fisheries and do not come often		
Table III F.1 complete in the composition of the first processes in the first processes in the first processes in the first process processes in the first process processes in the first process	F Tran			NA	No
F11 Achievements Results and deviation from NP proposal? Are the deviation application? Are			guidelines, wrong template used. Table IIIF1 incomplete. Information for North Atlantic with missing variables for effort; information for Mediterranean&Black Sea incomplete and complete absence of transversal data for Other Fishing Regions (OFR). Detail on missing variables	Yes	No
The design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? P13 Activate to avoid shortfalls in the future described? F14 Activate to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F15 Activate to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F16 Close years and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? F17 Close years (Regular and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? F18 F18 F19 Close years (Regular and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? F19 Close years (Regular and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? F19 Close years (Regular and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the responsive activations of the NP proposal? Are the responsive activations of the NP proposal? Are the responsive activate deviation for the NP proposal? Are the responsive activate acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the Nutrue acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the Nutrue acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the Nutrue acceptable? F15 Landings Are the deviations explained? Are the	F1		·		
And the deviations upstation? P13 Actions to avoid shortfalls P13 Actions to avoid shortfalls An extinction to avoid shortfalls P13 Actions to avoid shortfalls P14 Actions to avoid shortfalls P15 Actions to avoid shortfalls P15 Actions to avoid shortfalls P16 Actions to avoid shortfalls P17 Actions to avoid shortfalls P18 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? P19 Action to avoid shortfalls in the future described? P19 Action to avoid shortfalls in the future described? P19 Action to avoid shortfall in the future acceptable? P19 Action to avoid shortfall in the future a			consistent however the information is incomplete. There's no information for capacity variables in Other Fishing	Partly	MS to complete the table.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F2 Effort F1 Actions record and control in the future acceptable? F1 Actions and actions from the Proposal Are the deviations explained? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F1 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F1 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F2 Landings Are deviations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F2 Landings Are deviations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F3 Landings Are deviations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F3 Landings Are the deviations by the future acceptable? Are the deviations to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the deviations by the future acceptable? Are the deviations published? Are the deviations published? Are the deviations published? Are the deviations published? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations published? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations exp					
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? P11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations putitied? Are the deviations depthied? Are the deviation of spicified? Are the increased and deviation from NP proposal Are the increased actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are the deviations grained? Are the evaluation acceptable? Are the evaluation grained? Are the evaluation acceptable? Are the evaluation grained? Are the evaluatio				Vaa	Ne
F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the relevant excommendations Are the relevant excommendations from MI stead? Are the relevant excommendations from MI stead? Are the relevant excommendations from MI stead? Are consistent on word shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future exceptable? F13 Landings F14 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are deeping and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? F15 Solow-power of Regions and administration from NP proposal Are the deviations explained? Are the televant excommendations from NP proposal Are the explained and deviation from NP proposal Are the explained and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations ex					
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations spalaned? F12 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations pustfield? F13 Pollow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the deviations pustfield? F14 Pollow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F14 Actions a valid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F15 Landings F17 Actions a valid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F18 Landings Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? F18 Pollow-up of Regional and international pollow? Are the deviations explained? F19 Pollow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from NP proposal F19 Pollow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from M island? Are the deviations uputified? F19 Pollow-up of Regional and international pollow? Are the deviations explained? F19 Pollow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from M island? Are the deviations uputified? F19 Pollow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from M island? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations uputified? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations putified? F14 Actions t	F2				
Are the deviations suptilled? F12 Data quality, Results and deviation from NP proposal F13 Follow-up or Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM issae? Are the relevant recommendations from LM issae? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F13 Follow-up or Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM issae? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal F14 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations suptilled? Are the deviations acceptable? Are the deviations acceptable or the future described? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations acceptable or the future described or the deviations acceptable? Are the deviations acceptable? F12 Data quality, Results and deviation from NP proposal F14 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal? Are the deviations acceptable? F15 Follow-up or Regional and information given? Are the deviations acceptable? F16 F17 F18				Partly	MS to complete the table
F12 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations position? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F15 Landings F17 Landings F17 Activevements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations pusitified? F17 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal F18 Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations pusitified? F19 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal F19 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal F19 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal F19 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal F19 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal F19 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal F19 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal F19 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal F19 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal F19 Data quality. Results and deviation from NP proposal F19 Segencial data quality information given? Are the deviations pusiting? F19 Segencial data quality information given? Are the deviations pusiting? F19 Segencial data quality information given? Are the deviations pusiting? F19 Segencial data quality information given? Are the deviations pusiting? F19 Segencial data quality information given? Are the deviations pusiting? F19 Segencial data quality information given? Are the deviations pusiting? F19 Segencial data quality information given? Are the deviations pusiting? F19 Segencial data quality information given? Are the deviations pusiting? F19 Segencial data quality information given? Are the deviations pusiting? F19 Segenc		Are the deviations explained?		No	the te complete the table.
Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? F13 Follow-up or Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM interest with the NP proposal? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are selene specially and advisions of the NP proposal? F25 Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality, Results and deviation from NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality, Results and deviation from NP proposal? Are the deviations pushed? Are the deviations pushed? F14 Data quality information given? Are the deviations pushed? F15 Plow-up or Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? F15 Plotine-up or Regional and international recommendations Are the deviations pushed? F16 Plotine-up or Regional and international recommendations Are the deviations pushed? F17 Plotine-up or Regional and international recommendations Are the deviations pushed? F18 Plotine-up or Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? F19 Plotine-up or Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? F19 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations pushed? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations pushed? F15 Plotine-up or Regional and inter				No	
Are the deviations pusified? F13 Pollow-up of Regional and international recommendations F14 Pollow-up of Regional and international recommendations from LM listed? Are the respective actions described? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? F14 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal F15 Landings F14 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations spatianed? F12 Data quality results and deviation from NP proposal F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the deviations explained? Are the responsive actions described? Are th				Yes	No
F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions occupitable? Are the responsive actions occupitable? Are the responsive actions occupitable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F13 Landings F11 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F12 Landings F13 Landings F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F15 Landings F16 Landings F17 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? F16 Landings F17 Landings F17 Landings F18 Landings F19 Landings F19 Landings F19 Landings F19 Landings F19 Landings F19 Landings Are the deviations explained? F10 Landings F10 La		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls or the future acceptable? F25 Landings F15 Landings F16 Active wements: Results and deviation from NP proposal F17 Active wements: Results and deviation from NP proposal F18 Landings F17 Active wements: Results and deviation from NP proposal F19 Landings F11 Active wements: Results and deviation from NP proposal F10 Landings F11 Active wements: Results and deviation from NP proposal F12 Data quality: Results and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal F13 F10 Landings F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F15 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal? F16 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal F17 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal F18 F18 F18 Landings explained? F19 Landings F19 Landings Are the deviations justified? F19 Landings F19 Landings F19 Landings Are the deviations explained? F10 Landings F11 Active wements: Results and deviation from NP proposal F12 Landings F13 F10 Landings F14 Landings F15 Landings F16 Landings F17 Landings F18 Landings F19 Land				Yes	No
Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are before proposed actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F25 Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations sustified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations sustified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the deviations explained? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations acceptable? F15 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the relevant recommendations from LM itseld? Are the relevant recommendations from LM itseld? Are the responsive actions described? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal If the responsive actions described? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal If the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal If the responsive actions described? Are design and achievements consistent with the N				Yes	No
F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F3 Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal There are some deviations from the design, namely for the value and price per species for which it's not clear the procedure for estimating the values. Missing data on Other Fishing regions. Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the deviations justified? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations acceptable? F15 F16		Are the responsive actions described?		Yes	No
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? F3 Landings F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal F12 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal There are some deviations from the design, namely for the value and price per species for white its not clear the procedure for estimating the values. Missing data on Other Fishing regions. Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? F13 Follow-up or Regional and international recommendations Are the deviations pustified? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? A Re actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? A Re actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? A Re actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the deviations to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? A read deviation system of the value and price per species for which it is not clear the procedure for estimating the values and price per species from the finite procedure for estimating the values and price per species from the design, namely for the value and price per species on other Fishing regions. Mostly Mostly Mostly Mostly (Regions. Which with the Sprovice missing information on quality for the price and value per species on other sinking abroad and international form NP proposal Are the deviations splatified? Yes No A reactions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations splatified? Are the				Yes	No
F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal F12 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal There are some deviations from the design, namely for the value and price per species to being estimated from sales and the value of the				Yes	No
F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal There are some deviations from the design, namely for the value and price per species for which it is not clear the procedure for estimating the values. Missing data on Other Fishing regions. Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations in the deviation of the value and price per species for which it is not clear the procedure for estimating the values. Missing data on Other Fishing regions. Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pushified? Are the deviations in the future accommendations from Misted? Are the deviations of the procedure for		•		Yes	No
There are some deviations from the design, namely for the value and price per species for which it's not clear the procedure for estimating the values. Missing data on Other Fishing regions. Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal? Are the deviations supstified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal? Are the deviations supstified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are design and achievements consistent with AR quidelines? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations pushed? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are design and achievements to explained? Are the deviations pushed of the future acceptable? Are the deviations pushed of the future acceptable? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations pushed of the future acceptable? Are the deviation pus	F3				
Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F15 Research surveys at sea G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviation suptificat overage etc.)? Are the deviation supplication from NP proposal for the deviation from NP proposal and deviation from NP proposal for the deviation suptified? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation suptified? Are		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	design, namely for the value and price per species for which it's not clear the procedure for estimating the values. Missing data on Other Fishing		specie is being estimated from sales notes or from questionnaire on economic variables. Tabel III.F.1 must be updated with the landing variables collected/estimated for Other Fishing Regions.
Are the deviations justified? F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Mostly MS to provide missing information on quality for the price and values per species.		лио ило оступальной:		169	MS to clarify why the use of sales
F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? GResearch surveys at sea G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.6.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations pustified? Are the deviations pustified? Is the quality of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Are design and achievements consistent with Are proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations ignostrated and explained? Are the deviations ignostrated and explained? Are the deviations ignostrated and explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the de		Are the deviations iustified?		No	(Reg.(CE) 1224/2009) is not used as
Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? G Research surveys at sea G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the price and values per species. No No No No No Yes No No Yes No No Are the deviations explained? Yes No No The second achievements consistent with the NP proposal Is the quality of the price and values per species. No No No No Yes No No Are the deviations explained? Yes No No Yes No No Yes No No Yes No No No Yes No No No Yes No No No Yes No No Yes No No No Yes No No No Yes No No No No No No No No No N		•			
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? G Research surveys at sea G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Yes No No Yes No No Yes No Yes No No Yes No No Yes No		Is respective data quality information given?		Mostly	quality for the price and values per
F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Research surveys at sea G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Yes No Yes No No No Yes No No No Yes No No No Yes No		Are the deviations explained?			No
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? G Research surveys at sea G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations propagal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Yes No				Yes	No
Are the responsive actions acceptable? F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Research surveys at sea G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Yes No No Yes No No Yes No No Yes No		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Action to avoid shortfalls F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls F18					
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? G Research surveys at sea G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Yes No No No Yes No No Yes No No Yes No				Yes	No
G Research surveys at sea G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Yes No		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?			
G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Yes No	G Paca			Yes	No
Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Pata quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Yes No No No No Yes No					
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Pata quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Yes No No	-	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
Are the deviations justified? Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Pata quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Yes No No					
Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities? Pata quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Yes No Yes No					
Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Yes No		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?			
gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained? Yes No	G2				
Are the deviations explained? Yes No		gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?		Yes	No
Are the deviations justified?		Are the deviations explained?			-
		Are the deviations justified?			

	G3	Follow-up	of Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?		Yes Yes	No No
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
	G4	Actions to	avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes	No
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
IV			ion of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing indiconcerning the aquaculture	ustry		
	7 00110	solion or data	Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Species named, but not clear to which cell it is related.	Yes	MS should put the respective letter behind the cell of Species names (reported in the foot notes of Table IVa1) as specifically requested by the Guidelines
			Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	A census was carried out but the planned sample rate was only 75%	Mostly	MS should explain why the achieved sample rate is below 100%
	A1	Ashiovomor	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Miscalculations of response rate in line 15	Mostly	MS has to provide correct sample rate
	Ai	Acilieveillei	, ,	is not possible to evaluate because		
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because		
			Are the deviations explained?	the text is in spanish		
	A2	Data quality	Are the deviations justified? Results and deviation from NP proposal	is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
			la represtive data quality information given?	is not possible to evaluate because		
			Is respective data quality information given?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because		
			Are the deviations explained?	the text is in spanish		
			Are the deviations justified?	is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
	A3	Follow-up o	f Regional and international recommendations			ı
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
			Are the recognitive actions described 2	is not possible to evaluate because		
			Are the responsive actions described?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because		
	A4	Actions to a	Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls	the text is in spanish		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
				is not possible to evaluate because		
	B Colle	ection of data	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? concerning the processing industry	the text is in spanish		
			Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	B1	Achievemer	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? ats: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes	No
			, ,	is not possible to evaluate because		
			Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because		
			Are the deviations explained?	the text is in spanish		
			Are the deviations justified?	is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
	B2	Data quality	: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
			Is respective data quality information given?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because		
			Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?	the text is in spanish		
	D2	Follow up o	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
	В3	Follow-up o	Are the deviations explained?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because		
	В3	Follow-up o	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
	В3	Follow-up o	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Regional and international recommendations	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish the text is in spanish		
	В3	Follow-up o	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
	B3	·	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
		·	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
		·	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because		
V	В4	Actions to a	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
v	B4 Module o	Actions to a	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because		
v	B4 Module o	Actions to a	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? { Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because	Yes NA	No
v	B4 Module o 1 Achie	Actions to a	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? { Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because	NA	No No
V	Module o 1 Achie	Actions to a of evaluation of evaluation of evenents: Res	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because		No No
V	Module o 1 Achie 2 Action	Actions to a of evaluation of evaluation of evaluation of every even entry. Resumments: Resumments to avoid short managements.	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Int and use of the data	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because	NA NA	No
·	Module o 1 Achie 2 Action	Actions to a of evaluation of evaluation of evaluation of every even entry. Resumments: Resumments to avoid short managements.	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because	NA NA NA	
·	Module o 1 Achie 2 Action	Actions to a of evaluation of evaluation of evaluation of every even entry. Resumments: Resumments to avoid short managements.	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? In and use of the data Figure 1. The future described? It and use of the data Figure 2. The future described? It and use of the data Figure 3. The future described? It and use of the data Figure 3. The future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish	NA NA	No No
·	Module o 1 Achie 2 Action	Actions to a of evaluation of evaluation of evaluation of every even entry. Resumments: Resumments to avoid short managements.	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? nt and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish	NA NA NA	
·	Module o 1 Achie 2 Action	Actions to a of evaluation of evaluation of evaluation of every even entry. Resumments: Resumments to avoid short managements.	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? int and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish	NA NA NA Yes	No
·	Module o 1 Achie 2 Action	Actions to a of evaluation of evaluation of evaluation of every even entry. Resumments: Resumments to avoid short managements.	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem suits and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Int and use of the data suits and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish See general comment on data transmission	NA NA NA Yes	No No
·	Module o 1 Achie 2 Action	Actions to a of evaluation of evaluation of evaluation of every even entry. Resumments: Resumments to avoid short managements.	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? int and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish See general comment on data transmission	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No
·	Module o 1 Achie 2 Action Module fo 1 Achie	Actions to a of evaluation of evaluation of evaluation of evaluation of evaluation of managements: Res	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? int and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish See general comment on data transmission	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No
·	Module o 1 Achie 2 Action Module fo 1 Achie	Actions to a of evaluation of evaluation of evaluation of every even entry. Resumments: Resumments to avoid short managements.	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? f Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? void shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? int and use of the data sults and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish See general comment on data transmission	NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes NA	No No No No No

Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations
Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

IX IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?

X X. References

Is there a complete list of references?

XI XI. Annexes

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?

Most of the recommendations listed are not applicable to MS. Next year, only recommendations applicable to MS to be listed.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

		STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment	
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		Action needed by MS, please specify task
JRC/DG MARE	Fishing effort		- No data provided. No data for 2010-2011. Spain did not provide any data in response to the 2011 and 2012 data call.	no evident explanation for failure; contradictory to the AR information where it was indicated that all data have been collected	MS to clarify missing data
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: • Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (cost), capital & investment • Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings • Recreational catches: catches	Amount of the Community		MS to clarify missing data
JRC/DG MARE	Mediterranean & Black Sea	Fisheries' specific landings and discards by species, fishing effort and surveys' data for the years 2008-2012	The submitted Spanish data from all GSAs covers the full time series as requested by the data call, with the exception of GSA 2 where only the last three years were reported. - Biscards at length information was not provided. - Effort data was not submitted. - MEDITS and other surveys data are lacking for 2012.	and the second process of the RCM Medits S 2012: **RCMMedits 8.5, recoiling its 2011 recommendation and also the STECF EWG 11-20 recommendation on a harmonized time period required for data to be available for transmission to end-susers, recommends that the time period of 6 months following the end of the collection of transversal and biological data is respected by the data calls and the end wasers. Regarding discards: for some metier selected, data should be available (i.e. all OTB vessel) and MS should send in the should be submitted. Regarding GSA2, PMS should answer why data before 2009 are not available. **PS2-According to MS AR 2012, discarding levels are low for most of metiers in Mediterranean. MS carried out a pilot study on this subject. Now MS continue to sample mainly OTB metiers for discards issues. 3 MS AR 2012, discarding levels are low for most of metiers in Mediterranean. MS carried out a pilot study on this subject. Now MS continue to sample mainly OTB metiers for discards issues. 3 MS AR 2012, discarding levels are low for most of metiers in Mediterranean. MS carried out a pilot study on this subject. Now MS continue to sample mainly OTB metiers for discards issues. 3 MS AR 2012, discarding levels are low for most of metiers in Mediterranean. MS carried out a pilot study on this subject. Now MS continue to sample mainly OTB metiers for discards issues. 3 MS AR 2012, discarding levels are lower to the discards in the metiers of the discards issues. 3 MS AR 2012, discarding surveys (both MEDITS and MEDIAS), IRC/DG MARE should be aware that under each Member State reports the deadline for the availability of the data. All Mediterranean Countries established a deadline of 6 months after the sampling were supported that "recalling its 2011 recommendation, and also the STEC MS 11.20 recommendation on a mannoized time period required for data to be available for transmission to end-users, recommends that the time period of 6 months following the end of transmission to end-users, recommends that n	
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: including: income. Personal costs, • Energy costs, • Raw materia costs, • Other operational costs, • Capital costs, • Extraordinary costs, • Capital value, • Net investments, • Debt, • Raw material volume, • Total volume, • Employment, • Number of enterprises	- Production value was provided by species 2008-2010 but volume information was missing. All data were provided by segments. - The following production parameters were not submitted: Total sales volume national total and segments (2008-2010), Raw material volume: Livestock (2008-2010)	According to AR 2011 volume of sales were collected by Census for all segments with 100% response rate, so data should be available. According to AR 2011 tabls livestock should also be available for most segments.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddool in Subrazes I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are no fishing in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (13.05) master stock indicating that cod and haddook stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Nowegian law.	
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. For several countries discard age, length, weight and maturity of cod and Haddoci in Subrareas I and II are requested by the end users. Beside of fact, that most of countries are to fishing in the area, ICES has provided to the last STECF meeting (1376) 'master sock in disciting that cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed. Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.	
ICES	Red fish Sebastes mentella Subarea: I and II	s	Landings Age Landings Length Landings Weight Landings Maturity Landings Ser Ratio Discards Age Discards Age Discards Weight Discards Weight Discards Weight Commercial Fleets	According to MS AR 2012, 11579 fish were measured from unsorted catches and 221 more as identified as discards. For stock variables, between 476 to 11579 individuals were also sampled for updating biological parameters. But no mention if they were collected from landings or discards or both.	MS to clarify missing data

	STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment		
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		Action needed by MS, please specify task
ICES	Cod in Division VIb (Rockall)		Landings Weight		MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Cod in Division VIa (West of		Commercial Fleets Landings Age	According to MS NP 2011-2013, cod VIa was not selected for metier and stock variables data	MS to clarify missing data
	Scotland)		Landings Length	collection. However, MS mentionned in its AR table III.C.6 that 36 fish were measured as discards	
			Landings Weight	of metier OTB_DEF_100-119_0_0.	
			Discards Age Discards Length		
			Discards Weight		
ICES	Haddock in Divisions VIIb-k		Landings Weight	Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Megrim (Lepidorhombus spp) in		Landings Weight	Transversal data to be checked. According to MS NP 2011-2013, megrim in IV and VIa was not	MS to clarify missing data
ICLS	Subarea Via (West of Scotland) and		Discards Weight	selected for metier variables data collection. However, MS mentionned in its AR table III.C.6 that	ivis to clarify fillissing data
	sub-area IV (North Sea)			727 L. whiffiagonis and 42 L. boscii were measured as landings of metier OTB_DEF_100-119_0_0	
				in area VI.	
ICES	Megrim (Lepidorhombus spp) in Subarea VIb (Rockall)		Landings Weight Discards Weight	Transversal data to be checked. According to MS NP 2011-2013, megrims in IV and VIa were not selected for metier variables data collection. However, MS mentionned in its AR table III.C.6 that	MS to clarify missing data
	Subarea vio (Nockaii)		Discards Weight	727 L. whiffiagonis and 42 L. boscii were measured as landings of metier OTB_DEF_100-119_0_0	
				in area VI.	
ICES	Spurdog (Squalus acanthias) in the		Landings Maturity	According to MS NP 2011-2013, spurdog was not selected for metier and stock variables data	MS to clarify missing data
	Northeast Atlantic		Discards Maturity	collection. MS mentionned no sampling at all of spurdog in its AR table III.C.6, even when applying wide concurrent at sea sampling.	
ICES	Anchovy in Division Ixa		Landings Sex Ratio	According to MS AR 2012, 1228 fishes were sampled for updating sex-ratio@length parameter,	MS to clarify missing data
				when only 1000 were planned for NP 2012. However precision target for this parameter was not	
				achieved.	
ICES	Horse mackerel (Trachurus		Landings Age	According to MS AR 2012, 22927 fishes were sampled in fishing ground VIIIc/IXa for landings	MS to clarify missing data
	trachurus) in Division IXa (Southern stock)		Landings Length Landings Weight	metier variables. 3604 were also sampled for updating length@age parameter with good results as precision target has been achieved. But no mention if these fishes were collected from landings	
	Stock)		candings weight	or discards or both.	
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius budegassa) in		Landings Length	Transversal data to be checked for landings weight. According to MS AR 2012, 7389 fishes were	MS to clarify missing data
	Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b		Landings Weight	measured for landings caught in the relevant fishing grounds and 705 for discards.	
			Discards Length		
			Discards Weight Commercial Fleets		
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius budegassa) in		Landings Length	Transversal data to be checked for landings weight. According to MS AR 2012, 5038 fishes were	MS to clarify missing data
	Divisions VIIIc and Ixa		Landings Weight	measured for landings caught in the relevant fishing ground "Iberian".	
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius) in Divisions VIIIc and Ixa		Landings Length Landings Weight	Transversal data to be checked for landings weight. According to MS AR 2012, 5038 fishes were measured for landings caught in the relevant fishing ground "lberian".	MS to clarify missing data
	Divisions vinc and ixa		candings weight	measured for landings caught in the relevant listning ground liberian .	
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius) in		Landings Length	Transversal data to be checked for landings weight. According to MS AR 2012, 5464 fishes were	MS to clarify missing data
	Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b		Landings Weight	measured for landings caught in the relevant fishing grounds and 121 for discards.	
			Discards Length		
			Discards Weight Commercial Fleets		
ICES	Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI		Landings Length	Transversal data to be checked for landings weight. According to MS AR 2012, 79082 fishes were	MS to clarify missing data
	and VII and Divisions VIIIa,b,d		Landings Weight	measured for landings caught in the relevant fishing grounds and 5351 for discards.	
	(Northern stock)		Discards Length	Concerning stock variables sex ratio and maturity@length, around 2435 individuals were collected, but without achieving precision targets planned. No mention by MS if these fishes were	
			Discards Weight Discards Maturity	collected, but without achieving precision targets planned. No mention by MS if these fishes were collected from landings or discards or both.	
			Discards Sex Ratio	conected from landings of discards of both.	
ICES	Hake in Division VIIIc and IXa		Landings Weight	Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
	(Southern stock)		Commercial Fleets		
ICES	Megrim (L. whiffiagonis) in Subarea VII & Divisions VIIIa,b,d,e		Landings Age Landings Length	Transversal data to be checked for landings weight. According to MS AR 2012, 19618 fishes were measured for landings caught in the relevant fishing grounds and 4849 for discards.	MS to clarify missing data
	VII & DIVISIONS VIIIa,D,d,e		Landings Weight	Concerning stock variables, more than 2100 individuals were collected for every parameters. No	
			Landings Maturity	mention by MS if these fishes were collected from landings or discards or both.	
			Landings Sex Ratio		
			Discards Weight Commercial Fleets		
ICES	Nephrops in Division VIIIc (FU 25,		Landings Weight	Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
	North Galicia)				,
ICES	Nephrops in Division IXa (FU 30, Gulf		Landings Weight	Transversal data to be checked. According to its AR 2012, MS provided DCF metier variables at	MS to clarify missing data
	of Cadiz)		Discards Weight	fishing ground "Iberian" level, not by functionnal units. For VIIIc/IXa, 3497 indivuals were measured in 20122, but only 16 for discards.	
ICES	Nephrops in Division VIIIc (FU31,		Landings Weight	measured in 20122, but only 16 for discards. Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
	Cantabrian Sea)				,
ICES	Nephrops in Division IXa (FU 26-27		Landings Weight	Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
	West Galicia and North Portugal)				
ICES	Nephrops in Division IXa (FU 26-27		Landings Weight	Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
	West Galicia and North Portugal)		Containings weight	Transversar data to be triethed.	no to comy missing data
ICES	Megrim (Lepidorhombus boscii) in		Landings Weight	Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Divisions VIIIc and Ixa Megrim (Lepidorhombus		Commercial Fleets Landings Weight	Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
icco	Megrim (Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis) in Divisions VIIIc and		Commercial Fleets	Transversal data to be checked.	INIS TO CIGINA INISPILIE RAFA
	Ixa				
ICES	Red (=blackspot) seabream in		Commercial Fleets		MS to clarify missing data
	Subarea IX				

	STECF & DG MARE - Comments			EWG comment		
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		Action needed by MS, please specify task	
ICES	Nephrops in Division VIIb,c,j,k (Porcupine Bank, FU 16)		Landings Length Landings Weight Landings Sex Ratio Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Maturity Discards Ratio	Transversal data to be checked for landings weight. According to MS AR 2012, only 372 indivuals were measured for discards when 2600 were planned for landings and discards. Sampling failure due to changes in processing catches on board. Nephrops are now landed headless and frozen. Buying samples for stock variables proved to be too much expensive to be carried out every year.		
ICES	Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb, VIa,, VIIa-c, e-k, VIIIa-e (Western stock)		Uscards Sex Ratio Discards Length Discards Weight	According to MS AR 2012, more than 55000 fishes were measured for metiers variables, of which more than 31000 from discards samples. Concerning stoke 170 individuals were collected for updating lenth@age and sex-ratio@lentgh parameters, and 151 for maturity@length one. No mention by MS if these fishes were collected from landings or discards or both.		
ICES	Blue whiting in Subareas I-IX, XII and XIV (Combined stock)		Landings Maturity	According to its AR 2012, MS asks derogation for this biological parameter. MS stated in AR that the derogation was approved by EU.	None	
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.1	Segment *Fleet segment *Vessel number *Capacity (messure, value) GSA-Segment: *Geographical Sub-Area *Fleet segment *Vessel number	Segment: * Capacity (measure, value) - not provided	the userganoir was approved by CC.	MS to clarify missing data	
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.3	- Capactly (measure, value) Segment: - Engine power - Employment - Salary share % - Landing weight - Landing weight - Vessel value of total fleet - Working days/year per vessel - Working hours/days per vessel - Working hours/days per vessel - Working hours/days per vessel - Working total fleet - Working total share weight of the filter	All Task 1.3 data - not provided		MS to clarify missing data	
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.4	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: - Effort measure - Catch or Landing - CPUE/PUE - Discard - Bycatch - Bycatch - GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: - Catch or Landing - CPUE/PUE - CPUE/PUE	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: - Discard - only partially provided		MS to clarify missing data	
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.5	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: - Length range of captured species - Length average - Sex - Maturity	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: - Length range of captured species - only partially provided - Length average - only partially provided - Sex - only partially provided - Maturity - only partially provided		MS to clarify missing data	
ЮТС	Longline (swordfish)	IOTC species: - Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any - Catch-and-Effort data - Size frequency data Sharks: - Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any - Catch-and-Effort data - Size frequency data	IOTC species: - Catch-and-Effort data - incomplete report, data only provided for swordfish (target species) - Size frequency data - incomplete report, data only provided for swordfish (target species) Sharks: - Catch-and-Effort data - no data reported - Size frequency data - incomplete report, for Oceanic whitetip shark; ibid IOTC species	According to MS AR 2012, only 122 swordfish measured in IOTC region. No data collected on sharks.	MS to clarify missing data	
ютс	Purse seine	IOTC species: - Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any - Catch-and-Effort data - Stafe frequency data - Number and activities of supply vessels (purse seine only) Sharks: - Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any - Catch-and-Effort data - Stafe frequency data	Sharks: **Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any- incomplete report **Catch-and-Efford data - no data reported **Size frequency data - no data reported	According to MS AR 2012, catches of sharks by metier PS_LPF are very low. Around 50 fish discarded were measured in 2012.	MS to clarify missing data	
WCPFC	2011 aggregated catch and effort data	,	- the catch data are for swordfish only - the 5"x5"/month Longline catch and effort data are not stratified by "Hooks between Floats"		MS to clarify missing data	
WCPFC	2011 operational catch and effort data		- for LONGLINE GEAR - "Branchlines between floats" not provided - for LONGLINE GEAR - "Hooks per set" not provided - "Time of set" not provided - Discard information not included - Catches of shark by species have been provided	According to MS AR 2012, observers on board sample catches. Some data on discards collected. Around 880 Selectans were measured in 2012.	MS to clarify missing data	

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

Member State: Judgement levels Reference year 2012 Compliance class Compliance level Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal Partly 10-50% 50-90% **EWG Answer** Mostly Overall compliance Yes >90% not applicable NA General framework **EWG COMMENTS EWG** iudgement National data collection organisation **FWG** National correspondent and participating institutes Action needed? Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described? Yes No Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings? Yes MS to provide list of Are derogations listed? derogations If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines? NΑ No Regional and International coordination Attendance of international meetings MS to explain '?' for 6 Is Table II.B.1 complete? Mostly meetings and update table MS to give explanation for non-attendance at PGECON Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained? and any others Follow-up of regional and international recommendations B₂ 2011 LM recommendations should be Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed? given Nο MS to update list Are the responsive actions described? NA No Are the responsive actions acceptable? SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector General description of the fishing sector Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described? ves Nο Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? yes No Economic variables MS needs to resubmit table or to clarify why data are not Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? ctive vessels not contained in table reported more clustering than in NP: some segments would not require clustering Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? (e.g. DRB & DTS & HOK <12m) everal segments are missing (e.g. TBB1012, DRB1012...), response informations not correspond with MS needs to clarify (see those from table III.B.1 Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Partly Comment) Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal other variablity indicator provided in table IIIB3, but no explanation Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? MS to clarify (see Comment) provided; Mostly Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified? NA NA Nο Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal B2 Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? NA Nο Are the deviations justified? NA No Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations ВЗ Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Yes Nο NA No Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls В4 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? **Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic** Biological metier related variables Comment: No need to put tables in the text that are the same tables Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region? found in the excel sheets Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Inconsistencies between the planned MS to clarify inconsistencies number of trips in table III.C.3 vs (see comment) and update Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Mostly table accordingly Inconsistencies between the planned MS to clarify inconsistencies number of trips in table III.C.3 vs (see comment) and update Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? able accordingly Time stratification column is blank. Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Precision is expressed in precentage Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Yes No Over-sampling of stocks was reported in almost all cases. Undersampling in few cases. Over-sampling of 2 metiers and under-sampling in several Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? metiers Mostly but there is no information on Yes Nο Are the deviations justified? Yes Nο Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Yes No Were CV targets met? Partly No Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Yes Nο

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Region Atlantic Region Biological metier related variables Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal C1 Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Region North Sea & Eastern Artic Recreational fisheries Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? **Region North Atlantic** D Recreational fisheries Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

D2

D4

	Yes	lNo
2012 recommendations are not	100	110
applicable.	Yes	No
Inconsistencies between the planned number of trips in table III.C.3 vs III.C.3	Mostly	MS to clarify inconsistencie (see comment) and update table accordingly
Inconsistencies between the planned number of trips in table III.C.3 vs III.C.4	Mostly	MS to clarify inconsistencie (see comment) and update table accordingly
Precision is expressed in precentage. Time stratification column is blank.	Mostly Yes	MS to update table accordingly
Over-sampling of stocks was reported		
in almost all cases. Undersampling in few cases. Under-sampling of most metiers reported.	Mostly	No
General trends are explained but no details by metier provided.	Mostly	MS to amend text (see comment)
Is under-staffing considered as a legitimate reason?	Mostly	No
	1	MC to provide evalenation
		MS to provide explanation why some CVs were not
	Mostly	calculated.
Target CVs not reached for the vast		
majority of stocks	No	No MS to provide explanation
		why some CVs were not
	Partly	calculated.
	Partly	No
	Yes	No
RCM (2011,2012) recommendations are listed. MS should only list recs		
directed to MS (not e.g LM)	Yes Yes	No No
	Yes	No
		F
	Yes	No
	Yes Yes	No No
	Yes Yes Yes	No No
	Yes Yes NA	No No No
	Yes Yes NA NA	No No No No No
	Yes Yes NA	No No No
	Yes Yes NA NA	No No No No
	Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA MA MA MA MA MA Mostiy	No
	Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA Ves Mostly Yes	No N
	Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA MA MA MA MA MA Mostiy	No
	Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA Ves Mostly Yes	No N
	Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	No N
	Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Wostly Yes Yes NA	No
	Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	No N
	Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA Yes Mostly Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	No N
	Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA Wostly Yes Yes NA	No
	Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA Yes Mostly Yes Yes NA NO NA NO NA Yes Yes Yes	No
	Yes Yes NA NA NA NA Ves Mostly Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	No
	Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA Yes Mostly Yes Yes NA NO NA NO NA Yes Yes Yes Yes	No N
	Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes Mostly Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	No N
	Yes Yes NA NA NA NA Mostly Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	No N
	Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA Yes Mostly Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	No N

Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	No
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	•	•
Were data quality targets provided?	Yes	No
Were data quality targets met?	Mostly	No
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	-	
Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	No
Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	No
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	No
Actions to avoid shortfalls	-	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	No

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

E Biological stock-related variables

Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?

Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic

E Biological stock-related variables

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Atlantic

Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Yes	No
Yes	No

Table not consistent with NP, some rows were added. Required precision		
targets are missing in the table, precision expressed as		MS should only report the
precentage.Why are some cells red?.		species planned in NP
it appears as if it indicates changes		Proposal. MS to clarify the
from NP, but it is not explained	Mostly	meaning of red rows.
Approximately half of stock*parameter		
are sampled in excess. One quarter is		
undersampled.	Mostly	No
Yes, most parameters are sampled at		
surveys, difficult to predict catches.	Yes	No
	Yes	No

		1
Yes, what does CV 0 mean? Does it mean CV=O? or does it mean that CV were not calculated?	Yes	MS to explain what CV 0 means or clarify if this is an error.
For approx one quarter of the		
stocks*parameters, predominantely		
length@age	Partly	No
	-	
MS finds DCF targets unachievable (and costly) for many stocks at the MS level. It sates that precision may be achieved through the combination of samples collected by several member States with surveys in NS. Survey time limits the number of samples	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Derogations listed in metier section but no explanation if the derogation afects the length sampling or if it afects all variables. Derogation for species less than 200 tons or less		Ms should follow the guidelines and provide an
tahn 10% of TAC is not need to be		updated list of derogations in
asked for.	Partly	section I of AR texts.
Recommendations from RCM and		
PGCCDBS are listed .		
Recommendation of LM came from		
RCM.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

<u></u>		
Inconsistencies between NP and AR, more rows in AR. The added ones are in red text and seems to be parameters and/or data sources that have been included after NP submission but this is not consistent with the NS@EA part. No explanation, to be clarified by MS. Required precision targets are missing in the table, precision expressed as		MS should only report the species planned in NP Proposal. MS to clarify the
precentage.	Mostly	meaning of red rows.
The table includes 283 stock*parameters combinations, 31 is not sampled at all, 95 is undersampled, 68 is sampled in accordance with plan and the rest are		
sampled in excess.	Partly	No
Most of the stock*parameters are collected at surveys and the result are dependant on survey catches and available time for staff at the vessels. Given the relatively large discripancy from planned is it beneficial if MS expanded on eg if this is affecting assessment and how MS prioritise if		MS to extend the explanations about deviations, eg if this is affecting assessment and how MS prioritise if there is a
there is a shortage in sampling time.	Partly	shortage in sampling time.
Yes		see above

V		MO 45
Yes, what does CV 0 mean? Does it		MS to explain what CV 0
mean CV=O? or does it mean that CV		means or clarify if this is an
were not calculated?	Yes	error.

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Capacity

 $\mbox{\bf F11}$ Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified? F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

F2 **Effort**

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Landings

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Research surveys at sea

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

For approx one quarter of the		
stocks*parameters, predominantely		
length@age	Partly	No
MS finds DCF targets unachievable		
(and costly) for many stocks at the MS		
level. It sates that precision may be achieved through the combination of		
samples collected by several member		
States with surveys in NS. Survey		
time limits the number of samples	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Derogations listed in metier section		
but no explanation if the derogation		
afects the length sampling or if it afects all variables . Derogation for		Ms should follow the
species less than 200 tons or less		guidelines and provide an
tahn 10% of TAC is not need to be		updated list of derogations in
asked for.	Partly	section I of AR texts.
Recommendations from RCM and	-	
PGCCDBS are listed .		
Recommendation of LM came from	Vac	Ne
RCM.	Yes Yes	No No
	Yes	No
	I	· I
MS "There is a need for an		
internationally collaborative exercise		
to evaluate the coverage and		
precision obtained from the		
international collection of samples for growth, maturity, fish condition etc, in		
order that national targets can be		
optimised." Ideal but MS need to		MS need to describe how to
descrieb how to avoid shortfalls in the		avoid shortfalls in the present
present situation as well	Partly	situation as well
	Partly	see above
Table III.F.1 is not consistent with AR		
guidelines, MS is not using the correct		
template.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	N .	Ta a
	Yes Yes	No No
	100	110
		MS shall provide
		explanation/information on the
		process used to collect effort
		data for vessels of or under
<u> </u>	Mostly	10 meters.
	Yes	No
		l
	Yes	No
	Yes Yes	l
	Yes	No No
	Yes	No No
	Yes Yes Yes	No No No
	Yes	No No
	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No
	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No
	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No
	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No
	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No
	Yes	No N
	Yes	No
	Yes	No N
	Yes	No
	Yes	No N
Next year, reference to maps is not	Yes	No N

in accordance with the guidelines

Quitting DYFS is not

mentioned in the text

Mostly

Mostly

MS to update text on this (see

comment)

	Are the devictions contained?	<u> </u>		INIa
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes Yes	No No
		Next year, reference to maps is not		
G2		in accordance with the guidelines	Yes	No
	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in		Vee	Nie
	gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)? Are the deviations explained?		Yes Yes	No No
62	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
G3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	no recommendations have been		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described?	reported, both from RCM and LM	Yes NA	No No
	Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	No
G4	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA NA	No
	e of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing indus llection of data concerning the aquaculture	stry		
A 00	Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?		yes	No
				MS should provide information about quality
		no information about quality indicators		indicators by resubmitting
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	(Achieved no.sample, sampled rate)	no	table MS should provide
				information about quality
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Wrong version of standard tables, values missing for indicators	no	indicators by resubmitting table
A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?		yes yes	No No
	Are the deviations justified?		yes	No
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		no information about quality indicators		MS should provide
	Is respective data quality information given?	(Achieved no.sample, sampled rate) in table IV.A.2 and IV.A.3	Mostly	information about quality indicators
	Are the deviations explained?		yes	No
А3	Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		NA	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA NA	No No
	Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA NA	No
A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	lack of information about how will the		
		pilot study affect on a better quality of		MS needs to provide actions
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		partly Mostly	to avoid shortfalls
В Со				
D C0	llection of data concerning the processing industry		•	
5 00	llection of data concerning the processing industry Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		yes	No MS should provide
5 00	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	CV for debt for companies >=250	yes	MS should provide clarification about missing
B C0		CV for debt for companies >=250	•	MS should provide
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be	yes Mostly	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be	yes Mostly	MS should provide clarification about missing data
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables	yes Mostly	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) Comment (see Comment)
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing	yes Mostly Mostly	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing	yes Mostly Mostly partly	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment)
B1	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for	yes Mostly Mostly partly no	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing
B1	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for	yes Mostly Mostly partly	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide
B1	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables	yes Mostly Mostly partly no	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment)
B1	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see
B1	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing variables	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly no	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment)
B1	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing variables No relevant arecommodations	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see
B1 B2	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing variables No relevant arecommodations	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly no Yes	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment)
B1	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing variables No relevant arecommodations	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly partly no Yes Na NA	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) No No No
B1 B2 B3	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing variables No relevant arecommodations	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly partly partly NA	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment)
B1 B2 B3 B4 Module	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing variables No relevant arecommodations	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly no Yes Na NA Yes	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) No No No No
B1 B2 B3 B4 Module	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing variables No relevant arecommodations	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly partly no Yes Na NA	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) No No No
B1 B2 B3 B4 Module 1 Act	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables not information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables not for all variables No relevant arecommodations	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly no Yes Na NA Yes Yes NA	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) No needs to clarify (see Comment) No No No No No No No No No No
B1 B2 B3 B4 Module 1 Act	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables not information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables not for all variables No relevant arecommodations	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly partly no Yes Na NA Yes Yes Yes	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) NO NO NO NO
B1 B2 B3 B4 Module 1 Act	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem inevernets: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables not information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables not for all variables No relevant arecommodations	Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly no Yes Na NA Yes Yes NA NA	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) No No No No No No No No No No
B1 B2 B3 B4 Module 1 Act	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the relevant derogations listed? ions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables not information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables not for all variables No relevant arecommodations	Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly no Yes Na NA Yes Yes NA NA	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) No No No No No No No No No No
B1 B2 B3 B4 Module 1 Act	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? for management and use of the data nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing variables No relevant arecommodations	Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly no Yes Na NA Yes Yes NA NA	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) No No No No No No No No No No
B1 B2 B3 B4 Module 1 Act	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? for management and use of the data nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing variables No relevant arecommodations See general comment	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly no Yes Na NA Yes Yes NA NA NA	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) No No No No No No No No No No
B1 B2 B3 B4 Module 1 Act	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? for management and use of the data nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing variables No relevant arecommodations See general comment on data transmission	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly no Yes Na NA Yes Yes NA NA Yes	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) No No No No No No No No No No
B1 B2 B3 B4 Module 1 Act	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem is rable V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the relevant derogations listed? ions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are the relevant derogations listed? ions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? for management and use of the data inevements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing variables No relevant arecommodations See general comment on data transmission	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly no Yes Na NA Yes NA NA NA Yes Yes	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) No needs to clarify (see Comment) No
B1 B2 B3 B4 Module 1 Act	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed? ions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? for management and use of the data nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? for management and use of the data nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal? Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing variables No relevant arecommodations See general comment on data transmission No information is provided	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly no Yes Na NA NA NA NA NA Yes Yes Yes Yes No NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) No No No No No No No No No No
B1 B2 B3 B4 Module 1 Act	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? for management and use of the data nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing variables No relevant arecommodations See general comment on data transmission No information is provided regarding the status of a national DCF website	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly no Yes Na NA Yes Yes NA NA Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO
B1 B2 B3 B4 Module 1 Act 2 Act Module 1 Act	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? for management and use of the data nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations explained?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing variables No relevant arecommodations See general comment on data transmission No information is provided regarding the status of a national DCF website	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly partly no Yes Na NA Yes Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) NO No No No No No No No No No No
B1 B2 B3 B4 Module 1 Act 2 Act Module 1 Act	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? for management and use of the data nievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed? Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained?	CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Some of the variables are not be collected not for all variables no information about the missing variables not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing not for all variables no information about the missing variables No relevant arecommodations See general comment on data transmission No information is provided regarding the status of a national DCF website	yes Mostly Mostly partly no Mostly partly no Yes Na NA Yes Yes NA NA Yes Yes NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA NA N	MS should provide clarification about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO NO

No No Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Yes Yes Recommendations listed, is not Recommendations used, is not consistent with the AR guidelines. No clear action described Since no clear action is described, it's hard to justify To be updated To be updated NA No Is to actoryins and abbreviations
Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

IX IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections
Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?

VII	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Follow-up of STECF recommendations
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described?
VIII	Are the responsive actions acceptable?

X. References

Is there a complete list of references?

XI XI. Annexes

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?

UNITED KINGDOM

	STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment		
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		Action needed by MS, please specify task
JRC/DG MARE	Fishing effort		- U.K without SCL) Late submissions for all data tables (LW kithout SCL) Late submissions via files during the EWG 12-06 and not via the official channel which is the uploading facility on the data collection web site ACTCH: (UK without SCL) Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 2186 records with missing mesh sizeinformation mainly for pots and dredges. Several records were submitted with an invalid combination for area 85A and specific condition DEEP which were ignored in the analysis. (SCL) Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 28 records with no area information, 51 records with no gear information, 63 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types and 560 records for species 'OTM'. Several records were submitted with an invalid combination for area 85A and specific condition DEEP which were ignored in the analysis EFFORT: (UK without SCL) Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 95 records with missing mesh size information for ramab fash appetic condition DEEP which were ignored in the analysis. (SL) Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 95 records with missing mesh size and records were submitted with an invalid combination for area 85A and specific condition DEEP which were ignored in the analysis. (SL) Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 8 records with maxing mesh size information in for area 85A and specific condition DEEP which were ignored in the analysis C_SPECIFIC EFFORT: (UK without SCL) Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 8 records with no area information, 108 records with no gear information and 82 records with missing mesh size information in an area for a set of the submitted data set were 8 records were submitted with an invalid combination for area 85A and specific condition DEEP which were ignored in the analysis C_SPECIFIC EFFORT: (UK without SCL) Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 8 records were	no evident explanation for failure (apparently all minor issues)	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: • Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital & investment - Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings • Recreational catches: catches	Ouite significant amounts of missing data: Recreational catch data not submitted Energy costs for 2010 not submitted for national and fleet segment levels; only partial effort data submitted (fishing trips) National level capacity data (number of vessels, GT, kW) significantly less than fleet level data in 2009-2012	recreational catch data and 2012 data were not mandatory; all other issues: no evident explanation for failure	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: - Income, Personal costs, * Energy costs, * Raw materia costs, * Other operational costs, * Capital costs, * Extraordinary costs, * Capital value, * Net investments, * Debt, * Raw material volume, * Total volume, * Employment, * Number of enterprises	 Reported landings weight higher than Eurosta statistics STECF EWG-114 commented that the UK "did not provide a complete set of economic indicators". UK did not provide any data on production volume as well as raw material. Most of the economic parameters were missing. For DCF data, the following parameters were not submitted: Imputed value of unpaid labour (2009-2010), Item (2009-2010), Energy costs 2008-2020, Baw material costs 2008-2010, Repair and maintenance 2008-2010, Deb (2009-2010), Deb (2009-2010), Financial costs 2008-2010, Total sales volume 2008-2010, Not investments 2008-2010, Post investments 2008-2010	MS had serious problems to implement data collection on aquaculture. Maybe as in case of France and Italy, having in mind the huge number of small enterprises, MS should be asked and as long as there is serious improvement from year to year and a working data collection could be expected in one or two years, consequences should not be too harsh. MS should justify progress in applying DCF.	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Mutrity	Not applicable. MS have a bilateral agreement with DE (which is, in accordance with the contract, respossible to submit data to ICES) and a verbal agreement with Norway on sampling of this stock. No discarded cod were measured in the DE program 2012.	
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Mutrity	Not applicable. MS have a bilateral agreement with DE (which is, in accordance with the contract, respossible to submit data to ICES) and a verbal agreement with Norway on sampling of this stock. Only very few (1) discarded haddock were measured in the DE program 2012.	None
ICES	Cod in Division VIIe-k (Celtic Sea)		UK-England&Wales: Landings Maturity	Probably Not applicable. UK collects maturity data for cod in the celtic sea on surveys (No of fix analysed in 2012 were though low). Data is made available but quality seems to be low. All MS participating in the fishery get the same comment implying that this is something that probably have to be adressed at a regional level	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted
ICES	Cod in Division VIIe-k (Celtic Sea)		UK - Scotland: Landings Maturity	Probably Not applicable. UK collects maturity data for cod in the celtic sea on surveys (No of fish analysed in 2012 were though low). Data is made available but quality seems to be low. All MS participating in the fishery get the same comment implying that this is something that probably have to be addressed at a regional level	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted
ICES	Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland)		UK-Northern Ireland: Landings Age Landings Length Discards Age Discards Length	Applicable. It is not clear from the NP which UK countries that collect which parameters for biological data and how many length measurements that are done. (mismatch between UK in EU and countries in ICSS). Nevertheless, Northern Ireland carry out seasampling in the area and data should be available.	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted

UNITED KINGDOM

STECF & DG MARE - Comments				EWG comment		
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		Action needed by MS, please specify task	
ICES	Haddock in Divisions VIIb-k		UK-England&Wales: Landings Maturity Discards Age Discards Weight Discards Maturity Commercial Fieets	Applicable. Though maturity estimates from landed haddock are irrelevant since almost 100% of the landed fish is mature. England&Wales carry out seasampling in the area and discard data should be available.	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	
ICES	Nephrops in Division VIIa (Irish Sea East, FU14)		UK-England&Wales: Landings Length Landings Sex Ratio Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Reatio	Applicable. It is not clear from the NP which UK countries that collect which parameters for biological data and how many length measurements that are done, (mismatch between UK in EU and countries in ICSE). EnglandsWales have submitted data to ICSE but it is considered unrepresentative. In AR are changes in landing practices noted as a reason for failure to meet target on this stock.	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	
ICES	Nephrops in Division VIIa (Irish Sea East, FU14)		UK-Northern Ireland: Landings Length Landings Sex Ratio Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Sex Ratio	Applicable. Northern Ireland has an extensive sea-sampling programme in Vila [176 achieved trips for the metier OTB, CRU_70-99_0_0), so data should be available. In AR are changes in landing practices noted as a reason for failure to meet target on this stock but this seems like a strange explanation when sampling is carried out at sea. Data is not submitted to ICES (in contrast to England were it is submitted but not considered representative).		
ICES	Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)		Uk-Northern Ireland: Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Murinly	Applicable. Discard data available to ICES but data is considered to have low quality/representativity. To be explaned. Northern Ireland have an extensive sea.sampling programme in the area.	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	
ICES	Whiting in Division VIb (Rockall)		UK - Scotland: Surveys at Sea	Not applicable. UK landing < 20 tonnes . Survey data provided but considered to have low quality/representativity. Almost no data for this stock but this need to be solved elsewhere	None	
ICES	Spurdog (Squalus acanthias) in the Northeast Atlantic		UK-England&Wales: Landings Maturity Discards Maturity	Not applicable. Maturity only needs to be collected triannually in 2010/93. Was included in UK NP for 2010.	None	
ICES	Spurdog (Squalus acanthias) in the Northeast Atlantic		UK - Scotland: Landings Maturity Discards Maturity	Not applicable. Maturity only needs to be collected triannually in 2010/93. Was included in UK NP for 2010.	None	
ICES	Spurdog (Squalus acanthias) in the Northeast Atlantic		UK-Northern Ireland: Landings Maturity Discards Maturity	Not applicable. Maturity only needs to be collected triannually in 2010/93. Was included in UK NP for 2010.	None	
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius budegassa) in Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b		Discards Weight	Probably not applicable. UK collected data and made it availabe to ICES but the quality/ representativity of the data is considered to low. All participating MS get the same comment so it need to be sorted on a regional scale.	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius) in Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b		Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio Discards Weight	Probably not applicable. Maturity and sea-ratio not submitted by the MS but the data is presently not relevant for the assessment method. Discards- UK collected data and made it available to ICEs but the quality/ representativity of the data is considered to low. All participating MS (that submit data) get the same comment so it need to be sorted on a regional scale.	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	
ICES	Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions VIIIa,b,d (Northern stock)		UK-England&Wales: Discards Length Discards Weight	Applicable. It is not clear from the NP which UK countries that collect which parameters for biological data and how many length measurements that are done, (mismatch between UK in EU and countries in ICS). England&Welse have submitted data to ICS but it is considered unrepresentative. The real problem with the assessment is however that other MS do not provide data.	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	
ICES	Megrim (L. whiffiagonis) in Subarea VII & Divisions VIIIa,b,d,e		Landings Maturity	Applicable. MS collect maturity data. The real problem with the assessment is however that other MS do not provide data.	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	
ICES	Nephrops in Division IVbc (Botney Gut - Silver Pit, FU 5)		UvE-ngland&Wales: Landings Length Landings Weight Landings Maturity Landings Ser Ratio Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Maturity Coscards Ser Ratio Commercial Fleets Commercial Fleets	Not applicable. MS have (at least in accordance with AR) a derogation to sample FUS.	None	
ICES	Nephrops in Division IVb (Firth of Forth, FU8)		UK-England&Wales: Commercial Fleets	Applicable	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	
ICES	Nephrops in Division IVa (Noup, FU 10)		UK - Scotland: Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Maturity Discards Raturity	Not applicable. MS have (at least in accordance with AR) a derogation to sample FU10.	None	
ICES	Plaice Subarea IV (North Sea)		UK-England&Wales: Landings Age Landings Length Discards Age Discards Length	Applicable. UK sample biological parameters of plaice as well as discards. It seems like (comment in ICES sheet) a lot of the landings take place in NL. There is a bilateral agreement between UK and NL on sampling of anglo-ducth vessels landing into NL In accordance with this agreement is it NL that should provide data to ICES from this landings. But what about the landings that is not going into NL? Difficult to evaluate and need to be sorted out. Who is responsible for what?	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	
ICES	Plaice Subarea IV (North Sea)		UK - Scotland: Landings Age Landings Length Discards Age Discards Length	Applicable. UK sample biological parameters of plaice as well as discards. It seems like (comment in ICES sheet) a tot of the landings take place in NL. There is a bilateral agreement between UK and NL on sampling of anglo-ducth vessels landing into NL. In accordance with this agreement is it NL that should provide data to ICES from this landings. But what about the landings that is not going into NL? Difficult to evaluate and need to be sorted out. Who is responsible for what?	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	

UNITED KINGDOM

	STECF & DG MARE - Comments			EWG comment		
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		Action needed by MS, please specify task	
ICES	Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)		UK-England&Wales:	(Probably) Not applicable. Age based assessment, Landings- all MS involved in fishery have got the	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	
			Landings Length	same comment. WG probably have not asked for the data. Discards- for other countries ICES has		
			Discards Length	said that discard lengths are not relevant for the assessment method		
ICES	Herring in the Northeast Atlantic		UK - Scotland:	Not applicable - UK do not sample pelagic fleet for discards (NP)	None	
	(Norwegian spring-spawning		Discards Age			
	herring)		Discards Length			
			Discards Weight			
			Discards Maturity			
			Discards Sex Ratio			
ICES	Herring in the Northeast Atlantic		UK-Northern Ireland:	Not applicable - UK do not sample pelagic fleet for discards (NP)	None	
	(Norwegian spring-spawning		Discards Age			
	herring)		Discards Length			
			Discards Weight			
			Discards Maturity			
			Discards Sex Ratio			
ICES	Horse mackerel (Trachurus		UK-England&Wales:	(Probably) not applicable the discards that have been collected seems to be bycatches from	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	
	trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb,		Discards Age	demersal fisheries, no sampling of discards in the horse mackerel fishery		
	VIa,, VIIa-c, e-k, VIIIa-e (Western		Discards Length			
	stock)		Discards Weight			
ICES	Blue whiting in Subareas I-IX, XII and		UK - Scotland:	Applicable. Unclear, data is not included in NP (why not?), but submitted to ICES and considered	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	
	XIV (Combined stock)		Landings Maturity	unrepresentativ/low quality. Verbal agreement with DK on age and length sampling, what about		
				maturity? No individuals sampled for age in the DK AR		
ICES	Mackerel in the Northeast Atlantic		UK-England&Wales:	(Probably) not applicable the discards that have been collected seems to be bycatches from	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	
	(combined Southern, Western and		Discards Age	demersal fisheries, no sampling of discards in the mackerel fishery		
	North Sea spawning components)		Discards Length			
			Discards Weight			
ICES	Mackerel in the Northeast Atlantic		UK - Scotland:	(Probably) not applicable the discards that have been collected seems to be bycatches from	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	
1	(combined Southern, Western and		Discards Age	demersal fisheries, no sampling of discards in the mackerel fishery		
	North Sea spawning components)		Discards Length			
			Discards Weight			
IOTC	Longline (swordfish)	IOTC species:	IOTC species:		MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted	
		Total catches, including nominal catches (catches	Size frequency data - no data reported			
		unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any				
1		Catch-and-Effort data	Sharks:			
		Size frequency data	Size frequency data - no data reported			
		Sharks:				
1		Total catches, including nominal catches (catches)				
		unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any				
		Catch-and-Effort data				
1		Size frequency data				
1	-	- Size requeries data	1	1	1	

^{*} For GFCM data - this column refers to the aggregation level / data field(s)

4 EWG-13-07 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1 - Information on STECF members and invited experts' affiliations is displayed for information only. In some instances the details given below for STECF members may differ from that provided in Commission COMMISSION DECISION of 27 October 2010 on the appointment of members of the STECF (2010/C 292/04) as some members' employment details may have changed or have been subject to organisational changes in their main place of employment. In any case, as outlined in Article 13 of the Commission Decision (2005/629/EU and 2010/74/EU) on STECF, Members of the STECF, invited experts, and JRC experts shall act independently of Member States or stakeholders. 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 invited experts make declarations of commitment (yearly for STECF members) to act independently in the public interest of the European Union. 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

Invited experts		
Name	Address	<u>Email</u>
Angeliki ADAMIDOU	NAGREF-Fisheries Research Institute, Greece	adamidou@inale.gr
Jung ARMELLE	Des requins et des Hommes, France	armelle@desrequinsetdeshommes.org
Angeles ARMESTO	Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Spain	angeles.armesto@vi.ieo.es
Edo AVDIČ	Fisheries Research Institute of Slovenia, Slovenia	edo.avdic@zzrs.si
Paolo CARPENTIERI	MIPAF, Italy	paolo.carpentieri@uniroma1.it
Maria COZZOLINO	IREPA and NISEA scarl, Salerno	cozzolino@nisea.eu
Irina DAVIDJUKA	Fish Resources Research Department, Latvia	irina.davidjuka@bior.gov.lv
Ingeborg DE BOOIS	IMARES, Netherlands	ingeborg.deboois@wur.nl
Henrik DEGEL	Danish Fisheries Research Institute, Denmark	hd@difres.dk
Marina DIAS	IPMA - Instituto Portugês do mar e da Atmosfera, Portugal	mdias@ipma.pt
Christian DINTHEER	IFREMER, NANTES	christian.dintheer@ifremer.fr
Michael EBELING	Institute for Seafishery, Germany	Michael.Ebeling@vti.bund.de
Monica GAMBINO	IREPA Onlus, Italy	gambino@irepa.org
Maria HANSSON	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden	maria.hansson@slu.se
Edvardas KAZLAUSKAS	Agriinformation and Rural Business Center, Lithuania	edvardas.kazlauskas@vic.lt
Tomasz NERMER	National Marine Fisheries Research Institute, Poland	nermer@mir.gdynia.pl
Gráinne NÍ CHONCHÚIR	The Marine Institute, Ireland	grainne.nichonchuir@marine.ie
Jukka PÖNNI	Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute, Kotka	jukka.ponni@rktl.fi
Francesca SPAGNOL GRAVINO	Independent expert, Malta	francesca.gravino@um.edu.mt
Anne-Margaret STEWART	Sea Fish Industry Authority, United Kingdom	Anne.Stewart@seafish.co.uk

				: 11 20 21 11	
Jens ULLEWEIT		von Thünen Institute, Institute of		jens.ulleweit@vti.bund.de	
		Sea Fisheries, Germany			
Sofie VANDEMAI	ELE	Institute for agricultural and		sofie.vandemaele@ilvo.vlaanderen.be	
			s research, Belgium		
Maria YANKOVA			of Oceanology "Fridtjof	maria y@abv.bg	
1714114 1111 (120) 11			' - BAS, Bulgaria	mara_y (way v.og	
		Tunsen	Bris, Buigaria		
JRC experts					
Name			Address	<u>Email</u>	
Cristina CASTRO I	RIBEI	RO	EC JRC, Ispra, Italy	cristina.ribeiro@jrc.ec.europa.eu	
			, 1 , 3		
European Commis	sion				
Name	Addı	ress		<u>Email</u>	
Amelie KNAPP	EC I	OG MARI	E, Brussels, Belgium	Amelie.KNAPP@ec.europa.eu	
Bas DRUKKER	EC I	OG MARI	E, Brussels, Belgium	Bas.Drukker@ec.europa.eu	
STECF Secretariat					
Name Address		Email			
Cristina CASTRO				cristina.ribeiro@jrc.ec.europa.eu	
RIBEIRO	FC IRC Isnra Italy				
Fabrizio			_		
NATALE	EC J	EC JRC, Ispra, Italy		fabrizio.natale@jrc.ec.europa.eu	
IMAIALL					

5 LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background documents are published on the meeting's web site on: http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/stecf/ewg1307

List of background documents:

1. EWG-13-07 – Doc 1 - Declarations of invited and JRC experts

European Commission

EUR 26090 EN - Joint Research Centre - Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Title: Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries. Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF (1) (STECF-13-14).

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

EWG-13-07 members: Avdič E., Berkenhagen J., Carpentieri P., Cozzolino M., Davidjuka I., De Boois I., Degel H., Dias M., Dintheer C., Ebeling M., Gambino M., Hansson M., Kazlauskas E., Nermer T., Ní G., Pönni J., Spagnol F., Stewart A., Ulleweit J., Vandemaele S., Yankova M.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

2013 - 183 pp. - 21 x 29.7 cm

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

ISBN 978-92-79-32524-3

doi:10.2788/95695

Abstract

The Expert Working Group meeting of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries EWG 13-07 was held from 1 –5 July in Brussels to evaluate MS Annual Reports for 2012 of the DCF. The EWG report was reviewed during the STECF summer plenary meeting 8-12 July.

How to obtain EU publications

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

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

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

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

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

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



