



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 43<sup>rd</sup> plenary meeting  
held from 8 to 12 July 2013 in Copenhagen, Denmark

Report EUR 26090 EN

European Commission  
Joint Research Centre  
Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Contact information

STECF secretariat  
Address: TP 051, 21027 Ispra (VA), Italy  
E-mail: [stecf-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu](mailto:stecf-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu)  
Tel.: 0039 0332 789343  
Fax: 0039 0332 789658

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

Legal Notice

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

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

Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers to your questions about the European Union

Freephone number (\*): 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

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

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

JRC 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

Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF (1) (STECF-13-14) .....	4
Background .....	4
Request to the STECF .....	4
Observations of the STECF .....	4
Conclusions of the STECF .....	4
Advice and recommendations of the STECF .....	5
Expert 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.

**EXPERT WORKING GROUP EWG-13-07 REPORT**

**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 1<sup>st</sup> to the 5<sup>th</sup> 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 it evaluates Member States compliance with the DCF guidelines on submission of the Annual Reports. The Commission is relying on the outcome of this work for the assessment of DCF implementation in the 22 Member States carrying out fishing activities, to check for the correct implementation of EU policies and to assure a sustainable 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 out the Annual Report evaluations on a country by country basis and this has caused major consistency 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 STECF 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	CYP	DEN	EST	FIN	RFR	GER	GRE	IRL	ITA	LAT	LIT	MAL	NLD	POL	POR	ROM	SLO	SPA	SWE	UK	
<b>OVERALL COMPLIANCE</b>	P	N	M	M	P	Y	P	Y	N	M	M	M	M	M	M	Y	P	M	P	M	M	M	
<b>Module I</b>	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	M	M	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	
<b>Module II</b>	P	M	M	Y	M	Y	Y	M	M	Y	Y	P	M	M	Y	M	M	Y	P	M	P	P	
<b>Module III.A&amp;III.B</b>	M	P	M	Y	N	M	P	Y	N	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M	P	M	M	Y	M	
<b>IIIC</b>	M	N	M	M	M	M	P	Y	N	M	M	M	Y	M	P	M	M	M	P	M	M	M	
<b>IIID</b>	P	M	M	M	M	Y	M	M	M	Y	M	M	Y	M	M	Y	P	M	P	Y	M	M	
<b>IIIE</b>	P	N	M	M	M	Y	P	M	N	Y	M	M	M	M	P	Y	M	M	P	Y	M	M	
<b>IIIF</b>	M	Y	P	M	M	Y	P	Y	N	P	M	Y	P	M	M	Y	P	P	Y	P	Y	M	
<b>IIIG</b>	M	P	Y	Y	M	M	Y	Y	P	M	M	Y	M	M	Y	M	P	M	Y	Y	M	M	
<b>Module IV.A</b>	N	P	P	Y	N	Y	M	Y	N	Y	P	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M	M	P	
<b>Module IV.B</b>	M	M	M	M	N	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	M
<b>Module V</b>	M	M	P	M	P	M	M	Y	P	M	Y	Y	M	Y	M	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>Module VI</b>	M	P	M	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	P	P	Y	Y	M	M	M	Y	Y	M	
<b>Module VII</b>	N	N	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	M	

## 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 pre-screeners 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 5<sup>th</sup> 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 Programmes for 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	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	AR_2013_version 2_4 june	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	2011-2013	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
	<b>XXX</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

**I General framework**

**II National data collection organisation**

**A 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 to the guidelines?

**EWG COMMENTS**

**EWG judgement**

**EWG Action needed?**

/	Yes	No
/	Yes	No
/	Yes	No
/	Yes	No

**B Regional and International coordination**

**B1 Attendance of international meetings**

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?

**B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations**

Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?

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

**SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic**

**III 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?

Not clear what '?' means. MS should follow the guidelines for completing this table.	Mostly	MS to clarify the meaning of the '?' in the table II.B.1
	No	MS to provide text on non-attendance to planned meeting

MS provided recommendations from 2012 RCMs. However, MS should list the LM recommendations from 2011 RCMs / LM.	No	MS to provide recommendations from 2011 RCMs / LM
	No	MS to provide also responsive actions
	NA	No

**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?

**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?

	Yes	no
	yes	no

Length calsses in clustered segment is not correspondng to DCF regulation.Inactive vessels are not included in III B 1.	mostly	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 hightightedvthat the bimportance of bfleet segments should be assessed in tremns of landings .value and volume and or effort) . MS needs to resubmit table concerning missing data.
---	--------	--

length class missing, DTS asterisk missing; clusters still seem to be quite small; NP provided is empty, no comparison possible	mostly	MS needs to provide length calasses according to regulation 93/2010
---	--------	---

number of fishing enterprises missing; data should be indicated for unclustered, not for clustered segments; reference year should not be 2010 (lines 28-30); "NA" for data source should not have response rates (e.g. lines 74-80 )	mostly	MS is required to explain why reference year is different, resubmit table III.B.3 with a number of fishing enterprise and also identify correct segment names.
---	--------	--

MS do not clearly explain what method do they apply for capital value estimation	mostly	Need to provide an explanation to the adopted methodology.
	NA	no
	NA	no

	yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	NA	No
	NA	NO

**Region North Sea & East Arctic**

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	no

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

CVs not calculated for the vast majority of stocks for both landed and discarded species. <i>Lophius</i> stocks not presented separately. Some inconsistencies between fishing grounds and regions	Partly	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?

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	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
	Mostly	No
	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.

**C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Are the deviations justified?

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

	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

**C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

Were the relevant derogations listed?

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

	Yes	No
MS should not include recs directed to e.g EU were they do not need to take action	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Response for recommendation M_02 not relevant	Mostly	MS to update response for M_02 recommendation

**C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

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

**Region North Atlantic**

**C Biological metier related variables**

**C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
 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.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Yes There is an error in the intro text (reference to 2011 instead of 2012.	Yes	No
---	-----	----

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

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

CVs not calculated for the vast majority of stocks for both landed and discarded species. <i>Lophius</i> 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. Relatively few samples but a lot of fish measured (in excess of plan)- OTB_MCD_70-99_0_0, VIIIfg; 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, VIIIfg included but this metier does not appear in the tables	Mostly	Yes, MS to explain if the metier OTB_MCD_70-99_0_0, VIIIfg is an error in the table and what has happened with the metier in VIIIfg
--	--------	---

Comparison between planned and achieved number of fish measured was not possible since most species do not have a planned target in the NP. To clarify 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
--	--------	----

**C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Are the deviations justified?

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

	Partly	MS to provide missing CVs
	No	MS to clarify the 0.00 achieved CVs

Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

No explanation for not reaching all targets.	Partly	MS to provide explanations for not reaching targets.
	No	No

**C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

Were the relevant derogations listed?

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

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 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 Atlantic**

**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?

MS should not include recs directed to e.g EU were they do not need to take action	Yes	No
	Mostly	MS to provide action for LM 42
	Yes	No

MS have a plan on how to avoid shortfalls in the sea-sampling programme. MS seems to have a problem with the harbour sampling (all metiers undersampled) which is not mentioned. No actions mentioned to improve CV calculations issue	Partly	MS to update (see comments)
For at sea sampling only	Yes	No

In the NP, MS reported that rec 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	MS to provide references or pilot study data for sharks recreational fishery. MS to provide detailed information / data from recreational cod fishery sampling in 2011.
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	No	MS to provide info on this.
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	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 adjustment 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 appear 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.
---	----	---

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.
--	--------	---



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?

-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

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

**Region North Sea & East 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?  
 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?

Table III.E.3 in AR not completely consistent with NP.	Mostly	MS should only report the species planned in NP Proposal. MS should take it into account for 2013 AR preparation
Mostly (most stocks oversampled only a few undersampled)	Mostly	MS should only report the species planned in NP 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 apparent 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.

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

**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?  
 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**

		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 contain one variable only
-	Yes	No

-	Yes	No
-	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?

-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

**E Biological stock-related variables**

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

	Mostly	MS should report actions clearly divided for the respective regions
--	--------	---

**Region North Atlantic**

**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?

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 adjustment 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 appear 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
---	--------	----

**E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

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?

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 (but only few stocks are undersampled)	Mostly	MS to provide background material for estimating data quality (cv, etc. )
--	--------	---

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

**Region North Sea & East 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?

Were CV estimates provided?  
 Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

**E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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 appear 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.
---	----	---

**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?

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

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

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

**F Transversal variables**

**F1 Capacity**

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?

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
--------	-----	---

-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

**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?

	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

**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?

-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	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?  
 Are the deviations justified?

**G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

Data from North Sea Beam 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	MS to explain state of the art concerning uploading to the International database. Table to be updated.
	Yes	No

For the North Sea Beam Trawl Survey (BTS) MS well explained the problems encountered and why they couldn't achieved all the planned hauls	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	Yes	No
	NA	
	NA	

Mostly

	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No recommendation from the LM. MS followed the input derived from the WGBEAM for the BTS survey	Yes	No
			NA	No
			NA	No
<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
			NA	No
<b>IV</b>	<b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>			
<b>A</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>			
	Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	No		MS is required to explain why data was not submitted.
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No		MS is required to explain why data was not submitted.
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No		MS is required to explain why data was not submitted.
<b>A1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
			NA	No
			NA	No
<b>A2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
			NA	No
			NA	No
<b>A3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
			NA	No
			NA	No
<b>A4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No		MS should solve the derogation with EC
		No		MS should solve the derogation with EC
<b>B</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>			
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Obviously a Census was planned, this should be abbreviated by A, as used in table IV.B.2	Yes	No
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	More information are needed if Census has a response rate lower than 70%. CV of 5% for all variables seem implausible, also CV shall be reported in absolute figures	Partly	CV value is questionable and value of response rate is required. MS should resubmit table with achieved sample rate, response rate and recalculated CV.
<b>B1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
			NA	No
			NA	No
<b>B2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	CV seems to be implausible as it is exactly the same for all variables	Partly	MS need to justify the questionable CV value.
			Yes	No
			Yes	No
<b>B3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
			NA	No
			NA	No
<b>B4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
			Yes	No
<b>V</b>	<b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	The explanation why maturity is not sampled	Mostly	MS should better clarify why maturity is not sampled and follow the outcome of the international WK.
			NA	
<b>2</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
		In NP 2012 the MS state that they w	Partly	Action to avoid shortfall to be clarified
			Mostly	
<b>VI</b>	<b>Module for management and use of the data</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> 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?	See general text, evaluation AR-EWG 13-07, SG 3 Module diagram un-readable, but is a minor comment No website listed in this section or in section II.A	Yes	No
			Yes	No
			Yes	No
			No	To be clarified
			Yes	No
			NA	No
			NA	No
<b>2</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
			Yes	No
			No	
<b>VII</b>	<b>Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b> Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	The recommendation should be listed in a text table according to the AR guidelines.	Partly	A text table should be compiled according to the 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
The recommendation listed are not relevant for the MS.	No	Prepare a table with relevant recommendations and description of the action taken
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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 information submitted for vessels under 10m in length - 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. - E_LANDINGS: Minor issues identified were 1874 records with missing mesh size information for gear types such as trammels, dredges and gillnets.	1st part: no evident explanation for failure; rest: minor	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 recommendation, 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 volume, • Employment, • Number of enterprises	- 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 volume 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 requires 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 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.	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 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.	None
ICES	Plaice in Divisions VII f, 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 VII b-k and VIII a,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)	MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not submitted
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius) in Divisions VII b-k and VIII a,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)	MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not submitted
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

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

Member State:	Bulgaria		
Reference year	2012	Judgement levels	
Version of the AR reviewed	5/31/2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the NP proposal		No	<10%
		Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer XXX	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

I General framework

II National data collection organisation

A 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 to the guidelines?

B Regional and International coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?

B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea

III 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?

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?

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?

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.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?

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

Action needed?

	Yes	No
	No	Yes, MS should provide details of National Coordination meeting.
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	Yes	No
yes	Yes	No

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 what segments have been clustered, to put asterix on cluster segment, change the reference year to 2011, clarify the number of vessels by resubmitting table.
---	--------	---

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 to add gear code in the the cluster because at moment it is labeled only by length.
--	--------	---

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 correct reference year. Fleet segmentation should match in tables IIIB1 and IIIB2. Capital value is not required.
--	--------	--

	Mostly	Yes, MS should explain methodology applied to calculate capital costs.
	No	Yes, MS needs to explain deviations
	NA	No

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	NA	No
	NA	No

MS operates in only one region	NA	No
--------------------------------	----	----

Table filled except column N (number of trips by metier). But no quantitative information provided in AR reporting columns.	No	Yes, MS to discuss possible actions and solutions with the EU Commission regarding Financial issues
---	----	---

Table filled but no quantitative information provided in AR reporting columns.	No	No
--	----	----

Table filled but without real information provided in AR columns.	No	No
---	----	----

Table empty.	No	No
No data collection at all carried out in 2012	No	No

- 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?

	Yes	No
Commission to decide and follow up	??	Yes, MS to follow up with the EU Commission
	No	No
	No	No
	Yes	No
	No	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Partly	No
	No	No

**Region Mediterranean and Black Sea**

**D Recreational fisheries**

- Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?
- D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

	NA	No
--	----	----

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

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

- 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?

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

- 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?

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**E Biological stock-related variables**

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

MS operates in only one region	Yes	No
--------------------------------	-----	----

**REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

- E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

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.
---	--------	--

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

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"	Partly	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

- 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?

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 justify deviations.

- E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**  
Were the relevant derogations listed?

No relevant derogation listed in section 1	NA	No
--	----	----



	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No specific LM and RCM Med&BS recommendation was provided in 2011 for section E.	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	No	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No	No
<b>F</b>	<b>Transversal variables</b>			
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
<b>F1</b>	<b>Capacity</b>			
	<b>F11</b> 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
	<b>F13</b> 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>F2</b>	<b>Effort</b>			
	<b>F11</b> 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
	<b>F12</b> 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
	<b>F13</b> 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
	<b>F14</b> 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>F3</b>	<b>Landings</b>			
	<b>F11</b> 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
	<b>F12</b> 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
	<b>F13</b> 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
	<b>F14</b> 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>G</b>	<b>Research surveys at sea</b>			
	<b>G1</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	partly		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS should report the relevant international planning group for the demersal survey (i.e. Medits WG). / Max eligible days are not consistent with other survey participant.	mostly	Yes, MS to resubmit the table according to the guidelines and consistent with the agreements with Romania
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Only the demersal survey has been conducted. Problems have been encountered for the acoustic ones.	Partly	No
	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
<b>G2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	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 survey in the Black sea area could be compromised by the absence of the Bulgarian data	No	Yes, MS should take into account the EWG comment and clarify if the survey was compromised
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
<b>G3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	MS stated that there are no relevant recommendations for the Black Sea	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
<b>IV</b>	<b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>			
<b>A</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>			
	Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Species named, but not clear to which cell it is related.	Yes	Yes, MS should put the respective letter behind the cell corresponding to species Latin name.
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	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.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Data collection strategy differs from IV.A.2. Response rate and achieved sample rate can not be the same with strategy "B". Reference year is not correct.	Partly	Yes, In case of sample survey only CV should be reported as other measures of variability are not required.
A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	In AR text MS only mentions part of the variables to be collected,	Mostly	Yes, MS should clarify the methodology used to collect all variables listed in table IV.A.3
	Are the deviations explained?	Unclear if applicable, see cell before	No	Yes, MS needs to explain deviations
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	Collection strategy is not consistent with indicators reported	Partly	Yes, Clarification of collection 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	Collection of data concerning the processing industry			
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Reference year should be 2011	Mostly	Yes, MS should use the correct reference year - MS to change table.
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Number of enterprises from questionnaires	Mostly	Yes, MS should clarify how the number of enterprises is determined as by questionnaires or by business register.
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Text in the National Report speaks only about aquaculture. It's not clear if data are collected from SBS or/and another survey	Mostly	Yes, MS should clarify how data are collected
	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
B3	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
V	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
	1 Achievements: 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 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		No	Yes, MS should propose actions regarding indicator 8
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No	see above
VI	Module for management and use of the data			
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Partly	
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	see general comment SG3	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?	Information on the storage of data is missing. Information on progress is scarce.	Partly	Yes, MS to provide information on the development of the national database
	Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A) ?	MS stated that there will be a website 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 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No details and no time frame are given	Partly	Yes, MS to provide detailed information on the development of the national database
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
VII	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		No	
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?		No	Yes, MS to provide the list of recommendations with relevant actions according to AR guidelines
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Only general remarks	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
VIII	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 ?		Yes	No
X	X. References			
	Is there a complete list of references?		Yes	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

BULGARIA

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	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital &amp; investment</li> <li>Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings</li> <li>Recreational catches: catches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recreational catch data missing (blank template)</li> <li>Significant amount of missing data at the fleet segment level</li> <li>Discrepancies between national and fleet segment totals. National level capacity data (number of vessels, GT, kW) significantly lower than at fleet segment level</li> <li>Landings value data lower than Eurostat statistics, particularly for 2009</li> <li>Insufficient clustering information. Incomplete information on approach to clustering across time series and variables; reasons for clustering unclear due to large number of vessels. Missing variables by fleet segment cannot be confirmed due to insufficient data on fleet clusters.</li> </ul>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table C - Discards data: JRC did not receive any data on discards from Bulgaria</li> <li>Table D - The number of fisheries covered indicates that the quantitative information is scarce</li> <li>Table M - The specified length frequencies data of sprat and turbot was submitted inappropriately for the period from 2006 to 2011 and arranged age groups (instead of length classes)</li> </ul>	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_: Biological sampling of landings and discards: no MS action reported for 2012	MS needs to explain missing DCF data
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only a few variables (turnover, livestock costs (2008), livestock volume and total sales volume) were disaggregated at the segment level.</li> <li>The turnover and sales volume by specie were only partially reported by DCF segment.</li> </ul>	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fleet segment</li> <li>Vessel number</li> <li>Capacity (measure, value)</li> </ul> GSA-Segment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Geographical Sub-Area</li> <li>Fleet segment</li> <li>Vessel number</li> <li>Capacity (measure, value)</li> </ul>	All Task 1.1 data - not provided		MS needs to explain missing DCF data
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.2	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fishing gear class</li> <li>Group target species</li> <li>Vessel number</li> </ul> GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fishing period month (start-end)</li> <li>Fishing gear class</li> <li>Vessel number</li> <li>Species</li> </ul>	All Task 1.2 data - not provided		MS needs to explain missing DCF data
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.3	Segment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engine power</li> <li>Employment</li> <li>Salary share %</li> <li>Landing weight</li> <li>Landing value</li> <li>Vessel value of total fleet</li> <li>Working days/year per vessel</li> <li>Working hours/days per vessel</li> <li>Variable costs of fishing/days per vessel</li> <li>% of V.C. from fuel costs</li> <li>Yearly fixed costs per vessel</li> </ul>	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effort measure</li> <li>Catch or Landing</li> <li>CPUE/LPUE</li> <li>Discard</li> <li>Bycatch</li> </ul> GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Catch or Landing</li> <li>CPUE/LPUE</li> </ul>	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-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Length range of captured species</li> <li>Length average</li> <li>Sex</li> <li>Maturity</li> </ul>	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		
Reference year	2012	Judgement levels	
Version of the AR reviewed	31/05/2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the NP proposal		No	<10%
		Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

I General framework

II National data collection organisation

A 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 to the guidelines?

B Regional and international coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?

B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?  
Are the responsive actions described?  
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea

III 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?

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?

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?

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.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?

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG Action needed?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	No	MS to provide list of derogations
	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

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Supreregion name is incomplete. Reference year should be 2011. Clusters are not marked. No information about new categories of passive gears. No information about inactive vessels.	Mostly	MS should provide all information requested by resubmitting table or justify why the information is missing
--	--------	---

Supreregion name is incomplete. Reference year should be 2011. Clusters are not marked.	Mostly	MS should follow the guidelines
---	--------	---------------------------------

Supreregion 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 be displayed in the table	Partly	MS should provide all information requested by resubmitting table or justify why the information is missing
--	--------	---

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	NA	No
	NA	No

MS operates in only one region	NA	No
--------------------------------	----	----

Table complete. Only data concerning 2012 have to be reported.	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Table complete but only data concerning 2012 have to be reported. Some discrepancies between tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 concerning numbers of trips really achieved for meters 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
---	--	--

Table properly filled. But nothing about the multilateral agreement on LPF in column B and footnote (5) to update.	Yes	MS to update table accordingly
	Yes	No

	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.	Mostly	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	MS should try to sample more BFT	No
<b>C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	No
	Were CV targets met?	Partly	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
<b>C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	MS to provide list of derogations
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Mostly	MS to update
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Mostly	MS to update
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Mostly	MS to update
<b>C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>Region Mediterranean and Black Sea</b>			
<b>D Recreational fisheries</b>	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	MS operates in only 1 region	NA
<b>D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	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
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	MS should provide an updated list of derogations
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	No
<b>D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Were data quality targets provided?	NA	No
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	No
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	No
<b>D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	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 ?	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	No
<b>D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	No
<b>REGION MEDITERRANEAN &amp; BLACK SEA</b>			
<b>E Biological stock-related variables</b>	Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	MS operates in only one region	Yes
<b>E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes. Discrepancy exists in the sampling year mentioned in the table (2011 should be 2012)	Yes
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Targets in numbers of fish sampled are rarely achieved except for <i>M. barbatus</i> . All other species are undersampled.	Partly
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	In general lack of availability of samples due to low landings: MS reports that <i>M. surmuletus</i> 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 <i>B. boops</i> and <i>S. smaris</i> , 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
<b>E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			

	Were CV estimates provided?	CVs provided for less than 50% of the stocks. Otoliths are collected but not readen by lack of stereomicroscopes. So ALKs could not be calculated.	Partly	No
	Were CV targets met?		Partly	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes. Lack of samples for some species. Lack of specific equipments for ALKs.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		No	No
<b>E3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation listed in section 1	NA	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	One general recommendation listed. No specific RCM Med&BS recommendation was provided in 2011.	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes. By improvement of the sampling protocols for most of species.	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No
<b>F</b>	<b>Transversal variables</b>			
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	Incomplete data for the quality assessment.
<b>F1</b>	<b>Capacity</b>			
	<b>F11</b> 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
	<b>F13</b> 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>F2</b>	<b>Effort</b>			
	<b>F11</b> 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
	<b>F12</b> Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?		Partly	Missing CV must be calculated and provided.
	Are the deviations explained?		Partly	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?		No	Yes
	<b>F13</b> 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
	<b>F14</b> Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Mostly	MS should clarify what type of effort is needed in order to have the CV calculated in due time.
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Mostly	No
<b>F3</b>	<b>Landings</b>			
	<b>F11</b> 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
	<b>F12</b> 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
	<b>F13</b> 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
	<b>F14</b> 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>G</b>	<b>Research surveys at sea</b>			
<b>G1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	MS should refer to the most updated version of the Medits Manual (i.e. Version 6, 2012).	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ?		Yes	No
<b>G2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	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
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
<b>G3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No

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

**A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture**

		Mostly	MS should provide information requested by resubmitting table or justify why the information is missing. Table should be filled out correct.
Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	No data on Tuna have been provided		
	Tuna reporting is totally missing. Reference year is incorrect	Partly	MS should provide information requested by resubmitting table or justify why the information is missing
	Tuna reporting is totally missing. Reference year is incorrect	Partly	MS should provide information requested by resubmitting table or justify why the information is missing
<b>A1</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	No Tuna aquaculture data collection is reported, but mentioned in NP and table IV.A.1.	Mostly	MS should clarify why information on tuna has not been provided
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No	MS needs to explain deviations
Are the deviations explained?		No	MS needs to justify deviations
<b>A2</b> Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	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
Is respective data quality information given?		Partly	MS is asked to explain deviations
Are the deviations explained?		Partly	MS needs to justify deviations
Are the deviations justified?			
<b>A3</b> Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	No
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
<b>A4</b> Actions to avoid shortfalls			
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		No	MS is asked to provide all shortfalls
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No	MS is asked to justify shortfalls
<b>B</b> Collection of data concerning the processing industry			
Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
	Reference year is incorrect.	Yes	No
Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
	Reference year is incorrect.	Yes	MS should clarify why for some variables data sources are estimation
<b>B1</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	No information why some variables are collected using estimation and not questionnaires or financial accounts	Mostly	MS should clarify why for some variables data sources are estimation
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
Are the deviations justified?			
<b>B2</b> Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Financial accounts are not data source if data are asked by questionnaire or face to face interview.	Mostly	MS should clarify on data sources
Is respective data quality information given?			
	MS is invited to read the respective comments for clarification on fish processing activities.	Mostly	MS should clarify on data sources
Are the deviations explained?		No	MS needs to justify deviations
Are the deviations justified?			
<b>B3</b> 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
<b>B4</b> 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>V</b> Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
<b>1</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	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
Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
Are the relevant derogations listed?	no derogations requested	NA	No
<b>2</b> Actions to avoid shortfalls			
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Partly	MS to present actions for the estimation of indicator 9
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no shortfalls present	NA	No
<b>VI</b> Module for management and use of the data			
<b>1</b> 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 proposal?	see General comment EWG SG3	Yes	No
Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	Very little has happened in 2012	Mostly	Progress to be clarified by MS.



	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
	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
<b>2</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>VII</b>	<b>Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>VIII</b>	<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	No
<b>IX</b>	<b>IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No	No
<b>X</b>	<b>X. References</b>		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	No
<b>XI</b>	<b>XI. Annexes</b>		
	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				EWG comment	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	- 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 - 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 clustering 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 latter 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 effort data: The number of fisheries covered indicates that the quantitative information is scarce. Only two fisheries were reported and correspond to large pelagic fish (LPF) and demersal species (DEMSP). The effort data indicates that the two fisheries effort is distributed among 8 GSAs (Appendix I). - Tables MEDITs and other surveys data: JRC did not receive any information on abundance and biomass from other surveys than MEDITs data.	Reading the NP, seems that MS performed only Medits as survey at sea. No other surveys are carried out in Cyprus./ Concerning metier sampled, in the AR are reported for biological sampling the following metier targeting only large pelagic fish and demersal species: OTB_DEF_>=40_0_0; LLD_LPF_0_0_0; LLS_DEF_0_0_0; GTR_DEF_>=16_0_0; GNS_DEF_>=16_0_0; OTB_MDD_>=40_0_0. Regarding surveys (Both MEDITs and MEDIAS), JRC/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 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. JRC/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 metiers 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, JRC/DG MARE should be aware that RCMMed&BS created a regional view of the discard sampling programmes (i.e. metier 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	
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/nurseries and 1 tuna on-growing. So it seems plausible that dat are not 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	All Task 1.2 data - not provided		
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	All Task 1.3 data - not provided		

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

CYPRUS

STECF & DG MARE - Comments				EWG comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.4	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effort measure</li> <li>• Catch or Landing</li> <li>• CPUE/LPUE</li> <li>• Discard</li> <li>• Bycatch</li> </ul> GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catch or Landing</li> <li>• CPUE/LPUE</li> </ul>	All Task 1.4 data - not provided	Biological sampling of landings and discards : length distributions should be available for 4 or 5 meters 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	GFCM - Task 1.5	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Length range of captured species</li> <li>• Length average</li> <li>• Sex</li> <li>• Maturity</li> </ul>	All Task 1.5 data - not provided	Biological sampling of landings and discards : length distributions should be available for 4 or 5 meters 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)

Member State:	Denmark	Judgement levels		
		2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
Reference year		2012	No	<10%
Version of the AR reviewed		Copenhagen 31th of May 2013	Partly	10-50%
Version of the NP proposal			Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance			Yes	>90%
			NA	not applicable
<b>I General framework</b>				
<b>II National data collection organisation</b>		<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG Action needed?</b>
<b>A National correspondent and participating institutes</b>			Yes	No
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?		MS to clarify contents of national coordination meetings.	Mostly	MS to clarify contents of national coordination meetings.
Are derogations listed?			Yes	No
If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?			Yes	No
<b>B Regional and International coordination</b>				
<b>B1 Attendance of international meetings</b>			Yes	No
Is Table II.B.1 complete?				
Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?			NA	No
<b>B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations</b>			Yes	No
Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?			Yes	No
Are the responsive actions described ?			Yes	No
Are the responsive actions acceptable?			Yes	No
<b>SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic</b>				
<b>III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector</b>				
<b>A General description of the fishing sector</b>			Yes	No
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?				
<b>B Economic variables</b>				
Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Number of vessels in Annual Report and Table IIIB1 don't match. inactive vessels should be listed. Clustered segments should be marked with asterisk	Mostly	MS is asked to provide clarification on why the vessel number in AR and in table IIIB1 don't match.
Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		clustered segments should be marked with asterisk	Yes	No
Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			Yes	No
<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>				
Are design and achievements consistent with the 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; as it is in line with the NP, the approach on capital value estimation are regarded acceptable	Yes	No
Are the deviations explained?			NA	No
Are the deviations justified?			NA	No
<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>				
Is respective data quality information given?		MS applies non-probability sampling, but does not describe nor provide "other variability indicators" as requested in the guidelines. However, the sampling design as described in the NP looks more like probability sampling. Moreover, the request of "other variability indicators" is not very practicable	Mostly	Ms to clarify
Are the deviations explained?			NA	No
Are the deviations justified?			NA	No
<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			NA	No
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			NA	No
Are the responsive actions described ?			NA	No
Are the responsive actions acceptable?			NA	No
<b>B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			yes	No
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?			yes	No
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?				
<b>Region Baltic</b>				
<b>C Biological metier related variables</b>			Yes	No
Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?			Yes	No
<b>C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			Yes	No
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?		MS have added rows in AR with stocks (eg turbot, flounder) that are not present in the NP (including target levels). Species merged across fishing grounds (this is though the case in the NP as well). Sampling year is sometimes 2011. Last column not fully completed.	Mostly	To be updated by MS
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Metier LLD_ANA_0_0_0 appears on table III.C.3 but not in table III.C.6.	Mostly	To be updated by MS
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		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 NP but appears in AR.	Partly	To be clarified by MS
Are the deviations explained?			Yes	No
Are the deviations justified?		Ms to clarify on-shore metier important under sampling.	Mostly	Ms to clarify on-shore metier important under sampling.
<b>C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			Yes	No
Were CV estimates provided?			Mostly	No
Were CV targets met?			Yes	No
Are the deviations explained?			Mostly	No
Are the deviations justified?				
<b>C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			NA	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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
MS to describe actions for on-shore sampling.	Mostly	MS to describe actions for on-shore sampling.

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

- 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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
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 completed.	Mostly	Table to be updated by MS
Some metier appear on table III.C.3 but not in table III.C.6.	Mostly	To be clarified and tables to be updated
Most metiers undersampled on-shore. Most stocks over sampled.	Partly	To be clarified by MS
	Yes	No
MS to clarify reason for overall shortcomings in shore sampling	Mostly	MS to clarify reason for overall shortcomings in shore sampling

- 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?

	Yes	No
	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
	Mostly	No

- 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?

	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	Yes	No
MS to describe actions for on-shore sampling.	Mostly	MS to describe actions for on-shore sampling.

**Region 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?

Inconsistencies between NP and AR, one metier is missing in AR. MS sampled 49 out of 25 performed fishing trips (??).	No	To be clarified and table to be updated by MS
See above	No	To be clarified and table to be updated by MS
MS don't provide Achieved no of fish measured at national level (last column).	Mostly	Table to be updated by MS
	Yes	No
MS sampled 49 out of 25 performed fishing trips (??).	No	To be clarified by MS
	Yes	No
	Mostly	No

- Were CV estimates provided?
- Were CV targets met?
- Are the deviations explained?
- Are the deviations justified?
- C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

- 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?

	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**Region Baltic Sea**

- 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?

MS reports information only for the Baltic Region	Yes	No
---	-----	----

- 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?

In the report is mentioned only the rec fishery 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 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 (or that the quota is very low).	Mostly	To be clarified and text to be updated
No derogation reported. MS should report it in order to justify the absence of recreational fishery for other species in the AR	No	To be clarified by MS
	NA	No
	NA	No

- D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

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

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

**Region North Sea & Eastern Arctic**

**D Recreational fisheries**

**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?

Appendix IV of the EU Decision 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 recreationa fishery is not clear and not explained .	No	To be clarified by MS
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**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?

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**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 ?

	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

Recommendation arises from NS&EA 2009. MS to clarify why there's no overview available.	Partly	To be clarified by MS
	No	To be clarified by MS
	NA	No

**E Biological stock-related variables**

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

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

**Region Baltic**

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

Some information is missing. Small 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.	Mostly	MS to add countries participating in sampling (bilateral agreements). Clarify variables of flatfishes species added for sampling (inconsistency between text and tables). Divide herring stocks in area/stock row
--	--------	---

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

New species added. Oversampling in few species sampled during surveys. Oversampling of salmon. Dab and sole undersampled.	Mostly	No
Yes	Yes	No

**E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

Mostly justified, except for 600% oversampling of salmon variables, and for sole	Mostly	Specify if the salmon sampling (up to 600 % oversampling) caused 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	No
No	No	No
Yes	Yes	No

**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?

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 evaluation	Yes	No
No derogations are listed	NA	No
Yes	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

No description on how to avoid shrotfalls for the stocks were target have not been met	Partly	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
NA	NA	No

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

	Table is complete, only small adjustment is desirable	Yes	MS to add countries participating in sampling (bilateral agreements). Lemon sole and witch flounder variables must be separated
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS to clarify and explain reasons of deviations
	Are the deviations justified?	Partly	No
<b>E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	No
	Were CV targets met?	No	No
	Are the deviations explained?	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 NP evaluation not AR evaluation	Yes	No
<b>E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	MS only states that it is difficult to predict samples in surveys. Shortfalls appear however in harbour sampling and sea sampling as well. MS must describe more detailed about work on adjusting sampling scheme	Partly	MS to describe 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

**Region North Atlantic**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

<b>E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
<b>E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	No
	Were CV targets met?	No	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
<b>E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	To be updated
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	No
<b>E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No

**F Transversal variables**

<b>F1 Capacity</b>	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS shall provide information for the effort variables for small vessels (<10m). Nothing is stated in the table.
<b>F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
<b>F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Na	NA
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA
<b>F2 Effort</b>	In general there are missing information on effort variables for vessels <10 meters. Also noted inconsistency between NP and AR given that for vessels <10 m, it's planned to estimate the number of days@sea based on the sales notes (onesalnote=onedaysatsea) however nothing is stated in the AR.	Mostly	MS shall further explain if days@sea is being estimated for <10 meters.
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	No
<b>F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			

	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		
	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 ?	No	Further explanation
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	Identify actions to be taken in the future to overcome shortfalls for small scale.
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?	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?	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	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?	Yes	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	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
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
G3	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
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
A	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	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?	Mostly	MS should justify why the census was unsuccessful
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
A2	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
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?	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 acceptable?	Yes	No
B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry		
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	No
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS should provide all information requested by resubmitting table or justify why the information is missing
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	MS should clarify the difference between NP and AR for data sources and estimation method
	Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	MS need to explain deviations from NP.
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
B3	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 ?	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	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		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Are the relevant derogations listed?	Mostly	Text to be updated by MS
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		
	Text is not in line with table concerning indicator 4.	Mostly	Text to be updated by MS
		NA	No
		NA	No
		NA	No



	See general text on data transmission from sub group 3	Yes	No
		Yes	No
		Yes	No
	Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A) ?	Information is in section II. A	NA
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	No
<b>2</b>	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>VII</b>	<b>Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>VIII</b>	<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	The list is not in an alphabetic order as requested in the guidelines	Mostly
<b>IX</b>	<b>IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?		
<b>X</b>	<b>X. References</b>		
	Is there a complete list of references?		
<b>XI</b>	<b>XI. Annexes</b>		
	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		<p>The reporting of Fully Documented Fishery is particularly ambiguous in the data call. Denmark interpreted it as such as that FDF records should be reported separately only (and therefore subtracted 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 specon "none" where some FDF fisheries are involved were by inadvertence underestimated. This misinterpretation was also present in the 2011 report of the STECF, but the extent of FDF fisheries was lesser 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.</p> <p>- The data regarding small vessels (&lt;10m in Annex Ia and &lt;8m in Baltic) was observed to be erroneous (and thus largely underestimated) for data up to 2009</p> <p>- STECF EWG 12-06 noted that the Danish 2011 submission does not cover the special conditions BACOMA or T90.</p> <p>- Fishing activity (days at sea) in the Baltic up to 2007 is missing.</p> <p>A_CATCH:</p> <p>- Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 741 records with no gear information and 26 records with missing mesh size information for gear types such as pots, dredges and gillnets.</p> <p>B_EFFORT:</p> <p>- 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.</p> <p>C_SPECIFIC EFFORT:</p> <p>- Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 95 records with no gear information and 28 records with missing mesh size information for gear types such as pots, dredges and gillnets. Furthermore, 17 records were submitted with missing rectangle information.</p>	1st part - self-explanatory; <10m issue, Bacoma/T90 and activity <2007 no evident explanation for failure; A and B minor issues	
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	<p>Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital &amp; investment</li> <li>• Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings</li> <li>• Recreational catches: catches</li> </ul>	<p>- Cluster information not provided. Fleet segment clustering information not provided.</p> <p>- Fishing enterprise data for 2011 not submitted.</p> <p>- Only partial effort data submitted for all years.</p> <p>- Possible incomplete landings dataset. Reported landings weight and value significantly lower than Eurostat data. Landings income for 2011 not provided.</p> <p>- Missing capacity data for 2011 and 2012, effort data for all years. Capacity data for 2012 not provided; missing national level capacity data for 2011.</p> <p>- Forecast figures for 2011 had to be based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, as the latter was not provided during the data call.</p> <p>- Recreational catch data not submitted</p>	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 Sex Ratio	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 (13-05) "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.	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 (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.	Agreed
ICES	Salmon in the Main Basin and Gulf of Bothnia (Salmon in Subdivisions 22-31)		Landings Maturity	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 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.	Not applicable. Maturity is not used for the assessment Only from the rivers
ICES	Flounder in Subdivisions 22 to 32		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sex Ratio	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 Maturity 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 applicable. MS do not age read rays.	

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*		
ICES	Nephrops in Division IVa (Norwegian Deep, FU 32)		Landings Length Landings Maturity Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sex Ratio	Applicable. It is not possible to evaluate from the NP if MS sample this stock or not since MS do not identify the FU in the NP. They do sample Nephrops discards in the North Sea but it is unclear in which FU. MS need to be asked	
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 - Kattegat)		Surveys at Sea	(Probably) Not Applicable . MS collect the data and made it available: if the quality of data is poor 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 (Norwegian spring-spawning herring)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sex Ratio	Not applicable. MS do not sample discards this pelagic fisheries (derogation).	
ICES	Mackerel in the Northeast Atlantic (combined Southern, Western and North Sea spawning components)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Surveys at Sea	(Probably) Applicable. MS has a derogation to sample the metier OTB_SPF_32-69_0_0 for discards (were the mackerel are caught. But in the derogation is only the herring part of the fishery described. MS need to be asked	

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

Member State:	<b>Estonia</b>	<b>Judgement levels</b>	
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%
Overall compliance	<b>EWG Answer</b> <b>XXX</b>	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

I General framework

II National data collection organisation

A 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 to the guidelines?

B Regional and International coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?

B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

**SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic**

III 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?

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?

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?

**REGION BALTIC 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.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?

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

MS to clearly state if attended meeting or not.	<b>Partly</b>	Yes
MS to explain reason for non attendance.	No	Yes

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	yes	no
	yes	no

All grey cells are empty; for inactive vessels no gear should be provided	No	MS should submit table or justify why the information was not provided.
Asterisk should be added to the clustered fleet segment name	Yes	no
all grey cells are empty	No	MS should submit table or justify why the information was not provided.

assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs are not provided	Mostly	MS shoul provide reasons why the did not apply PIM method
Sampling scheme has been changed from probability sampling to census	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	NA	No
	NA	No

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

Table format changes. Information on sampling scheme incomplete. Wrong year mentioned. Same metiers split in different lines according to sampling strategy creating mismatch between the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in tables III.C.3 and III.C.4.	Mostly	Yes
Table format changes.	Yes	No

Table format changes. Wrong precision target for G2 species. Only unsorted catches mentioned. Table III.C.3 mentions concurrent sampling at sea and no discard sampling on table III.C.5.	Mostly	Yes
---	--------	-----

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.	Mostly	Yes
---	--------	-----

MS to clarify why targets planned in NP appear unrealistic compared to achieved numbers of fish sampled.	Partly	Yes
	Yes	No
MS to clarify deviations.	Mostly	Yes

**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 NORTH ATLANTIC - RFMO NAFO**

**C Biological meter 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.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 Baltic Sea**

**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?

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
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	yes	No
--	-----	----

Table format changes. Information on sampling scheme incomplete. Wrong year mentioned. 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
	No	No
	Yes	No
MS to complete the lake of information.	No	Yes
	NA	No
No recommendations arising from 8th LM. Only RCM NA 2008 mentioned	No	Yes
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
MS to clarify actions regarding sampling intensity and not only quality.	Partly	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
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Most recommendations arise from working groups. Only 1 recommendation arising from RCM Baltic 2007.	No	Yes
	Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
<b>D4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
<b>REGION BALTIC SEA</b>				
<b>E</b>	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>			
	Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?		Yes	No
<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table is complete, but contains also a data from other than DCF sources	Yes	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	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
	Are the deviations explained?	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
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No
	Were CV targets met?	Target is not reached even for pelagic species sampled in large amounts	No	No
	Are the deviations explained?	MS stated that CVs can only be achieved at regional level, as too small samples at national level are obtained	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No
<b>E3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	One derogations listed in section 1.	Yes	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Only some older recommendation provided, but there are no relevant ones to stock variables in Baltic	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Better planning in NP and increase of budget for buying more samples.	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No
<b>REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - RFMO NAFO</b>				
<b>E</b>	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>			
	Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?		yes	no
<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	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
	Are the deviations explained?	Low catch level, small number of trips	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	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
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No
	Were CV targets met?	Target precision is never reached	No	No
	Are the deviations explained?	No reason given	No	Yes, MS to provide explanations
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	NA
<b>E3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations listed	NA	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Some recommendations are missing.	No	MS shall list recommendation related to year of sampling
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Better training of observers	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	MS should improve rather sampling desing to avoid undersampling	Mostly	No
<b>F</b>	<b>Transversal variables</b>			
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	footnote c) should be followed; NR assumed to be "Not Relevant" but could be interpreted as "Not reliable" :).	Mostly	No

<b>F1 Capacity</b>	<b>F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
<b>F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>F2 Effort</b>	<b>F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	No	Yes
	<b>F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
	<b>F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>F3 Landings</b>	<b>F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
	<b>F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
	<b>F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>G Research surveys at sea</b>	<b>G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	table to be updated
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ?	Yes	No
	<b>G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	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
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
	<b>G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described ?	NA		
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA		
<b>G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA		
<b>IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>	<b>A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>		
	Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	yes	
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	MS should submit table or justify why the information was not provided.
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	MS should submit table or justify why the information was not provided.
	<b>A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	yes	no
	Are the deviations explained?	yes	no
	Are the deviations justified?	yes	no
	<b>A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is respective data quality information given?	No	MS needs to provide deviations from NP
	Are the deviations explained?	No	MS needs to explain deviations from NP
	Are the deviations justified?	No	MS needs to explain deviations from NP
<b>A3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA		

	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
<b>A4</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No information have been provided	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No information have been provided	No
<b>B</b>	Collection of data concerning the processing industry		
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No data quality and accuracy figures provided, even if stated in AR-text.	No
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No information have been provided	No
<b>B1</b>	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
<b>B2</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	No information has been provided	No
	Are the deviations explained?	No	MS should clarify data source
	Are the deviations justified?	No	MS need to explain deviations from NP
<b>B3</b>	Follow-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	
<b>B4</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No	MS should describe actions to avoid shortfalls
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	MS should describe actions to avoid shortfalls
<b>V</b>	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?	Content in table is not consistent between AR and NP. (North Atlantic is missing in NP).	Partly
	Are the relevant derogations listed?	NA	Update in order to be consistent
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
<b>VI</b>	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?	See general comment on data transmission from SG 3	Yes
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?		Yes
	Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A) ?	No	Information to be added in chapter II according to the guidelines.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	no
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	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?	NA	
<b>VII</b>	Follow-up of STECF recommendations		
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Header and reference for some recommendations are missing.	Mostly
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table	Partly
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Explanation of "action taken", to be described more specific and only recommendation relevant for this period to be left in table	Mostly
<b>VIII</b>	List of acronyms and abbreviations	The list is not complete	Partly
<b>IX</b>	IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections	section missing	
<b>X</b>	X. References	section missing	No
<b>XI</b>	XI. Annexes	section missing	To be updated
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		yes (see comments)



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

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

Member State:	<b>Finland</b>	<b>Judgement levels</b>	
Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31.5.2013	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal		Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

I General framework

II National data collection organisation

A 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 to the guidelines?

B Regional and International coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?

B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

**SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic**

III 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?

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?

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?

**REGION BALTIC 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.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?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Action needed? (Yes/No)
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	Yes	No
	Mostly	MS to give explanation on non attendance WKADS2

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	Yes	No
table should not contain all segments, just the ones subject to clustering; clustered segment names should be marked with asterisk	Mostly	MS should follow guidelines

Gross value of landings not listed (but apparently collected and correctly delivered for data call). Achieved sample rates are missing	Mostly	MS is required to clarify the absence of missing variable and achieved sample rates and to resubmit it.
--	--------	---

Assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs are not reported in specific section as it is required in guidelines.	Mostly	In the future MS is advised to report information in correct section and to follow the requirements listed in guidelines
--	--------	--

NA	NA	
----	----	--

NA	NA	
----	----	--

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

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

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

no relevant recommendations	Yes	No
-----------------------------	-----	----

NA	NA	
----	----	--

NA	NA	
----	----	--

NA	NA	
----	----	--

NA	NA	
----	----	--

NA	NA	
----	----	--

	NA	
--	----	--

	NA	
--	----	--

	NA	
--	----	--

	NA	
--	----	--

Only reporting on 2012 results were to be provided.	Mostly	MS to update table.
---	--------	---------------------

See comment above	Mostly	MS to update table.
-------------------	--------	---------------------

Only reporting on 2012 results were to be provided. Some CV provide in %.	Mostly	MS to update table.
---	--------	---------------------

--	--	--

Only reporting on 2012 results were to	Mostly	MS to update table and clarify if concurrent sampling at sea is really applied for all species caught.
--	--------	--

--	--	--

FYK_SPF which was undersampled. One stock undersampled.	Mostly	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
--	-----	----

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Region Baltic Sea**

**D Recreational fisheries**

**D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?  
 Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

	NA	
Appendix IV of the EU Decision 93/2010 reports also sharks as target group for Recreational Fishery.	Mostly	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.
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

**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?

Were data quality targets provided?	Yes	No
Were data quality targets met?	Yes	No
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

**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?

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	No
Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	No
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	No

**D4 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 described ?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

**REGION BALTIC SEA**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

Are information on III.E.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?

MS operates in only one region	Yes	No
--------------------------------	-----	----

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?

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 caused 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.	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 target precision must be reached.	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
One derogations listed in section 1.	Yes	No
MS listed all relevant recommendations	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
Improvement of the self-sampling programme for salmon in SD32.	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No

**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?

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?

Is Table III.F.1 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
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	No
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	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
Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	No
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
Are the deviations justified?	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
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	No
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No

- 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
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	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?

1. Number of hauls planned and conducted is not consistent between text and tables. Deviation in the BIAS survey in SD30, regarding number of days. 2. Put the planned no days from NP in this table (No= 6 instead of 4,5 ) and the % achievement will change accordingly.	Mostly	Table to be updated by MS
see above	Mostly	Table to be updated
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
MAPs are reported in annex II of the AR. For next year, Maps should be put in text according to the AR guidelines.	Mostly	No

**G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

- 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 justified?

There is no information on data quality. Since there is half the effort in BIAS sd30 compared to the plan, there might be an effect of the data quality and for the stock assessment.	Mostly	To be clarified by MS
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**G3 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	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

No text inserted. It's expected to be a text on future actions to avoid the shortfall of half the effort in BIAS SD 30.	No	MS to insert a text to describe future actions
	NA	

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

**A Collection 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?

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	NA	
	NA	
	NA	

**A4 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

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	NA	
	NA	
	NA	

**B4 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

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

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

	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 rows indicator n. 8)	Mostly	Update of table
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA NA	
<b>VI</b>	<b>Module for management and use of the data</b>		
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?	See general comment ... Yes Yes Yes	No No No
	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?	in section II NA Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	section empty NA NA	
<b>VII</b>	<b>Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes Yes Yes	No No No
<b>VIII</b>	<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	No
<b>IX</b>	<b>IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No	No
<b>X</b>	<b>X. References</b>		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	No
<b>XI</b>	<b>XI. Annexes</b>		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

FINLAND

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		- Data submitted in an inconsistent with the definitions of the data call format together with a hint 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 24,25,26,27,28 into area 24-28. - Invalid gear codes 'PASSIVE' and 'MOBILE'. - No rectangle information for effort (hence no effective fishing time available). - No landings by rectangle data for 2003-2007. - Missing rectangle information for landings by rectangle in area 24-28.	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 & 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: • 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	- 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 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 (13-05) "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 (13-05) "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	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.2, MS wrote "Coastal salmon fishery targets on spawning migrants, making maturity determination purposeless. Catch from the off-shore fishery 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 countries. 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 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	Herring in Subdivision 31, Bothnian Bay		Surveys at Sea		
ICES	Herring in Subdivisions 25 to 29 and 32 minus Gulf of Riga		Commercial Fleets		

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

Member State:	France	<b>Judgement levels</b>	
Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	Version 1 (6 juin 2013)	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal		Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	<b>EWG Answer</b> <b>XXX</b>	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

I General framework

II National data collection organisation

A 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?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Type of data, Region and justification is missing	Mostly	MS to add type of data, region and justification

B Regional and international coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?

B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Answer too generic	Mostly	MS to specify reasons for not attending meetings
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic

III 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?

Lack on description of changes	Mostly	MS to describe changes in fishing sector
	Yes	No

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?

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?

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. MS 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 .
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
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
	Yes	No

SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

III 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?

Lack on description of changes	Mostly	MS to describe changes in fishing sector
	Yes	No

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

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. MS to provide economic variables from Appendix VI for all segments ; NP and AR year should be filled in; MS to fill in response rate

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?

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

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
	Yes	No

**SUPRA-REGION Other regions**

**III 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?

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?

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?

lack on description of changes	Mostly	MS to describe changes in fishing sector
	Yes	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. MS 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
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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
	Yes	No

**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.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
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 meters. 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 columns were hidden. 2011 and 2013 data are also reported in table.	Mostly	MS to update table accordingly and to adhere to guidelines.
2011 and 2013 data are also reported in table. Revised standard tables were not used.	Mostly	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 meters 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 meters are however unsampled	Mostly	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 justified?

Yes	No
Partly	No
Yes	No
Yes	No

**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?

Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
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?

Yes	No
Yes	No

**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?

Sampling year is 2011. Is this an error? MS have not used updated tables. Sampling strategy missing for 8 meters. 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.
---	--------	--

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

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 columns were hidden. 2011 and 2013 data are also reported in table.	Mostly	MS to update table accordingly and to adhere to guidelines.
--	--------	---

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

No 2012 NA data submitted	No	MS to submit 2012 NA data in table III.C.5
---------------------------	----	--

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

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
--	--------	--

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

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
---	--------	----

- Are the deviations explained?
- Are the deviations justified?

Partly	MS should give more detailed description by metier and stock to explain under-sampling.
Partly	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 justified?

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

**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?

Yes	No
Yes	No
Yes	No
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?

Mostly	No
No	No

**Region Med & Black Sea**

**C Biological metier related variables**

**C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

Sampling 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).
---	--------	--

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

Sampling 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).
--	--------	--

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

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).
--	--------	--

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

No data for the Mediterranean region given	No	MS to provide data for the MED region.
--	----	--

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

	No	MS has to revise entire section and tables
--	----	--

- Are the deviations explained?
- Are the deviations justified?

No	MS to provide explanation for deviations
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 justified?

CVs for only 10 species	Partly	MS to clarify and provide CVs
	No	No
	No	MS to provide explanation for deviations
	NA	No

**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?

NA	No
No	MS to provide list
NA	MS to also provide responsive actions
NA	NA

**C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

No	MS to provide relevant actions to address all shortfalls
NA	No

**Region Other (IOTC, ICCAT and WECAF)**

**C Biological metier related variables**

**C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

	2011 and 2012 data is presented. MS have not used updated tables. ICCAT-planned no of trips to sample have been changed between NP and AR. WECAF- inconsistency between NP and AR, sea-sampling has disappeared in AR	Partly	Row 91 to be clarified. MS to clarify and amend the table accordingly.
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 disappeared in AR. The region is not reported but the RFMO	Partly	MS to clarify and update table according to comments
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
	2011 and 2012 data is presented. MS have not used updated tables. RFMOs are missing from the table. Results are not presented for all the species in the table. Only few stocks included from WECAF. CVs missing for nearly all stocks.	Partly	MS to amend to tables accordingly
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
	2011 and 2012 data is presented. MS have not used updated tables. No stocks included from WECAF.	Partly	MS to amend to tables accordingly
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Partly	MS to explain differences between NP and AR.
		Partly	MS to provide explanation for other deviations not tackled in text (see above)
		Partly	No
<b>C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
Were CV estimates provided?		No	MS to provide the CVs
Were CV targets met?		No	No
Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
Are the deviations justified?		No	No
<b>C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
Were the relevant derogations listed?		NA	No
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		No	MS to provide list of 2011 LM recommendations
Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	MS to also provide responsive actions
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
<b>C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Partly	MS to provide actions for the other shortfalls
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
<b>Region: ALL regions</b>			
<b>D Recreational fisheries</b>			
Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?		Yes	No
<b>D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
Are obtained derogations mentioned?		Yes	MS to show proof (pilot study report) of the study on sharks
Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
Were data quality targets provided?		Partly	MS to provide data quality targets for eel, BFT (Med)
Were data quality targets met?		Partly	MS to provide data quality targets for eel, BFT (Med)
Are the deviations explained?		Partly	MS to provide information on deviations for eel, BFT (Med)
Are the deviations justified?		Partly	No
<b>D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
Were the relevant derogations listed?		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
<b>D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
<b>Region North Sea &amp; Eastern Arctic</b>			
<b>E Biological stock-related variables</b>			
<b>E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Mostly	MS to provide the table including the CV. In the table MS should report only the AR year (i.e. 2012 and not 2011)
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Mostly	No
Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
Are the deviations justified?		Mostly	No
<b>E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
Were CV estimates provided?		No	MS to provide CVs for all stock parameters present in the table
Were CV targets met?		No	MS to provide CVs for all stock parameters present in the table
Are the deviations explained?		Yes	MS to respect the deadline and present all the results of the previous year in time
Are the deviations justified?		No	MS to provide CV respecting the deadline for the submission of the AR.

**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?

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

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

**Region North Atlantic**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

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)
---	--------	---

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

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
---	--------	----

- Are the deviations explained?
- Are the deviations justified?

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

**E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Were CV estimates provided?

	No	MS to provide CVs for all stock parameters present in the table
--	----	---

Were CV targets met?

	No	MS to provide CVs for all stock parameters present in the table
--	----	---

Are the deviations explained?

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

Are the deviations justified?

	No	MS to provide CV respecting the deadline for the submission of the AR.
--	----	--

**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 ?

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

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

**Region Med & Black Sea**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

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)
---	--------	---

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

One stock is sampled in accordance with plan, one in excess and the rest undersampled	Partly	No
---	--------	----

- Are the deviations explained?
- Are the deviations justified?

MS claims that the hole programme runned like plan.	No	MS to explain under sampling and missing information for GSA 8
	No	No

**E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Were CV estimates provided?

	No	MS to provide CVs for all stock parameters present in the table
--	----	---

Were CV targets met?

	No	MS to provide CVs for all stock parameters present in the table
--	----	---

Are the deviations explained?

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

Are the deviations justified?

	No	MS to provide CV respecting the deadline for the submission of the AR.
--	----	--

**E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

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

	NA	No
	Yes	No

	Mostly	MS to provide more explanation on the follow up for the relevant Recommendations
Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Mostly	See comment above
<b>E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Partly	MS to include actions to avoid shortfalls for all the stock variables undersampled and for the missing information for GSA 8
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Partly	See comment above

**Region Other (IOTC, ICCAT and WECAF)**

**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?

Inconsistency between AR and NP. WECAF stocks are missing in AR whereas a short description is present in the text	Mostly	MS to provide the table complete with the CVs. MS to also report WECAF stocks in table III.E.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 canneries. 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
	NA	No
	NA	No
	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
see above	Mostly	See comment above

**Region Inland waters**

**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?

**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?

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

	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
NA	NA	No
NA	NA	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 as "Census" even with a "Achieved sample rate (c)" of 0.38.	Mostly	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 III.F.1;	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 III.F.1.

		No	No
		Yes	No
		Yes	No
<b>F2 Effort</b>			
<b>F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are the deviations justified?		
<b>F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	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?		
<b>F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is respective data quality information given?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
<b>F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described ?		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
<b>F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
<b>F3 Landings</b>			
<b>F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
<b>F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is respective data quality information given?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
<b>F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described ?		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
<b>F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
<b>G Research surveys at sea</b>			
<b>G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	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 ?		
<b>G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	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 justified?		
<b>G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described ?		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
<b>G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
<b>IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>			
<b>A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>			
	Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?		
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	empty cells corresponding other marine fish on growing segment		
	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		
<b>A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
<b>A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is respective data quality information given?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
<b>A3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described ?		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

**A4** Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

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
	NA	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**B2** Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**B4** 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

**V** 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?

MS should report also information on indicator 9 in the table and report the different indicators separately for each Region	Mostly	MS to update table
	NA	

**2** 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	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?  
 Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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

Some of the diagrams and screen shots cannot be read due to low resolution. One paragraph is repeated.	Yes	No
--	-----	----

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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**2** 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

**VII** Follow-up of STECF recommendations

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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 ?

--

**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?

--

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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No age information submitted. Missing for years 2009 - 2011.</li> <li>- Discards information available only for years 2010-2011. Missing for 2003 - 2009.</li> <li>- Many records with missing rectangle information for effort and landings by rectangle data submitted. Missing 2003-2010 landings by rectangle data.</li> <li>- No fishing activity data for 2000 - 2009.</li> <li>- No fishing capacity data at all.</li> <li>- Some missing area information was evident.</li> <li>- A_CATCH: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 161 records with no gear information, 32 with missing area information and 653 records with missing mesh size information for gear type pots.</li> <li>- S_EFFORT: 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.</li> <li>- C_SPECIFIC EFFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 183 records with no gear information, 17 with missing area information and 567 records with missing mesh size information for gear types pots.</li> <li>- E_LANDINGS: 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.</li> </ul>	no evident explanation for failure;	
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital &amp; investment</li> <li>• Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings</li> <li>• Recreational catches: catches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Landings and effort data for 2011 (total and fleet segment level) not provided</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>- Capacity data for 2011 and 2012 not provided</li> <li>- Reported capacity data lower than Eurostat statistics</li> <li>- Landings income data and fishing enterprise data for 2011 not submitted</li> <li>- Financial position data for all requested years and depreciation replacement value for 2009, at national and fleet segment levels not provided</li> <li>- Unpaid labour values not submitted for any years</li> <li>- A change in methodology in 2010 has rendered, in some cases, incompatibility with previous year's data</li> <li>- 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</li> </ul>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Catch data from GSA 8 is entirely missing.</li> <li>- Only 2011 Effort data was submitted for GSA 7 and 8.</li> </ul>	MS should be able to submit not only catch data for GSA 8 and the other requested data for 2011 from both GSAs./ Regarding surveys (both MEDITS and MEDIAS), JRC/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 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. JRC/DG MARE should be aware that not all métiers 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 métier will be considered. So not all métier are sampled during the year and this could imply that data (i.e. length) for species caught by those métier are not available. Consequently, no data should be requested for those métiers/species. Regarding discards, JRC/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 métiers coverage. Moreover, the RCMMed&BS identified the key métiers important to sample for discards, providing scientific justification for not sampling certain métiers. RCMMed&BS 2010 (Varna, Bulgaria 2010) reported that "A discards behaviour table is used to provide justification for not sampling certain métiers. This justification could be based in the discards behaviour or in the non selection of métier in the regional ranking system" and recommends "to strictly follow the proposed table to sample métiers for discards" (ref: Table 7,	
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Most of the economic variables for 2008-2009 are missing.</li> <li>- There are some marine fish segments with statistical confidentiality issues. Data not published for the following segments: salmon cages (seg1.4), sea bass &amp; sea bream on growing (seg3.2), turbot/on growing and combined.</li> <li>- 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).</li> </ul>	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 never be collected anymore. Maybe it could be asked when MS thinks to have a reliable data collection, having in mind that it more or less 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 serious questions should be asked. But currently an improvement is obvious.	No actions needed
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Probably Partly Applicable. MS have applied for a derogation from sampling this fishery, but it has not been granted (NP). NP states that FR will try to initiate a selfsampling program. Biological parameters not included in NP.	Cod data available only in subareas IV and Vild. MS cannot submit this data.
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Probably Partly Applicable. Unclear from NP if and how métiers in I,II will be sampled (suggestion 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.	Haddock data available only in subareas IV and Vild. MS cannot submit this data.
ICES	Herring in Subarea IV and Division IIIa and Vild (North Sea Autumn spawners)		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 NL. There is a bilateral but it do not specify stocks only french landings into NL. The NP states that most small pelagic s are landed into NL. In accordance with the bilateral is it NL that have the responsibility to submit data to ICES. To be clarified if the landings take place in NL and if it is NL that are responsible for data transmissions or if the exemption rule apply.	

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*		
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 NL. There is a bilateral but it do not specify stocks only french landings into NL. The NP states that most small pelagic s are landed into NL. In accordance with the bilateral is it NL that have the responsibility to submit data to ICES. To be clarified if the landings take place in NL and if it is NL 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 meter sampling in area VI so lengths should be available.	
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 applicable. 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 VIIIbd and subarea VII		Landings Age Landings Length Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sex Ratio Surveys at Sea	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 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.	
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius) in Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b		Discards Weight .	Probably not applicable- MS 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.	
ICES	Megrim (L. whiffagonis) 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 and 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 period month (start-end) • Fishing gear class • Vessel number • Species	All Task 1.2 data - not provided .		



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*		
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.3	Segment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engine power</li> <li>• Employment</li> <li>• Salary share %</li> <li>• Landing weight</li> <li>• Landing value</li> <li>• Vessel value of total fleet</li> <li>• Working days/year per vessel</li> <li>• Working hours/days per vessel</li> <li>• Variable costs of fishing/days per vessel</li> <li>• % of V.C. from fuel costs</li> <li>• Yearly fixed costs per vessel</li> </ul>	All Task 1.3 data - not provided		
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.4	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effort measure</li> <li>• Catch or Landing</li> <li>• CPUE/LPUE</li> <li>• Discard</li> <li>• Bycatch</li> </ul> GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catch or Landing</li> <li>• CPUE/LPUE</li> </ul>	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Length range of captured species</li> <li>• Length average</li> <li>• Sex</li> <li>• Maturity</li> </ul>	All Task 1.5 data - not provided	MS to submit available data collected through the DCF to GFCM	
IOTC	Reunion Longline (swordfish)	IOTC species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any</li> <li>• Catch-and-Effort data</li> <li>• Size frequency data</li> </ul> Sharks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any - incomplete report</li> <li>• Catch-and-Effort data - no data reported</li> <li>• Size frequency data - no data reported</li> </ul>	IOTC species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catch-and-Effort data - incomplete report</li> <li>• Size frequency data - incomplete report, data only provided for swordfish (target species)</li> </ul> Sharks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any - incomplete report</li> <li>• Catch-and-Effort data - no data reported</li> <li>• Size frequency data - no data reported</li> </ul>	MS to submit data available on SWO for IOTC area	
IOTC	Reunion coastal fisheries (handline and trolling)	IOTC species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any</li> <li>• Catch-and-Effort data</li> <li>• Size frequency data</li> </ul> Sharks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any - incomplete report</li> <li>• Catch-and-Effort data - no data reported</li> <li>• Size frequency data - no data reported</li> </ul>	IOTC species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catch-and-Effort data - incomplete report</li> <li>• Size frequency data - no data reported</li> </ul> Sharks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any - incomplete report</li> <li>• Catch-and-Effort data - no data reported</li> <li>• Size frequency data - no data reported</li> </ul>	MS to submit data available for IOTC area	
IOTC	Purse seine	IOTC species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any</li> <li>• Catch-and-Effort data</li> <li>• Size frequency data</li> <li>• Number and activities of supply vessels (purse seine only)</li> </ul> Sharks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any</li> <li>• Catch-and-Effort data</li> <li>• Size frequency data</li> </ul>	Sharks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total catches, including nominal catches (catches unloaded/transhipped) and discards, if any - incomplete report</li> <li>• Catch-and-Effort data - no data reported</li> <li>• Size frequency data - no data reported</li> </ul>	MS to submit data available for IOTC area	

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

Member State:	Germany	<b>Judgement levels</b>	
Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	29/05/2013	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal		Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance	<b>EWG Answer</b> <b>XXX</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

I General framework

II National data collection organisation

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

A 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?

Action needed?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
List of derogations was provided in Chapter 2 instead of Chapter 1	Yes	No

B Regional and International coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

	Yes	No
	Mostly	No

B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?  
Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?  
Are the responsive actions described ?  
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

RCM 2012 recommendation given; reference year is 2011	No	MS to update list of general recommendations
	NA	No
	NA	No

**SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic**

III 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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Gross value of landings missing (but they were delivered for data call and from III.F1 it can be deducted that they are collected exhaustively); "all gears" and "all" length classes were not elements of original dropdown list but were introduced in case a variable was NA or sampling homogeneous over all segments	Mostly	No

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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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?

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

B4 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	No

**SUPRA-REGION Other regions**

III 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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Gross value of landings missing (but they were delivered for data call and from III.F1 it can be deducted that they are collected exhaustively); "all gears" and "all" length classes were not elements of original dropdown list but were introduced in case a variable was NA or sampling homogeneous over all segments	Mostly	No

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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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?

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**B4** 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	No

**Region Baltic**

**C Biological metier related variables**

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

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

**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?

	Yes	MS to specify whether 'Concurrent' is at sea or market?
	Yes	No

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?

Precision target is incorrect. Planned targets for plaice are blank.	Mostly	MS to explain from where the numbers to be measured at regional level originated.
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	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 justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

**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?

Sampling frame codes are missing	Mostly	No
	Yes	No

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?

Precision targets are wrong.	Yes	MS to explain from where the numbers to be measured at regional level originated.
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	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 justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

Sampling frame codes are missing.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Were CV estimates provided?  
 Were CV targets met?

No CV given for cod in NAFO	Mostly	MS to provide CV for cod in NAFO
	Yes	No

Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

	No	MS to provide explanation for missing cod CV
	NA	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	Mostly	No
	Yes	No

**Region Long distance fisheries**

**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?

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

	Were CV estimates provided?	NA	No
	Were CV targets met?	NA	No
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	No
<b>C3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	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
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	No

**Region: Baltic Sea**

**D Recreational fisheries**

<b>D1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		Yes	No
	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?		Yes	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	All the requested derogations are provided at the beginning of the AR. For the pending ones MS should provide the acceptance, For sharks derogation have been accepted	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>D2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were data quality targets provided?	Quality targets nor provided for 2012 data (2010 is last year provided)	Partly	MS to submit data quality targets for 2012 data
	Were data quality targets met?	Not possible to assess this since targets for 2012 were not submitted	NA	No
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
<b>D3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		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
<b>D4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		No	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No

**Region: North Sea & Eastern Arctic;**

<b>D1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	On the basis of the pilot studies carried out by the MS, Sharks and Eel derogation are still pending. Cod and sharks derogations have been approved	Yes	MS to confirm and update text (see comment)
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	All the requested derogations are provided at the beginning of the AR. For the pending ones MS should provide the acceptance	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>D2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were data quality targets provided?		No	MS to present the pilot study results
	Were data quality targets met?		NA	No
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
<b>D3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		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
<b>D4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		No	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No

**Region Baltic**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		Yes	No
	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?		Yes	No
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	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 evaluation). 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?

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 possible 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

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 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

Were CV targets met?  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?  
**E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

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 possible 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

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?

	Yes	No
Yes MS need to update sampling targets	Yes	Targets need to be revised in future NPs

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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)	Mostly	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
	Yes	No

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**

For approx. Half of the stocks*parameters. Acceptable for stocks sampled in surveys. Not calculated for sex-ratio@length.	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

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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Yes MS need to update sampling targets	Yes	Targets need to be revised in future NPs

**Region North Atlantic**



On Table III.F.1 the regions must be identified so as the capacity variables instead of just stating "all".	Yes	For next years MS shall detail the name of Regions and variables in accordance with the guidelines.
---	-----	---

**F1 Capacity** 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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
 Is respective data quality information given?  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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	No
	Yes	No
	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	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
 Is respective data quality information given?  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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	No
	Yes	No
	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	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 ?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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.)?  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**  
 Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  
 Are the responsive actions described ?  
 Are the responsive actions acceptable?

	NA	No
	NA	No
	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	No
	NA	No

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

**A Collection 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?

No freshwater data collection	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
 Is respective data quality information given?  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**A4 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

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
 Is respective data quality information given?  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**B3 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
<b>B4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	No
<b>V</b>	<b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>		
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	No
	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
<b>VI</b>	<b>Module for management and use of the data</b>		
	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 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) ?	Yes	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 shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	No
<b>VII</b>	<b>Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>VIII</b>	<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?		
<b>IX</b>	<b>IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?		
<b>X</b>	<b>X. References</b>		
	Is there a complete list of references?		
<b>XI</b>	<b>XI. Annexes</b>		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		



Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

GERMANY

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		- 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 <8m in the Baltic as these vessels are not mandatory to provide detailed logbook information.	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 & investment • Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings • Recreational catches: catches	- 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 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 (higher than the figures reported by Eurostat), the volumes of landings reported in DCF are less than half of that reported by Eurostat.	1st issue appears self-explanatory and consistent with AR (stating "pelagic vessels cannot be published for confidentiality reasons") and would probably not require further action; 2nd issue: both value and volume of landings should be lower than Eurostat (because of missing pelagic catches for confidentiality reasons); - no evident explanation for discrepancy;	No action needed by MS
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	- Provided data covered only marine aquaculture. Due to confidentiality, no data was provided for oyster production. The data was provided only for blue mussel segment and therefore represents the German marine aquaculture.	In line with DCF regulation, only marine aquaculture mandatory and oyster production is done by only one enterprise, so confidentiality arises. No data missing!	
ICES	Brill in Subdivisions 22 to 32		Landings Age Landings Length Landings Weight Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity 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 brill 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 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 (13-05) "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.	None
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 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 (13-05) "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.	None
ICES	Saithe in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Landings Maturity Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Commercial Fleets	Partly Applicable. MS perform in accordance with the NP a sea-sampling programme in the area. However were no discarded saithe measured in 2012. Maturity is not collected in NP. Regarding the 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 <i>Sebastes mentella</i> Subareas I and II		Landings Age Landings Weight Landings Maturity Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Commercial Fleets	Partly 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		Commercial Fleets	Applicable. MS a main contributor in this fishery	
ICES	Flounder in Subdivisions 22 to 32		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sex Ratio	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.	None
ICES	Herring in Subdivisions 25 to 29 and 32 minus Gulf of Riga		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 Maturity 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	Sole in Division IIIa and Subdivisions 22-24 (Skagerrak, Kattegat, and the Belts)		Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio	Not applicable. Stock not included in MS NP.	

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

GERMANY

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

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

I General framework

II National data collection organisation

A National correspondent and participating institutes

	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles 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?	No national coordination meeting held; reason not justified	No	No
Are derogations listed?		Yes	No
If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?		Yes	No

B Regional and International coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Only meetings attended are highlighted. Planned participation in non-attended meetings is not given	Mostly	MS to update table accordingly
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

SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

III 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?		Yes	No
Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?		No	

B Economic variables

Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	apparently no data collection at all; Supra region name incomplete	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	empty table, no clustering, according to NP	Yes	
Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	apparently no data collection at all; Supra region name incomplete	No	MS need follow DCF requirements

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	no activity, no further information	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
Are the deviations explained?	budgetary issues	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
Are the deviations justified?	data collection is an obligation	No	MS need follow DCF requirements

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	no activity, no further information	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
Are the deviations explained?	budgetary issues	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
Are the deviations justified?	data collection is an obligation	No	MS need follow DCF requirements

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no relevant recommendations	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		No	MS need follow DCF requirements
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	

REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA

C Biological metier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	MS operates in only one region	NA	No
Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Information filled for the only 1 sampled metier	Yes	No
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Information filled for the only 1 sampled metier	Yes	No
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Information filled for the only 1 sampled stock	Yes	No
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Information filled for the only 1 sampled stock	Yes	No
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	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.	No	No
Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
Are the deviations justified?	Commission to decide and follow-up.	??	No action required by MS. EU Commission to decide and follow-up

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Only for swordfish all Greek GSAs merged	No	No
Were CV targets met?	Yes for swordfish all Greek GSAs merged	No	No
Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No

	Are the deviations justified?	Commission to decide and follow-up.	Yes	No action required by MS. EU Commission to decide and follow-up
<b>C3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		NA	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Relevant RCM Med&BS recommendation on LPF sampling multilateral agreement not listed by RCM. Likewise LPF meters 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
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	<b>No</b>
<b>Region Mediterranean and Black Sea</b>				
<b>D</b>	<b>Recreational fisheries</b>			
	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	MS operates in only 1 region	NA	No
<b>D1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	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 references or eventually carrying out a pilot study) that Sharks are not target species for recreational fishermen.	Mostly	MS to clarify about the sharks recreational fishery
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
<b>D2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were data quality targets provided?		NA	No
	Were data quality targets met?		NA	No
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
<b>D3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		Yes	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
<b>D4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	<b>No</b>
<b>REGION MEDITERRANEAN &amp; BLACK SEA</b>				
<b>E</b>	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>			
	Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	MS operates in only one region	Yes	No
<b>REGION MEDITERRANEAN &amp; BLACK SEA</b>				
<b>E</b>	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>			
<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS clearly explained at the beginning of the AR that they had problems "due to administrative and financial obstacles... moreover, the late authorization of the budget in December 2012 allowed the implementation of only some modules of 2012 NP". Table not filled except for Swordfish at ICCAT_BIL95 scale. For this species multilateral agreement not complete (more MS involved).	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?	Regarding III.E.2, 8 species were planned to be updated in 2012. But 27 species found in table III.E.3 and finally only results provided for two parameters on swordfish (length and maturity @age) under the RCM agreement frame. In term of number of fish sampled, target planned for swordfish is achieved.	No	No
	Are the deviations explained?	All the deviations are linked to financials and administrative problems. Note that a pilot study on eel Greek fishery is given in Annex 1, demonstrating interest for performing monitoring in the mid-long term. Samples for calculating biological parameters for this species were also collected but not yet analysed.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	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
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes for swordfish.	NA	No
<b>E3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	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
	Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	NA
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	NA
E4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Main problems are related to financial and administrative issues	NA	NA
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	NA
F	Transversal variables			
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		No	No
F1	Capacity			
	F11 Achievements: 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?		No	No
	F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		No	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No	No
F2	Effort			
	F11 Achievements: 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?		No	No
	F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?		No	No
	Are the deviations explained?		No	No
	Are the deviations justified?		No	No
	F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		No	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		No	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		No	No
	F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		No	No
	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?		No	No
	Are the deviations explained?		No	No
	Are the deviations justified?		No	No
	F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?		No	No
	Are the deviations explained?		No	No
	Are the deviations justified?		No	No
	F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		No	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		No	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		No	No
	F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		No	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No	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?	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.
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	The MEDITS survey was not performed in 2012 due to the delayed start of the programme. Whereas, the realized MEDIAS survey covered only 33% of the planned days at sea.	No	Proper planning is needed to conduct the survey in the right time of the year so the data can be used. MS to clarify.
	Are the deviations explained?	Deviations in data quality are related only for the Medias surveys.	Partly	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Since the survey was conducted in another time of the year compared to the plan, the effect on the data use is not described.	Partly	The effects on the data use (stock assessment) should be described. MS to clarify
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ?	The map reports the achieved days for the Medias survey	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.)?	The quality of the acoustic and the demersal surveys in the Mediterranean 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 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	
G4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Only provided for the MEDIAS	Partly	The actions needed for avoiding shortfalls to be described
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Only provided for the MEDIAS	Partly	The actions needed for avoiding shortfalls to be described
IV	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry			
A	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?	No data collection undertaken, even if mandatory	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		No	MS need follow DCF requirements
A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No data collection undertaken	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	

				MS need follow DCF requirements
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the deviations justified?	No	
		Is respective data quality information given?	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
		Are the deviations explained?	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the deviations justified?	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	No
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table to be resubmitted with applying correct % for response rate and achieved sample rate; to specify a data source for collected information
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	MS should to provide more clear information about quality evaluation
		Are the deviations explained?	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
		Are the deviations justified?	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
B3	Follow-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	
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No	MS should to provide information about actions to avoid shortfalls
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	MS need follow DCF requirements
V	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?	Partly	To be clarified by MS
		Are the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Partly	Data collected in the surveys should be included in this section. To be clarified by MS
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
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?	No	No
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	No
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No	Progress in datamanagement to be described.
		Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A) ?	No	MS should mention if the website is existing or not, and make a reference if.
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
		Are the deviations justified?	Probably not for EWG 13-7 to decide on, due to late authorization of the budget	No
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
VII	Follow-up of STECF recommendations	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Mostly	No
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No	No
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No	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 ?		
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?			
---	--	--	--

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital &amp; investment</li> <li>• Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings</li> <li>• Recreational catches: catches</li> </ul>	- 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	Fisheries' specific landings and discards by species, fishing effort and 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.	<p>/ Regarding surveys (both MEDITS and MEDIAS), JRC/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 year. RCMed&amp;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.</p> <p>JRC/DG MARE should be aware that not all métiers 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 métier will be considered. So not all métier are sampled during the year and this could imply that data (i.e. length) for species caught by those métier are not available. Consequently, no data should be requested for those métiers/species.</p> <p>Regarding discards, JRC/DG MARE should be aware that RCMed&amp;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 métiers coverage. Moreover, the RCMed&amp;BS identified the key métiers important to sample for discards, providing scientific justification for not sampling certain métiers.</p> <p>RCMed&amp;BS 2010 (Varna, Bulgaria 2010) reported that "A discards behaviour table is used to provide justification for not sampling certain métiers. This justification could be based in the discards behaviour or in the non selection of métier in the regional ranking system" and recommends "to strictly follow the proposed table to sample métiers for discards" (ref: Table 7, RCMED&amp;BS Report, Varna 2010). Following this issue, not all métier are sampled for discards and no discards data should be requested for those métiers.</p>	
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Income</li> <li>• Personal costs</li> <li>• Energy costs</li> <li>• Raw materia costs</li> <li>• Other operational costs</li> <li>• Capital costs</li> <li>• Extraordinary costs</li> <li>• Capital value</li> <li>• Net investments</li> <li>• Debt</li> <li>• Raw material volume</li> <li>• Total volume</li> <li>• Employment</li> <li>• Number of enterprises</li> </ul>	- No data submitted by Greece for the current data call.	No AR for 2011 available, in AR Greece stated, that no data collection took place due to missing budget.	
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.2	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fishing gear class</li> <li>• Group target species</li> <li>• Vessel number</li> </ul> GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fishing period month (start-end)</li> <li>• Fishing gear class</li> <li>• Vessel number</li> <li>• Species</li> </ul>	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Species - not provided</li> </ul>		
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.3	Segment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engine power</li> <li>• Employment</li> <li>• Salary share %</li> <li>• Landing weight</li> <li>• Landing value</li> <li>• Vessel value of total fleet</li> <li>• Working days/year per vessel</li> <li>• Working hours/days per vessel</li> <li>• Variable costs of fishing/days per vessel</li> <li>• % of V.C. from fuel costs</li> <li>• Yearly fixed costs per vessel</li> </ul>	Segment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salary share % - not provided</li> <li>• Landing weight - not provided</li> <li>• Landing value - not provided</li> <li>• Vessel value of total fleet - not provided</li> <li>• Working days/year per vessel - not provided</li> <li>• Working hours/days per vessel - not provided</li> <li>• Variable costs of fishing/days per vessel - not provided</li> <li>• % of V.C. from fuel costs - not provided</li> <li>• Yearly fixed costs per vessel - not provided</li> </ul>		



**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	GFCM - Task 1.4	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effort measure</li> <li>• Catch or Landing</li> <li>• CPUE/LPUE</li> <li>• Discard</li> <li>• Bycatch</li> </ul> GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catch or Landing</li> <li>• CPUE/LPUE</li> </ul>	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	GFCM - Task 1.5	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Length range of captured species</li> <li>• Length average</li> <li>• Sex</li> <li>• Maturity</li> </ul>	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	<b>Judgement levels</b>	
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%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	<b>EWG Answer</b> <b>XXX</b>	NA	not applicable

I General framework

--

II National data collection organisation

A 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 to the guidelines?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

B Regional and International coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?  
 Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?  
 Are the responsive actions described ?  
 Are the responsive actions acceptable?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic**

III 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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

B Economic variables

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

Total achieved sample no. appears quite low, no vessels listed as inactive	Mostly	MS should provide all information requested by resubmitting table or justify why the information is missing
--	--------	---

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

Clustering scheme inappropriate; many segments are big enough (>10) to be reported unclustered	Mostly	MS should explain the reasons of clustering more than 10 vessels in the segment
--	--------	---

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

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 III.B.3, to provide a CV, clarify which variables were collected, provide information about data collection scheme.
--	--------	--

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

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 Value estimation
Voluntary nature of surveys	Mostly	

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

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	Partly	MS is advised to review and change, if necessary data collection strategy for better response rate
---	--------	--

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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?

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

B4 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

**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 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS to present only one line per metier (including different sampling strategies). Changes in Table format (e.i. grey color for Achievement data, Adding line for Region name) make them difficult to analyse.	Mostly	MS to present only one line per metier (including different sampling strategies). Changes in Table format (e.i. grey color for Achievement data, Adding line for Region name) make them difficult to analyse.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS to clarify inconsistencies between tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 for number of "Achieved number of trips" and "Total number of trips during the Sampling year"	Mostly	MS to clarify inconsistencies between tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 for number of "Achieved number of trips" and "Total number of trips during the Sampling year"
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly filled.Changes in Table format (e.i. grey color for Achievement data, Adding line for Region name) make them difficult to analyse. But no species planned in NP 2012 for the region and two found in AR tables.	Mostly	No
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Only 49 Capros aper sampled in addition of the planed species mentioned in III.C.5. This does not reflect concurrent sampling as specified in III.C.3 and III.C.4	Mostly	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	MS to clarify why no Achievement on discards for Scomber scombrus since on-board sampling is performed	Mostly	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	see coment above	Mostly	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	see coment above	Mostly	Yes
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?	No CV for Clupea harengus	Partly	No
	Were CV targets met?	CV provided just for unsorted catches of Scomber scombrus	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	see comment above	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	see comment above	Yes	No
<b>C3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		NA	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	MS to clarify the actions to avoid the shortfall BY region	Mostly	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	see comment above	Mostly	No
<b>REGION NORTH ATLANTIC</b>				
<b>C</b>	<b>Biological metier related variables</b>			
	Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	MS to present the variables BY region	Mostly	No
<b>C1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Changes in Table format (e.i. grey color for Achievement data, Adding line for Region name) make them difficult to analyse	Mostly	MS to present only one line per metier (including different sampling strategies). Changes in Table format (e.i. grey color for Achievement data, Adding line for Region name) make them difficult to analyse.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS to clarify inconsistencies between tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 for number of "Achieved number of trips" and "Total number of trips during the Sampling year"	Mostly	MS to clarify inconsistencies between tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 for number of "Achieved number of trips" and "Total number of trips during the Sampling year"
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Mostly	No
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS to provide discards data provided in table III. C 5 in Table III. C. 6 (only Nephrops is completed)	Mostly	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Mostly	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Stocks were generally correctly sampled or oversampled except for those of the undersampled fishing grounds. Changes in the fishing strategies are also given as reasons for re-allocation of sampling effort between fishing grounds.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	MS to explain if concurrent sampling is really applied	Mostly	Yes
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?	Most CV's are provided. MS to precise why no CV's were calculated for several species	Mostly	Yes
	Were CV targets met?		Partly	No
	Are the deviations explained?	MS to state some explanation on devaited CV	No	No
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
<b>C3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			

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

	NA	NA
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

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
---	--------	-----

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Proposals only for some metiers. If changes in Irish fisheries have significant effects on the quality of data collected, MS should modify its sampling protocols	Partly	Yes
---	--------	-----

**Region North Atlantic**

**D Recreational fisheries**

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	NA
	NA	NA

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	NA
	NA	NA

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**D4 Actions to 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**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

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

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 disregarded 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
---	-----	----

**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?

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**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
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**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?

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**E4 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	No

**REGION NORTH ATLANTIC**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

Are information on III.E.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?

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

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Around 50% of the stocks are oversampled (at national expense). Stocks of undersampled fishing grounds are consequently often undersampled.	Mostly	No
---	--------	----

Are the deviations explained?

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

Are the deviations justified?

In general lack of availability of samples due to low landings	Yes	No
--	-----	----

**E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Were CV estimates provided?

Yes for most of the stocks	Yes	No
----------------------------	-----	----

Were CV targets met?

In general yes for length@age, rather no for other parameters	Partly	No
---	--------	----

Are the deviations explained?

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

	Are the deviations justified?	for maturity only 50% of stocks achieved the numbers planned. For sex ratio 14 out of 43 do not reach the planned numbers and for weight about 25% do not reach the planned numbers . If precision target is achievable only at a non affordable cost, then the numbers planned should be revised.	Mostly	MS could review the numbers of fish to be sampled to find better coherence between planned and achieved targets.
<b>E3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation listed in section 1	NA	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes. RCM NA 2011 recommendation on John dory is missing. (not relevant)	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	-	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	-	Yes	No
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	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
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	Mostly	No
<b>F</b>	<b>Transversal variables</b>			
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Missing capacity and landings information for small vessels (<10m)	Partly	MS shall provide additional information on the achievements particularly on regard to landings from small vessels.
<b>F1</b>	<b>Capacity</b>			
	<b>F11</b> 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
	<b>F13</b> 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>F2</b>	<b>Effort</b>			
	<b>F11</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	In the future additional information on the number of trips covered by the sentinel programme shall be provided. The number of vessels is not enough 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
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	<b>F12</b> 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
	<b>F13</b> 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
	<b>F14</b> 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>F3</b>	<b>Landings</b>			
	<b>F11</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Missing landing information for small vessels (<10m)	Partly	MS shall provide information on the collection of landing data for small vessels (<10 metres). In AR is stated that landing data for small vessels will be collected based on the same sampling survey as effort data however none information on the achievements is provided under table III.F.1.
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	<b>F12</b> 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
	<b>F13</b> 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
	<b>F14</b> 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>G</b>	<b>Research surveys at sea</b>			
	<b>G1</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No

	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 an * or in text in NP.	Mostly	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	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
<b>G2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	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
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
<b>G3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	No
<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>IV</b>	<b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>		
	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?		
<b>A1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
<b>A2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
<b>A3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	No
<b>A4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>B</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>		
	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
<b>B1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
<b>B2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	No
<b>B3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	No
<b>B4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>V</b>	<b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Are the relevant derogations listed?	Mostly	No
<b>2</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	No
<b>VI</b>	<b>Module for management and use of the data</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	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) ?	Yes	No
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
<b>2</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>VII</b>	<b>Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>		
	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

Old Acronyms (e.g. PGNEPS, PGIPS) on working groups are used and should be updated next year.	Yes	No
---	-----	----

IX IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections [Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?](#)

[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?](#)

--	--	--

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

IRELAND

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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No nominal effort, effective effort by rectangle information submitted for vessels under 10 meters in length.</li> <li>- A_CATCH: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 1237 records with no gear information, 287 with missing vessel length information and 6043 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types.</li> <li>- B_EFFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 26 records with no gear information, 58 with missing vessel length information and 2110 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types.</li> <li>- C_SPECIFIC EFFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 20 records with no gear information, 48 with missing vessel length information and 3984 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types.</li> <li>- E_LANDINGS: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 58 records with no gear information, 199 with missing vessel length information and 14962 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types.</li> </ul>	no evident explanation for failure; (most issues are regarded minor)	
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital &amp; investment</li> <li>• Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings</li> <li>• Recreational catches: catches</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Landings value data significantly lower than Eurostat data</li> <li>- Landings and effort data for 2011 (national and fleet segment levels) not provided</li> <li>- Landings income data for 2011 not provided</li> <li>- Only partial (energy consumption and fishing trips) effort data submitted</li> <li>- 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</li> </ul>	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)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discards Age</li> <li>Discards Length</li> <li>Discards Weight</li> <li>Discards Maturity</li> </ul>	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 (13-05) "master stock table" indicating that <i>cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed</i> . 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)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discards Age</li> <li>Discards Length</li> <li>Discards Weight</li> <li>Discards Maturity</li> </ul>	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 (13-05) "master stock table" indicating that <i>cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed</i> . 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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landings Age</li> <li>Landings Length</li> <li>Landings Weight</li> <li>Landings Maturity</li> <li>Landings Sex Ratio</li> <li>Discards Age</li> <li>Discards Length</li> <li>Discards Weight</li> <li>Discards Maturity</li> </ul>	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 VII-k (Celtic Sea)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landings Maturity</li> </ul>	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 VII-b-k		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landings Maturity</li> <li>Discards Maturity</li> </ul>	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 VIII.g (Celtic Sea)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discards Age</li> <li>Discards Length</li> <li>Discards Weight</li> <li>Discards Maturity</li> <li>Commercial Fleets</li> </ul>	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)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discards Age</li> <li>Discards Length</li> <li>Discards Weight</li> <li>Discards Maturity</li> </ul>	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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landings Maturity</li> <li>Discards Maturity</li> </ul>	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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discards Weight</li> <li>Surveys at Sea</li> </ul>	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 Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discards Weight</li> <li>Surveys at Sea</li> </ul>	According to MS AR 2012, 2268 fish were measured. Enough to provide volumes estimates by metier or for the stock ?	
ICES	Megrim (L. whiffiagonis) in Subarea VII & Divisions VIIa,b,d,e		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landings Maturity</li> </ul>	According to MS AR 2012, 903 fish sampled for maturity @length parameter.	
ICES	Nephrops in Division VIIb,c,j,k (Porcupine Bank, EU 16)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discards Weight</li> </ul>	In table III.C.6 of its AR 2012, MS states that 3260 individuals were measured for OTB_CRU_70-99_0_0 discards and 2875 for OTB_DEF_100-119_0_0 discards.	
ICES	Herring in the Northeast Atlantic (Norwegian spring-spawning herring)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discards Age</li> <li>Discards Length</li> <li>Discards Weight</li> <li>Discards Maturity</li> <li>Discards Sex Ratio</li> </ul>	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, VIIa, VIIa-c, e-k, VIIIa-e (Western stock)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discards Age</li> <li>Discards Length</li> <li>Discards Weight</li> </ul>	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)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landings Maturity</li> </ul>	According to MS AR 2012, 1476 fish sampled for maturity @length parameter.	

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



Member State:	Italy	<b>Judgement levels</b>	
Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	Text and Tables 31/05/2013	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	Text and Tables Dec 2010	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	<b>EWG Answer</b> <b>XXX</b>	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

**I General framework**

**II National data collection organisation**

**A 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?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed ?
Roles not well described	Mostly	MS to update text with roles
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**B Regional and International coordination**

**B1 Attendance of international meetings**

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

	Yes	No
Only meetings attended are highlighted. Planned participation in non-attended meetings is not given	Mostly	MS to update table accordingly

**B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations**

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?  
 Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?  
 Are the responsive actions described ?  
 Are the responsive actions acceptable?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea**

**III 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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**B Economic variables**

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

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

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

several segments are far too big to be clustered (e.g. DRB0612, PS0612, PS1218 etc.)	Mostly	No
	Yes	No

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?

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**B4 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	No

**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?

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

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 numbers of trips found between NP and AR tables III.C.3 : for GSAs 16, 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.	Yes	MS to update table according to the comments
--	-----	--

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

MS to clarify 'NP' meaning. Two discrepancies between tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 found for sampling frames DS9_4 and DS9_6 concerning numbers of trips really achieved for metiers OTB_MDD_>40_0_0 and OTB_DWS_>40_0_0.	Yes	MS to update table accordingly and provide information on discrepancies mentioned.
---	-----	--

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

MS is not required to include all species encountered during sample in this table.	Yes	MS to clarify if planned targets are by GSA or national level.
	Yes	No

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

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

	Mostly	MS to adopt a more scientific presentation for usefull stock assessment issues and quality assesment of data provided.
--	--------	--

	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.
	Mostly	No

**C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?  
 Were CV estimates provided?  
 Were CV targets met?  
 Are the deviations explained?

	Mostly	No
	Partly	No
	Yes	No
	Mostly	MS to clarify reasons for under-sampling especially related to how does seasonality interfere with sampling at landing site

**C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

Were the relevant derogations listed?

	Yes	MS to clarify why pilot studies 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 ?  
 Are the responsive actions acceptable?

	Yes	No
	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	MS to provide any actions to avoid shortfalls required
	NA	No

**REGION OTHER REGIONS - RFMO CECAF**

**C Biological 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 mentioned in MS' NP 2011-2013.
--	-----	--

**C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables.	No	Commission / RCM LDF 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**

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

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**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?

	No	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	Mostly	No
	Mostly	Commission is requested to solve this ongoing issue with the MS

**Region Mediterranean and Black Sea**

**D Recreational 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?  
 Are obtained derogations mentioned?  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

	NA	No
--	----	----

- 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 MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

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 ?

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 protocols on a GSA basis for stock assessments 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, 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 protocols on a GSA basis for stock assessments 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

- E4 **Actions to avoid shortfalls**  
 Are the responsive actions acceptable?  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

	Yes	No
No shortfall raised by MS	NA	No
	NA	No

**REGION OTHER REGIONS - RFMO CECAF**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

No information provided on CECAF metiers, neither in NP nor AR tables. MS should prove that a derogation was accepted	NA	Yes. MS should prove that a derogation was accepted
---	----	---

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

No information provided in AR 2012. MS states it asked for a derogation for biological sampling in CECAF area but no information is provided on the finally grant or not.	NA	Yes. MS should prove that a derogation was accepted
	NA	NA
	NA	NA

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	NA
	NA	NA
	NA	NA
	NA	NA

**E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

Were the relevant derogations listed?

	No	Yes. MS should prove that a derogation was accepted
--	----	---

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No shortfall raised by MS	NA	NA
	NA	NA

**F Transversal variables**

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

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

**F1 Capacity**

**F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

"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). This makes the comparison more difficult. This is allowed according to food note a) in NP.	Mostly	No
	No	No
	Yes	No

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?

No shortfalls. Census data	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**F2 Effort**

**F21 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

"Other regions" is not in the NP.	Mostly	No
No	No	No
	Yes	No

**F22 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

	No	No
	No	No
	Yes	No

**F23 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	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**F24 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

**F3 Landings**

**F31 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

"Other regions" is not in the NP.	Mostly	No
	No	No
	No	No

**F32 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

No CV is calculated in 19 cases despite a low sampling achievement for sampling type "B".	Partly	MS should calculate CV in those cases
	No	MS should provide explanations
Not possible to judge on missing CVs		

**F33 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	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**F34 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

**G Research surveys at sea**

**G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

	Mostly	
	Yes	

	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	There are inconsistencies between the report text and the table in respect of the percentages and with the NP 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
<b>G2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	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	
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	
<b>G3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		NA	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	
<b>IV</b>	<b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>			
<b>A</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>			
	Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?		Yes	No
	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
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no information provided on indicators	No	MS needs to resubmit table
<b>A1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>A2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is respective data quality information given?	lack of information about the quality of data	no	MS needs to provide quality information
	Are the deviations explained?		yes	
	Are the deviations justified?	it is unclear why data are not already processed	no	MS should justify deviations.
<b>A3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	
	Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	
<b>A4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	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>B</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>			
	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 by census, the sample rate seems to be too low there	Mostly	MS to justify low response rate.
<b>B1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>B2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is respective data quality information given?	CV missing	Partly	MS needs to clarify the quality information
	Are the deviations explained?	No, MS explains a deviation concerning non-main activity enterprises, but this should be done under B1.	no	MS need to explain deviation
	Are the deviations justified?		no	
<b>B3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	
	Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	
<b>B4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	no information about actions to avoid shortfalls regarding data quality indicators	Partly	MS should clarify the issue regarding data quality indicators
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	see comment above	No	In the future MS should provide the quality information...
<b>V</b>	<b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		yes	
	Are the relevant derogations listed?		Yes	No
			NA	
<b>2</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		NA	

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
<b>VI</b>	<b>Module for management and use of the data</b>		
	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?	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
<b>VII</b>	<b>Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>	yes	
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>VIII</b>	<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?		
<b>IX</b>	<b>IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?		
<b>X</b>	<b>X. References</b>		
	Is there a complete list of references?		
<b>XI</b>	<b>XI. Annexes</b>		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

ITALY

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	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital &amp; investment</li> <li>• Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings</li> <li>• Recreational catches: catches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Landings and effort data (for total and fleet segment levels) for 2011 not provided</li> <li>- No capacity and effort data for 2011 provided</li> <li>- Capacity data for 2012 not submitted</li> <li>- Landings income data for 2011 not provided</li> <li>- Financial position value for national fleet for 2010 and investment data for any of the years requested not submitted</li> <li>- 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</li> </ul>	no evident explanation for failure; delivery of 2012 data not mandatory	MS to provide missing data available through the DCF
JRC/DG MARE	Mediterranean & Black Sea	Fisheries' specific landings and discards by species, fishing effort and surveys' data for the years 2008-2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No fishing activity data for the period 2002 – 2005.</li> <li>- MEDITS 2012 was not submitted, no MEDITS data from GSA 17 for 1994-2001, major gaps in MEDITS TT and TD tables.</li> <li>- Echo survey for 2012 not submitted.</li> <li>- Discards data for the years 2007 and 2008 were missing for all GSAs.</li> </ul>	<p>Regarding Medits and MEDIAS 2012, may be MS followed the output of the RCM Med&amp; BS 2012: "RCM Med&amp;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 meter selected, data should be available and MS should send it. Missing effort data and discards data should be submitted. / Regarding surveys (both MEDITS and MEDIAS), JRC/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 year. RCM Med&amp;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.</p> <p>JRC/DG MARE should be aware that not all meters present in the Appendix IV of the EU Decisions 93/2010 are sampled. In order to identify the meters to be sampled, the ranking system is yearly applied by MS and for sampling purpose, only the major métier will be considered. So not all meter are sampled during the year and this could imply that data (i.e. length) for species caught by those meter are not available. Consequently, no data should be requested for those meters/species.</p> <p>Regarding discards, JRC/DG MARE should be aware that RCM Med&amp;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 meters coverage. Moreover, the RCM Med&amp;BS identified the key métiers important to sample for discards, providing scientific justification for not sampling certain métiers.</p> <p>RCM Med&amp;BS 2010 (Varna, Bulgaria 2010) reported that "A discards behaviour table is used to provide justification for not sampling certain métiers. This justification could be based in the discards</p>	
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Income</li> <li>• Personal costs</li> <li>• Energy costs</li> <li>• Raw materia costs</li> <li>• Other operational costs</li> <li>• Capital costs</li> <li>• Extraordinary costs</li> <li>• Capital value</li> <li>• Net investments</li> <li>• Debt</li> <li>• Raw material volume</li> <li>• Total volume</li> <li>• Employment</li> <li>• Number of enterprises</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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 no clarification was provided.</li> <li>- 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</li> </ul>	<p>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. In AR 2012 MS stated: "In addition to activities related to data referred to 2011, all data for the period 2008-2010 have been reprocessed in order to take into account the recommendations of STECF working group on aquaculture and the Lisbon workshop (October 2012)." So with the latest Aquaculture call Data should be available, even for the years 2008-2010. For 2011 data is has been stated again: "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." So maybe MS should clarify when data are available. It should be checked if missing data have been reported in 2013 data call, if not there is no justification so far, contrary, it would have been a wrong statement in the AR 2012 then.</p>	MS to provide missing data available through the DCF
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.3	Segment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engine power</li> <li>• Employment</li> <li>• Salary share %</li> <li>• Landing weight</li> <li>• Landing value</li> <li>• Vessel value of total fleet</li> <li>• Working days/year per vessel</li> <li>• Working hours/days per vessel</li> <li>• Variable costs of fishing/days per vessel</li> <li>• % of V.C. from fuel costs</li> <li>• Yearly fixed costs per vessel</li> </ul>	Segment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yearly fixed costs per vessel - not provided</li> </ul>		
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.4	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effort measure</li> <li>• Catch or Landing</li> <li>• CPUE/LPUE</li> <li>• Discard</li> <li>• Bycatch</li> </ul> GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catch or Landing</li> <li>• CPUE/LPUE</li> </ul>	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPUE/LPUE - not provided</li> <li>• Discard - not provided</li> <li>• Bycatch - not provided</li> </ul> GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPUE/LPUE - not provided</li> </ul>	According to AR 2012, MS collected data on discards by meters 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
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.5	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Length range of captured species</li> <li>• Length average</li> <li>• Sex</li> <li>• Maturity</li> </ul>	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Length range of captured species - only partially provided</li> <li>• Length average - only partially provided</li> <li>• Sex - only partially provided</li> <li>• Maturity - not provided</li> </ul>	Information provided by GFCM not enough precise to be examined. Which species/stocks? Which meters?	MS to provide missing data available through the DCF

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

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

I General framework

II National data collection organisation

A 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 to the guidelines?

B Regional and International coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?

B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

**SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic**

III 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?

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?

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?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Action needed?
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	No	MS to provide list of derogations
	No	No
	Partly	MS to update table with all eligible meetings
	No	MS to provide reasons for non-attendance
	No	MS to provide relevant 2011 LM general recommendations
	NA	No
	NA	No

**SUPRA-REGION Other regions**

III 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?

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?

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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs should be reported under chapter III.B.1 in the text and not under III.B.2.	Mostly	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**Region Baltic**

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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No



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

	Yes	No
	Mostly	No
	Mostly	MS to update table accordingly (see comment)
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	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 justified?

	Yes	No
	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	No	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Mostly	No
	Mostly	MS to update table accordingly (see comment)
	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	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 justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**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?

	No	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	Mostly	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.
	Mostly	MS to amend 'MS 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 agreements.
	Mostly	MS to amend 'MS participating in sampling' to reflect the multi-lateral agreement present
	Mostly	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.
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	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?

**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?

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**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?

	No	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	NA	No
	NA	No

**Region Baltic Sea**

**D Recreational 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?

	Mostly	MS to clarify the situation on the sharks recreational fishery; MS to provide the results for the cod pilot survey
--	--------	--

Are obtained derogations mentioned?

	Yes	MS to provide list of derogations in Section 1
--	-----	--

Are the deviations explained?

	No	No
--	----	----

Are the deviations justified?

	NA	No
--	----	----

**D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Were data quality targets provided?

	No	MS to identify if exhaustive coverage provided good quality of the data
--	----	---

Were data quality targets met?

	NA	No
--	----	----

Are the deviations explained?

	NA	No
--	----	----

Are the deviations justified?

	NA	No
--	----	----

**D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

Were the relevant derogations listed?

	Yes	MS to provide list of derogations in Section 1
--	-----	--

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

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

Are the responsive actions described ?

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

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

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

**D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

	No	No
--	----	----

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

	NA	No
--	----	----

**Region Baltic**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

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

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

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

Sampling of whitefish not planned in NP.	Yes	Yes, MS to explain additional sampling of whitefish
--	-----	---

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

No salmon sampling of parr and smolt due to environmental conditions troubles (high water level). Over and under sampling occurred of almost all variables. Some variables not sampled at all	Mostly	No
---	--------	----

Are the deviations explained?

Mostly, information about eel and pike-perch is missing	Mostly	MS to clarify lack of eel and pike-perch variables
---	--------	--

Are the deviations justified?

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

**E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Were CV estimates provided?

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

Were CV targets met?

For approx one third of the stocks*parameters	Mostly	No
---	--------	----

Are the deviations explained?

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

Are the deviations justified?

Yes, there are many explanations but it comes down to that the required precision levels sometimes cannot be reached without substantially increasing sampling and costs	Yes	No
--	-----	----

**E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

Were the relevant derogations listed?

No derogations exist for Latvia	NA	No
---------------------------------	----	----

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

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

Are the responsive actions described ?

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

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

MS says that possible cooperation about age reading task sharing has been discussed during 2012.	Mostly	MS shall describe results of discussion with other MS's to share a tasks in age reading.
--	--------	--

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Yes adopt to a decreasing fleet	Yes	No
---------------------------------	-----	----

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

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

**Region North Atlantic**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

Inconsistencies between NP and AR. 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 otoliths have been collected but not read. In NP age variables not included in III.E.3 but in III.E.2.	No	MS to clarify differences between NP. and AR
--	----	--

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

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
---	--------	--

Are the deviations explained?

Only in case of Pandalus	Partly	MS to explain lack of planned redfish variables
--------------------------	--------	---

Are the deviations justified?

Justified in case of Pandalus	Partly	see comment above
-------------------------------	--------	-------------------

**E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Were CV estimates provided?

Yes (for the single parameter left)	Yes	No
-------------------------------------	-----	----

Were CV targets met?

No (despite excess sampling)	No	No
------------------------------	----	----

Are the deviations explained?

No	No	Yes, provide an explanation about data quality and how to reach precision level
----	----	---

Are the deviations justified?

NA	NA	No
----	----	----



	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>F14</b>	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>G</b>	<b>Research surveys at sea</b>		
<b>G1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	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?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ?	Yes	No
<b>G2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	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
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
<b>G3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	No
<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	No
<b>IV</b>	<b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>		
	Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	NA	No
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	No
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	No
<b>A1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
<b>A2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is respective data quality information given?	NA	No
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	No
<b>A3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	No
<b>A4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	No
<b>B</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>		
	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
<b>B1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	MS should clarify contradiction in sample and response rate for segment 11-49 and explain the differences in achieved sample rates and respond rates for the other segment.
	Are the deviations explained?	No	MS should explained the deviations
	Are the deviations justified?	No	MS should explained the issue
<b>B2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
	Are the deviations explained?	No	MS should explained the deviations
	Are the deviations justified?	No	MS should explained the issue
<b>B3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
<b>B4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No	MS should provide actions to avoid shortfalls
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	MS should justify actions to avoid shortfalls
<b>V</b>	<b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	No
	Are the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No
<b>2</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	No
<b>VI</b>	<b>Module for management and use of the data</b>		

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 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 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?

	Yes	No
For next year; only put in single species if that is what is done. E.g. only cod was reported to be uploaded to DATRAS while there are several species uploaded in DATRAS.	Yes	No
Information provided but no website is up running	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
No shortfalls defined in this section	NA	No
	NA	No
For next year, only include the last years of relevant recommendations	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No


Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

LATVIA

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	- A_CATCH: STECF EWG notes that according to the Latvian National Programme discard data should be collected for cod only. - B_EFFORT & C_SPEIFIC 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_SPEIFIC EFFORT	no evident explanation for failure/issues; however, the first issue is not a failure and might therefore not require MS explanation; moreover, Latvia 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 Latvian National Programme discard data should 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), capital & 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 than the figures reported by Eurostat - Vessel tonnage and kilowatts 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 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 (13-05) "master stock table" indicating that <i>cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed</i> . Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited 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 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 <i>cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed</i> . 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 <i>Sebastes mentella</i> Subareas I and II		Landings Age Landings Length Landings Weight Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Commercial Fleets	Discarding is prohibited there. Country is not fishing in ICES I&II	None
ICES	Flounder in Subdivisions 22 to 32		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sex Ratio	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.	None
ICES	Herring in the Gulf of Riga		Landings Maturity	Applicable. Data is should be collected in accordance with NP.	MS to clarify missing data

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

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

I General framework

II National data collection organisation

A 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 to the guidelines?

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

Action needed?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	No	Yes - list derogations
	NA	No

B Regional and International coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

	Yes	No
MS to explain reason for non attendance	No	MS to explain reason for non attendance

B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?  
Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?  
Are the responsive actions described ?  
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic

III 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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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?

Table should display clustered segments as clustered	Yes	MS for AR2013: Table should display clustered segments as clustered
	Yes	
Data should be displayed for unclustered segments; length class should not be included in column G,	Mostly	For AR2013: Data should be displayed for unclustered segments; length class should not be included in column G. MS to follow 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?

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

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?

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

B4 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

SUPRA-REGION Other regions

III 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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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?

Table should display clustered segments as clustered	Yes	MS for AR2013: Table should display clustered segments as clustered, MS to amend table
	Yes	No
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 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

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?

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

B4 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

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
MS to clarify 2 lines for Anguilla anguilla	Yes	Yes (see Comment)





	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	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.
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?		NA	No
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
D2	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were data quality targets provided?		NA	No
	Were data quality targets met?		NA	No
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
D3	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		NA	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
D4	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
E	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>			
	Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Information given correctly for the Baltic Sea and Other Areas, NA and NS@EA merged, without giving explanations	Mostly	MS to follow guidelines and to separate regions, or give explanations
<b>REGION BALTIC SEA</b>				
E1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly filled	Yes	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	For a less than 50% parameters sampled intensities were above those planned. Herring variables appears oversampled	Mostly	No
	Are the deviations explained?	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 length, not a numbers of variables to be collected. EWG also cannot find in table III.E.3 sprat oversampling	Partly	Deviation is caused by a human mistake, so in future NP. MS has to follow the guidelines
	Are the deviations justified?	Misunderstanding NP. guideline	Partly	No
E2	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No
	Were CV targets met?	Target precision reached for around 50% of parameters updated. Best results were got for weight and maturity parameters. Concerning ALKs, precision achieved only for cod and herring.	Mostly	No
	Are the deviations explained?	For some species only : cod, eel flounder. Seasonal patterns and for eel high variability in age reading.	Mostly	No
E3	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Mostly	Mostly	No
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	NA	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	MS listed recommendation not relevant to this section	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	no relevant recommendations are given by LM	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No
E4	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	To improve numbers of samples of cod and flounder to reach better CVs.	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No
<b>REGIONS NORTH SEA &amp; EASTERN ARCTIC and NORTH ATLANTIC-RFMO NAFO</b>				
E	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>			
E1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly filled.	Yes	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Missing information about planned sampling (NP2012) of sebastes spp. In NAFO 3MNO area. More variables listed than in NP. General inconsistency between NP. and AR in variables. Oversampling occurred in most of the collected variables	Partly	MS to clarify oversampling
	Are the deviations explained?	Moratorium for Pandalus, missing information about Sebastes in NAFO 3MNO. Reason for oversampling not given	Partly	MS to clarify reason for oversampling Pandalus
	Are the deviations justified?	Partly	Partly	No



	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>F14</b>	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>F3</b>	<b>Landings</b>		
	<b>F11</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	MS to complete the table by disaggregating information by region and add missing fleet segments
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
<b>F12</b>	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
<b>F13</b>	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
<b>F14</b>	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>G</b>	<b>Research surveys at sea</b>		
	<b>G1</b> 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 ?		
<b>G2</b>	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.)?	Mostly	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 the deviations explained?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	No
	For next year, Maps should be presented in text and not in annex according to the AR guidelines	Yes	For AR2013: MS should present maps in text and not in annex according to the AR guidelines
		Yes	No
		NA	No
		NA	No
<b>G3</b>	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
<b>G4</b>	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>IV</b>	<b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>		
	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
<b>A1</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	No
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	No
<b>A2</b>	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
<b>A3</b>	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
<b>A4</b>	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>B</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>		
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	No
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	No
<b>B1</b>	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
<b>B2</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	No
<b>B3</b>	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
<b>B4</b>	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**

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?

**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?  
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?

**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 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?

1. MS should update the table with the indicators from 1 to 4 (following the last version of the AR Guidelines 2013) 2. Indicator 5,6,7 is not mentioned in the text.	Mostly	MS to update and complete table and text according to updated guidelines
	NA	No

Sub grouped checked the pre screeners comment and the result is in line with NP proposal	NA	No
	NA	No

See general comment on datatransmission from SG3	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Not described in text	No	MS to provide details in progress in the management of data according to the updated AR guidelines.
	No	MS to provide information on staus of national DCF website
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

--	--	--

--	--	--

--	--	--

--	--	--

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

LITHUANIA

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		- 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital &amp; investment</li> <li>• Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings</li> <li>• Recreational catches: catches</li> </ul>	- Capacity data for 2012 not provided - Landings data significantly higher than Eurostat statistics - Landings income data for 2011 not submitted - Financial position and investment values for 2008 at national level - Energy 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 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 (13-05) "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.	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 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.	None
ICES	Red fish <i>Sebastes mentella</i> Subareas I and II		Landings Age Landings Length Landings Weight Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Commercial Fleets	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 Sex Ratio	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.	None
ICES	Black scabbardfish ( <i>Aphanopus carbo</i> ) in Subareas VI, VII, and Divisions Vb, XIb		Landings Weight Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio Discards Length Discards Weight	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: **Malta**

Reference year Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal  Overall compliance	Judgement levels		
	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
EWG Answer <b>XXX</b>		No	<10%
		Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

**I General framework**

**II National data collection organisation**

**A 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 to the guidelines?

**B Regional and International coordination**

**B1 Attendance of international meetings**

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?  
**B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations**  
Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?  
Are the responsive actions described ?  
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

**SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea**

**III 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?

**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?

**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?

**Region Med & 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.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?

**EWG COMMENTS**

**EWG judgement**

**Action needed? (Yes/No)**

	Yes	No
	No	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	No	MS to provide complete meeting list.
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	Yes	No
NA	Yes	No
TR year should be 2012; information should be provided only for one reference year (2011)	Yes	No
	Yes	No
TR year should be 2012; information should be provided only for one reference year (2011)	Yes	No
Estimation of PCU was provided in special section	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
See below	Mostly	No
50% lower sampling intensity than planned (responses from about 15% of the total fleet); source for value of landings has changed (negligible issue)	Mostly	MS should in future devote more effort to reach planned sampling intensity.
Variability within segments low, therefore no. of responses sufficient	Yes	No
no relevant recommendations	Yes	No
NA	NA	No
NA	NA	No
yes	Yes	No
yes	Yes	No

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

Sampling years 2011 and 2013 included. Total No. of trips during the Sampling year doesn't match with table III.C.4. Names of metiers not always consistent with reference list.	Partly	MS to complete table
Sampling years 2011 and 2013 included. Total No. of trips during the Sampling year doesn't match with table III.C.4. Names of metiers not 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 achieved. Stocks 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 with metiers in C.3. Names of metiers not always consistent with reference list. Sampling results from 2011 included in the table	Partly	MS to complete 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 of NA in the table which make it difficult to compare planned and achieved.	Partly	MS to clarify (see Comment)

- 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 Mediterranean and Black Sea**

**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
	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
Some recommendations from RCM Med&BS 2012 are listed, but no recommendations from RCM 2011 and LM	Partly	Provide missing relevant recommendations from RCM 2011 and LM
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Mostly	No

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
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 Sharks are not target species for recreational fishermen.	Mostly	Yes (see Comment)
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	Yes	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

	Malta is obliged to collect stock-related variables only for three species since Malta is exempted from sampling the other species as their landings by weight correspond to less than 10% of the total Community landings from the Mediterranean Sea or less than 200 tonnes. Undersampling for some species (Aristeus antennatus and Raja miraletus) is explained, main reason for sampling in excess is that sampling is taking place at surveys or concurrently. No extra cost involved.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA
<b>E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Were CV estimates provided?		Yes	No
	CV is not reached for any of the species 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)	No	No
Were CV targets met?		Mostly	No
Are the deviations explained?		Mostly	No
	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 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).	Mostly	No
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	No
<b>E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Were the relevant derogations listed?		No	Yes. Following the AR Guidelines 2013, MS should report the appropriate recommendations from the LM relevant to the AR year (i.e. 2012)
	Some recommendations from RCM Med&BS 2012 are listed but these should be relevant for AR 2013. Recommendations from RCM 2011 and LM 2011 are missing.	No	Yes. Following the AR Guidelines 2013, MS should report the appropriate recommendations plus a description of the responsive actions relevant to the AR year.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		No	Yes. Following the AR Guidelines 2013, MS should report the appropriate recommendations plus a description of the responsive actions relevant to the AR year.
Are the responsive actions described ?		Mostly	Yes. Following the AR Guidelines 2013, MS should report the appropriate recommendations plus a description of the responsive actions relevant to the AR year.
	Since the responsive actions are related to RCM 2012 recommendations is not possible to answer to this question. In any case, why does Malta and RCM Med&BS 2012 consider CV a poor indicator of quality? It may be a poor stand alone indicator of quality as the present situation but it is for sure an indicator of quality. LM did not agree on this recommendation	Mostly	Yes. Following the AR Guidelines 2013, MS should report the appropriate recommendations plus a description of the responsive actions relevant to the AR year.
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
<b>F Transversal variables</b>			
	It is indicated in the NP that all variables for vessels < 10m are sampled by survey. This survey is not included in the table III.F.1 in AR. Information should be provided only for one reference year (2011); CV should not be given as percentage	Mostly	No
<b>F1 Capacity</b> F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			Update table.
Are the deviations explained?		No	MS should explain deviation
Are the deviations justified?		No	MS should justify deviation
<b>F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No	No
		Yes	No
<b>F2 Effort</b> 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?		Yes	No
	Number of rigs is not provided.	Yes	No
		Yes	No
		Yes	No
<b>F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
		Yes	No
		Yes	No
<b>F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No



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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Census data	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	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?  
**G2** Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  
 Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ?  
 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 justified?  
**G3** Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations  
 Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  
 Are the responsive actions described ?  
 Are the responsive actions acceptable?  
**G4** Actions to avoid shortfalls  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

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 Comment)
	Yes	No
	NA	
	NA	
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

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

**A Collection 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?  
**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?  
**A2** 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?  
**A4** 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
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?  
**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?  
**B4** 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
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	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  
 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?

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	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?  
 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?  
**2** Actions to avoid shortfalls  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
see general comment SG3	Yes	No
Comparing with the NP, the proposed study on the management of data has not been carried out. It is not clear if any progress has been done.	Partly	To be clarified by MS (see Comment)
	No	To be clarified by MS (see Comment above)
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**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 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
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	No	No
	No	No
	Yes	No

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

MALTA

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	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	/ Concerning survey 2012 data MS reported in the NP that "Data for each annual survey is inputted into ATRIS software by the end of the same year". So at the period of the data call (November) these data were not available. RCMMed& BS 2012 stated that: "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 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 metier (Table III.C.1 AR 2012). At least discards data for these metiers should be available/ Regarding surveys (both MEDITS and MEDIAS), JRC/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 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. JRC/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 metiers 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, JRC/DG MARE should be aware that RCMMed&BS created a regional view of	MS to clarify why data not provided
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	- 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 • Yearly 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 GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: • Catch or Landing • CPUE/LPUE	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		MS to clarify why data not provided
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 why data not provided

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

Member State:	Netherlands		
Reference year	2012	Judgement levels	
Version of the AR reviewed	version 1	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the NP proposal		No	<10%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer XXX	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

I General framework

II National data collection organisation

A 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 to the guidelines?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	No	To be updated
	NA	No

B Regional and International coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?  
 Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?  
 Are the responsive actions described ?  
 Are the responsive actions acceptable?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic

III 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?

	Yes	No
yes	Yes	No

B Economic variables

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

fleet register indicates 846 vessels on Jan1, 2011; AR has only 741 (NP contained even less - 584); should be briefly clarified by MS	Mostly	MS is required to clarify the number of vessels in reference year and explain the differences from fleet register
---	--------	---

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

clustering scheme is not in line with guidelines; several segments are included in clusters which contain a sufficient number of vessels to be reported individually (e.g. DTS0010, PG0010, etc.); moreover the clustering scheme differs from NP; apart from that, the table layout is misleading (no straight horizontal lines)	Partly	MS needs to clarify the applied clustering scheme with high number of active vessels. In the future MS is strictly required to use clustering scheme according to guidelines, separating segments which have sufficient number of vessels and also to provide data according to NP
---	--------	--

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

table contains clusters instead of unclustered segments; for inactive vessels irrelevant variables have been listed; some variable group names incorrect (negligible);	mostly	MS should report information according to guidelines avoiding unnecessary data.
--	--------	---

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?

Description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs indicated under IIIB2, but should be provided under III.B.1;	Yes	Next year, MS should follow guidelines
NA	Yes	No
NA	Yes	No

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

	Yes	No
NA	Yes	No
NA	Yes	No

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?

	Yes	No
NA	NA	No
NA	NA	No

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

	NA	No
	Yes	No

Region North Sea & Eastern Arctic

C Biological metier related variables

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

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

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Row 15 presentation is not correct. Not used revised standard table, selfsampling trips are planned as ashore sampling but reported as sea sampling	Mostly	MS to update table. Refer to comment
---	--------	--------------------------------------

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

Revised table not used.	Mostly	MS to update table accordingly
-------------------------	--------	--------------------------------

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

Not used revised standard table, CVs not provided, information on "achieved number of fish measured at national level" missing	Partly	MS to update table accordingly
Codes are many times incorrect. No data on landings for plaice. Many inconsistencies. Apart from eel, only discards are reported in table III.C.6	No	MS to resubmit III.C.6. table
No comments on over- and under-sampling	Mostly	MS to provide comments (see comment)
	No	MS to provide explanations
	NA	No

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?

	No	MS to provide CVs for table III.C.5
	NA	No
	No	To be clarified
	NA	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

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

	No	MS to provide CVs for table III.C.5
	NA	No
	No	To be clarified
	NA	No

**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?

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

**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?

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

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

**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?

	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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
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 relevant information on the sharks issue
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
Were data quality targets provided?	For cod and eel; no data for sharks	Yes
Were data quality targets met?	For cod and eel; no data for sharks	Yes
Are the deviations explained?	No mention of non-sampling for sharks	Mostly
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	To be clarified by MS
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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. 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, except 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/parameters for which CVs were calculated	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. There 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

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**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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, except for one stock. Stock boundaries do not always match regions. (There seems to be a mistake with trachurus trachurus, the stock IIa, IVa, Vb, VIa, VIIa-c, e-k VIIIabde does not belong to North Sea and Eastern Arctic). Some stocks are undersampled in the atlantic region but sampled in excess in the NS region.	Yes	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

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**

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/parameters for which CVs were calculated	Partly	No
-	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

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?

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. There 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

**Region Long distance fisheries CECAF**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

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**

NA . According Commission Decision sampling requirements for biological parameters are triennial so, there is no need to estimate the CV every year. They have to be calculated at the end of period.	NA	No
Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	NA	No
Yes. Sampling was interrupted since fisheries were terminated (no EU-third country agreement)	Yes	No
-	Yes	No

**E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

Were the relevant derogations listed?

	No	Ms should follow the guidelines and list the derogations, if any, in section I
No. There are at least 1 recommendation about stock variables. Related to "Methodology on biological sampling"	No	Ms should follow the guidelines and list the recommendations from LM and its follow up
	No	see above
	No	see above

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**F2 Effort**

**F11** Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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	Yes. Clarification regarding the derogation is needed and MS shall provide further information to allow the evaluation on what was planned in the NP.
	Partly	see above
	Partly	see above

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
	No	To be clarified by MS
	No	To be clarified by MS
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	No	Further information on the future actions is needed.
	No	Yes.

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No



Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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	No
	Yes	No
	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	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?

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

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

	Yes	No
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 indicative.	Yes	No

As stated by the MS the few deviations had minor influence on the quality of the survey indices

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	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.)?  
Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

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

In the future MS should clearly report the relevant recommendations under each section	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**G4 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

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

**A 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?  
Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

MS is reminded to make use of Footnote (a)	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**A4 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

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

In NP MS promised a model for data estimation. Nothing is said in AR. MS maybe asked for clarification, if model is available. MS is also asked to clarify whether in 2012 data for 2010 or 2011 have been collected and/or data for 2010/2011 have been processed. In other countries final results from SBS are available with a 1,5 year time lag, and calculation and data collection takes place already the year after the reference year. MS just asked to clarify.	mostly	MS is also asked to clarify whether in 2012 data for 2010 or 2011 have been collected and/or data for 2010/2011 have been processed. In other countries final results from SBS are available with a 1,5 year time lag, and calculation and data collection takes place already the year after the reference year. MS just asked to clarify.
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
<b>B3</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	No
<b>B4</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	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>V</b>	<b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>		
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Are the relevant derogations listed?	Mostly	Table to be updated
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls	NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	No
<b>VI</b>	<b>Module for management and use of the data</b>		
	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 proposal?	see general comment SG3	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 not given in this section but a link is given in section VII (STECF EWG 11-08 recommendation topic 10)	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	No shortfalls	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	No
<b>VII</b>	<b>Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
<b>VIII</b>	<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?		
<b>IX</b>	<b>IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?		
<b>X</b>	<b>X. References</b>		
	Is there a complete list of references?		
<b>XI</b>	<b>XI. Annexes</b>		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

NETHERLANDS

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		- Catch information available for years 2003-2008 only for 3 species, comparing to approximate 40 for 2009-2011.	no evident explanation for failure/issues;	
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 value 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 DCF (all other years cannot be evaluated due to insufficient information) - Financial position value for 2010 at national level not provided	no evident explanation for failure/issues;	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: • Income, • Personal costs, • Energy costs, • Raw material costs, • Other operational costs, • Capital costs, • Extraordinary costs, • Capital value, • Net investments, • Debt, • Raw material volume, • Total volume, • Employment, • Number of enterprises	- The Netherlands has a two year data collection lag, i.e. data for 2010 had not yet been collected. The 2010 data templates were uploaded with no data. - For DCF data, the following parameters were not submitted: Number of enterprises (2008), Number of employees by gender, FTE - Imputed value of unpaid labour and raw material volume was provided as zero values.	AR 2011: "However since all panels in the sub-segment exist of too few firms it proved impossible to reliably aggregate the results for the entire segment." If there is a two year time lag and accepted by Commission, no action necessary, maybe checked with this year data call results. For mussel/oyster segment no unpaid labour and raw material volume is plausible, also feed costs maybe zero? One should have in mind that freshwater species data collection is not mandatory, and MS does not receive reliable data from that sector, even if tried according to AR. Missing number of enterprises and number of employees by gender and FTE for 2008 MS is maybe asked for clarification.	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 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.	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 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.	None
ICES	Sole in Division IIIa and Subdivisions 22-24 (Skagerrak, Kattegat, and the Belts)		Landings Age Landings Length Landings Weight Landings Maturity Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Commercial Fleets Surveys at Sea	Not applicable. Sole in Division IIIa and Subdivision 22-24 is not included in the NP. MS has <10% of EU share of quota.	
ICES	Spurdog (Squalus acanthias) in the Northeast Atlantic		Landings Maturity Discards Maturity	Not applicable. Spurdog not included in the NP.	
ICES	Demersal elasmobranchs in the North Sea, Skagerrak and eastern English Channel		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	Sardine in Divisions Villab and subarea VII		Landings Age Landings Length Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sex Ratio Surveys at Sea	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 VIII-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 VIII-d		Landings Length Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio Surveys at Sea	Applicable. Biological sampling of lemon sole included in NP (triannual). Data from DIFS not uploaded into DATRAS. In table on data transmissions it is stated that survey data is provided.	
ICES	Cod in Subarea IV, Division VIII-d & Division IIIa (Skagerrak)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight	Applicable. Discardsampling of relevant meters in NP.	
ICES	Nephrops in Division IVbc (Botney Gut - Silver Pit, FU 5)		Landings Weight Landings Maturity Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sex Ratio	Applicable. Included in NP.	
ICES	Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)		Landings Length Landings Maturity Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	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)

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

I General framework

II National data collection organisation

A 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 to the guidelines?

B Regional and International coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?

B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

**SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic**

III 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?

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?

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?

**SUPRA-REGION Other regions**

III 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?

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?

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?

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG Action needed?

	Yes	No
No coordination meeting was held. National coordination meeting is an obligation.	Partly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Incomplete list provided. No general recommendations of RCM NA 2011 ? Only relevant 2011 recommendations were to be provided in AR 2012.	Mostly	MS to update list
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Official nomenclature is not "demersal trawlers", but "demersal trawlers and seiners"	Yes	No
Clustering of DTS1012 and DTS1218 would not be necessary, but is in line with NP	Yes	No
Some variable group names not in line with 93/2010 (negligible)	Yes	No

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 describes a different approach	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	NA	No
	NA	No

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Some variable group names not in line with 93/2010 (negligible)	Yes	No

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 describes a different approach	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	NA	No
	NA	No

**Region Baltic**

**C Biological metier related variables**

**C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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.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?

	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 achieved. 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
	Yes	No
Only 2011 recommendations were to be provided	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

**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?

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 achieved. 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
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**Region Other regions; CECAF and South Pacific**

**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?

table properly filled and complete.	Yes	No
table properly filled and complete.	Yes	No
No information provided on CECAF achievements 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?
- Are the deviations explained?
- Are the deviations justified?

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**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?

	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	NA	No
	NA	No

**Region Baltic Sea**

**D Recreational fisheries**

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)
derogations for eel and salmon are reported	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

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?

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**D4 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

**Region Baltic**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

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

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

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

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	Mostly	No
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 planned 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.	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
Yes, failure to meet sampling targets primarily due to decrease in fisheries.	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No

- 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?

Yes, what does CV 0 mean?	Yes	MS to explain what CV 0 means or clarify if this is an error.
Mostly not	No	No
MS considers some of the targets unrealistic. Sampling (and costs) will have to increase substantially if they should be met	Yes	Targets need to be revised in future NPs
see above	Yes	No

- 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?

no derogation applied (list in chapter 1)	Yes	No
Recommendations from RCM and LM are listed.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**E4 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

**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?

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?

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 correct naming for the region is North Atlantic, although the coordination is made in RCM NS&EA and the fishig ground is Va+XII+XIV according 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
	Yes	No

Yes, chapter 1	Yes	No
Recommendations from RCM and LM are listed.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

NA	NA	No
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

**Region Other regions CECAF and south pacific**

**F Transversal variables**

**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?

**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?

**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?

	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
	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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	
	NA	

	For next year, maps should be in text and not in annex according to the AR guidelines	Mostly	No
<b>G2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ? 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 justified?	Yes Yes Yes	No No No
<b>G3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No specific RCM recommendation NA NA	No No No
<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA NA	No No
<b>IV</b>	<b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>		
	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 should be resubmitted	Yes Yes Yes	MS to fill tables according to guidelines and resubmit. No No
<b>A1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> 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 justified?	Yes Yes Yes	No No No
<b>A2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes Yes	No No No
<b>A3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA NA	No No No
<b>A4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes Yes	No No
<b>B</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>		
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	No
<b>B1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	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 91%, and even the same as from other source, not plausible, to be clarified? Mostly	MS should clarify why number of enterprises in register is less than 100 %
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes Yes	No No No
<b>B2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes Yes	No No No
<b>B3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA NA	No No No
<b>B4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes Yes	No No
<b>V</b>	<b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	Yes NA	No No
<b>2</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA NA	No No
<b>VI</b>	<b>Module for management and use of the data</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	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?	See general comment on data transmission from SG3 Yes Yes	No No No
	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?	In section II.A NA Yes Yes Yes	No No No No
<b>2</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes Yes	No No
<b>VII</b>	<b>Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?  Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes  Mostly	No  No



**VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations**

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

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 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

Source		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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discards information for herring, sprat and flounder submitted only for 2011. For earlier years only discards on cod reported.</li> <li>- A_CATCHES: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 351 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types.</li> <li>- Comparison of 2011 mesh size data with 2004-2010 shows that they are not consistent and significantly different.</li> <li>- Neither mesh size nor SPECON (BACOMA window, T90) information were available from the database for 2004-2010.</li> <li>- B_EFFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 549 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- C_SPECIFIC EFFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 1469 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types.</li> <li>- Mesh size data breakdown for 2011 is not comparable with previous years because of different aggregation method used (as described above).</li> <li>- E_LANDINGS: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 3730 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>	no evident explanation for failure/issues;	MS needs to clarify why data were not submitted to enduser
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital &amp; investment</li> <li>• Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings</li> <li>• Recreational catches: catches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Landings income data for 2011 not provided</li> <li>- Fleet segment level capacity data for 2012 not submitted</li> <li>- Landings weight data significantly higher than figures reported in Eurostat</li> <li>- 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</li> </ul>	no evident explanation for failure/issues; delivery of 2012 data not mandatory	MS needs to clarify why data were not submitted to enduser
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including:</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There were missing employment and economic parameters for 2008. All data was mostly provided by segments.</li> <li>- For DCF data, the following parameters were not submitted: Wages and salaries 2008, Imputed value of unpaid labour 2008, Repair and maintenance 2008, Capital costs 2008, Extraordinary costs 2008, Capital value 2008, Employment 2008 (except total employees)</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>- The data for 2010 is based on a sample of 597 establishments, which cover 41% of the total population of 1459 establishments</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>- 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;</li> </ul>	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
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discards Age</li> <li>Discards Length</li> <li>Discards Weight</li> <li>Discards Maturity</li> </ul>	Applicable. MS perform in accordance with the NP a sea-sampling programme in the area. However were no discarded cod measured in 2012.	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 (13-05) "master stock table" indicating that <i>cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed.</i> 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)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discards Age</li> <li>Discards Length</li> <li>Discards Weight</li> <li>Discards Maturity</li> </ul>	Partly applicable. MS perform in accordance with the NP a sea-sampling programme in the area. However were no discarded haddock measured in 2012. MS do not (NP) sample biological parameters (age, maturity) for this stock	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 (13-05) "master stock table" indicating that <i>cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed.</i> 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 Bothnia (Salmon in Subdivisions 22-31)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landings Maturity</li> <li>Commercial Fleets</li> </ul>	Applicable. MS collect maturity data on salmon (NP), problem with the quality of the commercial 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 22-31) is requested from some countries. 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 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	Sea trout in Subdivisions 22-32 (Baltic Sea)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commercial Fleets</li> </ul>	Probably Applicable. Problem with the quality of the commercial fleet data (species misreporting? is this DCF) that needs to be adressed.	MS needs to clarify why data were not submitted to enduser
ICES	Flounder in Subdivisions 22 to 32		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discards Age</li> <li>Discards Length</li> <li>Discards Weight</li> <li>Discards Maturity</li> <li>Discards Sex Ratio</li> </ul>	(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	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.

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

Member State:	Portugal	<b>Judgement levels</b>	
Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed		No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal		Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	XXX	NA	not applicable

I General framework

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
--------------	---------------	-----

II National data collection organisation

A 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 to the guidelines?

	EWG judgement	Action needed?
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

B Regional and International coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?  
 Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?  
 Are the responsive actions described ?  
 Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Only 2 recommendations from RCM NS&EA are listed.	Partly	MS to provide complete recommendations list
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic

III 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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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?

Table contains no inactive vessels; total no. of vessels (4866) only half of no. from fleet register (8441)	Mostly	MS is asked to provide missing data and clarify the issue about significantly lower population compare to fleet register.
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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?

Assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs are not reported in specific section as it is required in guidelines.	Mostly	In the future MS is advised to report information in correct section and to follow the requirements listed in guidelines
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

	Yes	No
	NA	NA
	NA	NA

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?

	Yes	No
	NA	NA
	NA	NA

B4 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

SUPRA-REGION Other regions

III 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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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?

table contains no inactive vessels	Mostly	MS is asked to provide missing data by resubmitting table.
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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?

Assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs are not reported in specific section as it is required in guidelines.	Mostly	In the future MS is advised to report information in correct section and to follow the requirements listed in guidelines
	NA	NA
	NA	NA

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Response rate is lower than expected, still the coverage (38%) looks sufficient	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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?

	Yes	No
	NA	NA
	NA	NA

B4 Actions to 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**

**C Biological metier related variables**

**C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
 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.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
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Only species listed in III.C.5 are reported in III.C. 6	Mostly	MS to clarify how concurrent at 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 rate for métier OTM_DEF
	Mostly	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 justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**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?

	NA	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - NAFO and adjacent areas**

**C Biological metier related variables**

**C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
 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.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
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Only species listed in III.C.5 are reported in III.C. 6	Mostly	MS to clarify how concurrent at sea is apply on board
	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
	Mostly	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 justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Mostly	No

**C4 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

**REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - ICES areas**

**C Biological metier related variables**

**C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
 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.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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Mostly	MS to provide number of Total Nuüber of trip during the sampling Year for Iberian fishing ground
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Mostly	MS to aggregate area X with the other ICES fishing grounds in the text
	Yes	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 justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Mostly	MS to provide responsive action to the recommendation on landing abroad and regional data-base
	Mostly	see comment above

**C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

	Yes	No
	Mostly	No

**REGION OTHER REGIONS - RFMOs ICCAT, IOTC, CECAF**

**C Biological metier related variables**

**C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
 Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  
 Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

	Yes	No
Some empty cells. New metier CECAF (FPO_FIF) not planed in NP	Yes	No

	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table mostly fulfilled. Some cells missing (total numbers of trips in 2012 for LPF metiers, splitting at sea / on shore for CECAF sampling frames). Inconsistencies 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
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	RFMO not fulfilled	Mostly	No
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Confusing section names for RFMO's column. Some inconsistencies 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
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Inconsistencies between III.C.4 and III.C.3. MS to clarify the good data	Mostly	MS to clarify the inconsistencies
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?		Yes	No
	Were CV targets met?	For around 33% of planned stocks, with better chievement in ICCAT region.	Partly	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>C3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		NA	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
<b>Region North Atlantic</b>				
<b>D Recreational fisheries</b>				
	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?		Yes	No
<b>D1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No data collected for sea bass in 2012, and no information provide for eel. MS to clarify if all species of sharks are forbidden for recreational fisheries or if only Salmon shark (Lamna spp.)	Partly	MS to clarify eel and sharks
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?		NA	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>D2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were data quality targets provided?		NA	No
	Were data quality targets met?		NA	No
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	No
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	No
<b>D3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		NA	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
<b>D4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
<b>E</b>	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>			
	Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?		Yes	No
<b>REGION NORTH SEA &amp; EASTERN ARCTIC</b>				
<b>E Biological stock-related variables</b>				
<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly complete.	Yes	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Sampling occurred 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
	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.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Partly	MS should better clarify how to solve the logistic problem in the future
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?	Only for cod weighth@length	Partly	No
	Were CV targets met?		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.	Yes	No
Are the deviations justified?		NA	No

**E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation listed in section 1	NA	No
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	One of RCM NS&EA 2011 on age reading task sharing, and some other older and a 2012 one.	Yes	No
Are the responsive actions described ?	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
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Proposals to improve sampling programmes by involving more 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
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Mostly	No

**REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - NAFO and adjacent areas**

**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?

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly filled. According to table III.E.2, 10 to 12 stocks were planned to be sampled in 2012 according to parameters listed..	Yes	No
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	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
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. Data collection for maturity or sex-ratios cannot be carried on board the concerned vessels.	Yes	No
Are the deviations justified?		Mostly	No
Were CV estimates provided?	Only for 12 on 28 parameters updated.	Partly	No
Were CV targets met?	For only 6 parameters on 12 provided.	Partly	No
Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
Are the deviations justified?		NA	No

Were the relevant derogations listed?	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.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	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
Are the responsive actions described ?	For 3 only. Not for the one concerning Regional data base.	Mostly	Yes, MS should describe all responsive actions
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Mostly	No

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	MS is trying to improve its sampling protocols on board and to involve more vessels in sampling programmes. Ms is ready also to improve task sharing on otoliths reading.	Yes	No
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No

**REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - ICES areas**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table mostly complete. CVs not provided for sub-area X (Azores).	Mostly	No
--	--	--------	----

	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 Iberian 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
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes for most of the stocks in Iberian areas, no at all for area X.	Mostly	No
	Were CV targets met?	For 40% of parameters in Iberian 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
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>E3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	One derogation for 7 species listed in section 1.	Yes	No
	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
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	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
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Mostly	No
<b>REGION OTHER REGIONS - RFMOs ICCAT, IOTC, CECAF</b>				
<b>E</b>	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>			
<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	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 mentioned multilateral agreements in column B. MS to clarify ?	Mostly	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	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.	Partly	Yes, MS should improve data collection in CECAF areas in the future.
	Are the deviations explained?	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	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes considering that fisheries are LDF.	Yes	No
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes for ICCAT and IOTC when samples sizes permitted to calculate CVs.	Partly	No
	Were CV targets met?	No. Samples are also small for some species.	No	No

	Are the deviations explained?	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
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>E3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation listed.	No	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	MS states "Not applicable"	No	Yes, MS should clarify why recommendations are "not applicable"
	Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	NA
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	MS states "Not applicable"	No	Yes, MS should clarify why shortfalls are "not applicable".
<b>F</b>	<b>Transversal variables</b> Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Perfect	Yes	No action by MS
<b>F1</b>	<b>Capacity</b> 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?		Yes	No action by MS
			Yes	No action by MS
			Yes	No action by MS
<b>F2</b>	<b>Effort</b> 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?	For budgetary reasons only energy consumption is collected for vessels <10m; information in text provided only for mainland, MS should specify whether the information provided refers also to other areas.	Mostly	Information and data should be given for each areas separately
		Yes for mainland. Not for other areas	Partly	MS should clarify the situation in other areas.
		Budgetary restrictions is not an acceptable justification	no	MS should pursue the solution already stated in the AR and continue the collection of effort various measures from vessels <10m
			Yes	No action by MS
			Yes	No action by MS
			Yes	No action by MS
<b>F3</b>	<b>Landings</b> 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 action by MS
			Yes	No action by MS
			Yes	No action by MS
		All census data	Yes	No action by MS
			Yes	No action by MS
			Yes	No action by MS
			Yes	No action by MS
			Yes	No action by MS
			Yes	No action by MS
<b>G</b>	<b>Research surveys at sea</b> G1 <b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> 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 ?	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
		Only for the survey carried out	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.)?  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

Due to the fact that three survey have not been performed, the survey indices are likely to be compromised	No	In future, MS should try to ensure the conduction of all planned surveys
see above	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

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

	NA	NA
	NA	NA
	NA	NA

**G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

	Yes	No
Portugal plans for a new research vessel in order replace RV Noruega, which has several operational problems.	Yes	No

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

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

**A Collection 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	No
	Yes	
Order of variables shall follow the guidelines, enterprises of different sizes are no variables.	Mostly	MS is asked to provide the data according to guidelines only for variables listed.

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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	NA	NA
	NA	NA
	NA	NA

**A4 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

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

Some data are not collected (FTE by gender/unpaid labour and epreciation of capital). SBS as datasource was used even for small size enterprises	Mostly	MS is asked to clarify whether really a Census was conducted, even for the small enterprises
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	NA	NA
	NA	NA
	NA	NA

**B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

	Yes	No
MS is asked to clarify whether depreciation is really not collected under SBS	Mostly	MS is asked to clarify whether depreciation is really not collected under SBS

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

**V 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?

Cells for indicator 5, 6, 7 are not filled in, it is not clear why the time gap for the availability for the indicator 1-4 is 3 years	Mostly	MS to clarify
	NA	

**2 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

Indicator 9 is given only for vessels with overall length > 10 metres. For vessels < 10 m MS couldn't calculate it due to the budget restrictions	Mostly	MS to clarify
	Yes	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?  
 Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

	Yes	No
see general comment	Yes	No

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

Due to financial constraints there is no progress related to the building of a central data base	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?  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**2 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

**VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations**

Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?

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

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

	Yes	No
	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 ?

--	--	--

**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?

--	--	--

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

PORTUGAL

STECF & DG MARE - Comments			EWG comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested		
JRC/DG MARE	Fishing effort		<p>- A_CATCH: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 18 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types.</p> <p>- 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.</p> <p>- Landings appear to be submitted in Kg and not in tonnes as requested in the data call.</p> <p>- B_EFFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 13 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types.</p> <p>- No data on allowed activity were provided.</p> <p>- C_SPEIDIFIC EFFORT: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 12 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types.</p> <p>- E_LANDINGS: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 18 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types.</p>	
JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	<p>Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital &amp; investment</li> <li>• Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings</li> <li>• Recreational catches: catches</li> </ul>	<p>- Financial position values not submitted</p> <p>- Only partial effort data for 2011</p> <p>- Some issue on landings data were encountered; such as landings income data for 2011 not provided, only partial landings weight submitted for several species (landings in weight did not correspond to landings in value).</p> <p>- Unpaid labour costs not submitted for 2008 and 2009</p> <p>- Fleet segment clustering information not submitted</p> <p>- Landings value data significantly higher than figures reported in Eurostat</p> <p>- 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.</p>	MS to provide missing data available through the DCF
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	<p>Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<p>- There were missing employment and economic parameters for 2008. All data was mostly provided by segments.</p> <p>- For DCF data, the following parameters were not submitted: Wages and salaries 2008, Imputed value of unpaid labour 2008, Repair and maintenance 2008, Capital costs 2008, Extraordinary costs 2008, Capital value 2008, Employment 2008 (except total employees)</p> <p>- 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</p> <p>- The data for 2010 is based on a sample of 597 establishments, which cover 41% of the total population of 1459 establishments</p> <p>- 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</p> <p>- 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</p>	<p>Same jrc comment as for Poland. To be checked first for which country it is meant. If valid for Portugal, only missing data for 2008 and quality for the following years seems to be problematic. Maybe MS just set up a data collection programme and therefor no data for 2008 are available? MS should clarify the mentioned issues.</p>
ICES	Cod in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		<p>Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity</p>	<p>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 (13-05) "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.</p>
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		<p>Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity</p>	<p>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 (13-05) "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.</p>
ICES	Red fish Sebastes mentella Subareas I and II		<p>Landings Age Landings Weight Landings Maturity Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Commercial Fleets</p>	<p>According to MS AR 2012, no stock variables data were collected on Sebastes mentella in Eastern Arctic region. Budgetary and administrative constraints did not allow to implement observers at sea programme as planned.</p>
ICES	Kitefin shark (Dalatias licha) in the Northeast Atlantic		<p>Commercial Fleets Surveys at Sea</p>	
ICES	Jack mackerel (Trachurus picturatus) in the waters of the Azores		<p>Discards Age Discards Maturity</p>	<p>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.</p>
ICES	Megrim (Lepidorhombus bosci) in Divisions VIIIc and IXa		<p>Landings Age Landings Maturity Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight</p>	<p>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 collected with good precision when calculating biological relationships. Concerning meters variables on discards, only 24 fish were measured in 2012. But no mention in AR 2012 if fish sampled were collected from landings or discards or both.</p>
ICES	Megrim (Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis) in Divisions VIIIc and IXa		<p>Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight</p>	<p>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.</p>
ICES	Black scabbardfish (Aphanopus carbo) in all the other areas		<p>Landings Length</p>	<p>According to MS AR 2012, landings were sampled and 12254 fish measured.</p>
ICES	Blue whiting in Subareas I-IX, XII and XIV (Combined stock)		<p>Landings Maturity</p>	<p>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 parameter. But no mention if they were collected from landings or discards or both.</p>

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

Member State: **Romania**

**Judgement levels**

Reference year	2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed		No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal		Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance		NA	not applicable

EWG Answer  
**XXX**

**General framework**

**National data collection organisation**

**A 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 to the guidelines?

**EWG COMMENTS**

**EWG judgement**

**EWG**

Action needed?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	No	No
	NA	No

**B Regional and International coordination**

**B1 Attendance of international meetings**

Is Table II.B.1 complete?  
Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?

	Mostly	In future ARs, MS is requested to include the full list of eligible meeting as per guidelines
	Yes	

**B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations**

Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?  
Are the responsive actions described?  
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

This section should only contain the general recommendations. The specific recommendations should be highlighted under the relevant modules	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**SUPRA-REGION**

**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.B.1-4 for each supra-region given?

	Yes	No
NA	Yes	No

**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?

fleet register contains 476 vessels, MS reports only 200; no inactive vessels listed (unlikely); MS should use segment names according to 93/2010, appendix III (minor)	Mostly	MS needs to clarify why total fleet population in AR differs from fleet register. Missing information need to be clarified and resubmitted. For segment names MS is required to follow the 93/2010 appendix III.
MS should use segment names according to 93/2010, appendix III (minor)	Yes	
table incomplete, substantial revision required; no response information, no CV; data are not provided by fleet segment; no. of enterprises must not be described per size class	No	Table needs to be resubmitted with correctly named segments respective to III.B.1 and III.B.2 Standard tables according to 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?

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 related information is missing	mostly	No
NA	NA	
NA	Yes	No

**B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

no comment	Yes	No
NA	NA	No
NA	NA	

**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?

no relevant recommendations	Yes	No
NA	NA	No
NA	NA	No

**B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

NA	Yes	No
NA	Yes	No

**REGION**

**C Biological metier related variables**

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

	NA	
--	----	--

**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**

**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 Med & Bkack Sea**

**E Biological stock-related variables**

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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 the NP)	Mostly	MS to update table according 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 the NP)	Mostly	MS to update table according to comments
Sampling year is 2011.	Mostly	MS to update sampling year. MS to clarify whether sample numbers are from unsorted catches or from retained catches.
	Mostly	MS to clarify whether concurrent sampling was actually done, in which case the additional species should be reported in table III..C.6
All metiers/frames are sampled in acc	Mostly	No
Yes, low effort in trawl fishery which all	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	
Very extensive list given	Yes	No
	Yes	
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
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 a pilot study).	Mostly	MS to provide supporting information on sharks
	NA	MS to clarify whether the derogation mentioned was accepted
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	No	Yes, MS should provide a full list of derogations.
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No
	Yes	No

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

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.
--	-----	--

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Assuming that is the entity in the year column that is wrong; whiting is sampled although not present in NP, maturity, sex-ratoin 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
---	--------	----

Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

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

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

Were CV targets met?

	Yes	No
Mostly not (despite excess sampling). The regional coordination in the sampling and the calculation of CVs with Bulgaria do not exist.	Partly	No
	No	MS should better explain the deviations on CV.
	NA	No

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?

	NA	No
MS list several recommendations from RCM Med&BS (2009-2012) incl. LM comments	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Yes. MS indicates that In next RCM 2013, it is absolutely necessary to realize a new bilateral agreement between the two Member States	Yes	No
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.	Yes	No

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?

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	No	The table IIIF1 should be re-done according to guidelines.
---	----	--

The variable "-----" is clearly a copy-paste mistake from the template. How this could be sampled as census data is a mysterium.	Mostly	The table IIIF1 should be re-done according to guidelines.
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS

	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS

**F2 Effort**

**F11** Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

In general the fleet segmentation in table IIIF1 is not consistent ("Pelagic trawlers" 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
--	--------	--

- 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

	No	The table III F1 should be re-done according to guidelines.
	No	The table III F1 should be re-done according to guidelines.
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS

- 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?

In general the fleet segmentation in table III F1 is not consistent ("Pelagic trawlers" 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
	No	The table III F1 should be re-done according to guidelines.
	No	The table III F1 should be re-done according to guidelines.
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS
	Yes	No action by MS

**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 ?

	Mostly	
MS should report the relevant international planning groups both for the demersal and acoustic surevys (PGMed is not the relevant one)	Yes	No
Only 55% of the planned hauls for the acoustic survey has been achieved. As the MS refers in the report and table only on fish trawls it is not clear if the MS has also conducted the acoustics.	Mostly	To be clarified by MS (see Comment).
MS refers to the financial problems for the acoustic survey	Mostly	No
Deviation are not caused by MS.	Mostly	No
	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.)?
- 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 ?  
Are the responsive actions acceptable?
- G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**  
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Due to the fact that only 55% of the acoustic survey has been achieved, the quality of the acoustic survey in the Black sea area could be compromised	Mostly	No
MS refers to the financial problems for the acoustic survey	Yes	No
	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
	NA	
	NA	
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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

- A Collection 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?
- 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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
CV is missing in most necessary cases, MS to resubmit	Partly	MS needs to resubmit table with CV for segments less than 70% of response rate.
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**A2** Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

MS shall be reminded that AR 2012 is for 2012 actions and that information requested in the tables shall be reported there and not in the text	Mostly	MS i to provide information in particular section following guidelines, without unnecessary data which is submitted in Standard tables.
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

MS maybe reminded that LM recommendations are requested.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**A4** 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

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**B2** Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**B4** 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

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	No

**2** 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	No

**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?

	Mostly	
	Yes	No
see general comment SG3	Yes	No
	Yes	No

- 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?

	No	MS to provide information on the status of establishing a national DCF website
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**2** 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

**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**

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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**List of acronyms and abbreviations**

- Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

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

**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**

- Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?

	Yes	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?

--	--	--



Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

ROMANIA

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	Fleet economics	Economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital &amp; investment</li> <li>• Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings</li> <li>• Recreational catches: catches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Significant amounts of missing data</li> <li>- Some capacity and landings data were not reported</li> <li>- Clustering information incomplete</li> <li>- Significant differences were observed in gross tonnage and kilowatts for 2010 and landings weight for 2009</li> <li>- Capital values and investments data not submitted</li> <li>- Capacity data (GT) higher than Eurostat statistics for 2008-2009, but lower for 2010</li> </ul>	no evident explanation for failure; contradictory to the AR information where it was indicated that all data have been collected exhaustively for 2011	MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not provided
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: 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 meters: 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 available	MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not provided
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	- 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fleet segment</li> <li>• Vessel number</li> <li>• Capacity (measure, value)</li> </ul> GSA-Segment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geographical Sub-Area</li> <li>• Fleet segment</li> <li>• Vessel number</li> <li>• Capacity (measure, value)</li> </ul>	All Task 1.1 data - not provided		MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not provided
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.2	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fishing gear class</li> <li>• Group target species</li> <li>• Vessel number</li> </ul> GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fishing period month (start-end)</li> <li>• Fishing gear class</li> <li>• Vessel number</li> <li>• Species</li> </ul>	All Task 1.2 data - not provided		MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not provided
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.3	Segment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engine power</li> <li>• Employment</li> <li>• Salary share %</li> <li>• Landing weight</li> <li>• Landing value</li> <li>• Vessel value of total fleet</li> <li>• Working days/year per vessel</li> <li>• Working hours/days per vessel</li> <li>• Variable costs of fishing/days per vessel</li> <li>• % of V.C. from fuel costs</li> <li>• Yearly fixed costs per vessel</li> </ul>	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effort measure</li> <li>• Catch or Landing</li> <li>• CPUE/LPUe</li> <li>• Discard</li> <li>• Bycatch</li> </ul> GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catch or Landing</li> <li>• CPUE/LPUe</li> </ul>	All Task 1.4 data - not provided		MS needs to clarify why missing DCF data were not provided
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.5	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Length range of captured species</li> <li>• Length average</li> <li>• Sex</li> <li>• Maturity</li> </ul>	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)

Member State:	Sweden			
Reference year		2012	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed			No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal			Partly	10-50%
			Mostly	50-90%
			Yes	>90%
Overall compliance		EWG Answer XXX	NA	not applicable

I General framework

II National data collection organisation

		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
<b>A National correspondent and participating institutes</b>				
Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?		Roles are not well described	Mostly	No
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?		No coordination meeting was held. National coordination meeting is an obligation.	Partly	No
Are derogations listed?			Yes	
If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?			Yes	
<b>B Regional and International coordination</b>				
<b>B1 Attendance of international meetings</b>				
Is Table II.B.1 complete?			Yes	No
Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?			Yes	No
<b>B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations</b>				
Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?		LM 2011 recommendations are not listed	No	MS to update list
Are the responsive actions described ?			NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?			NA	

**SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic**

III 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?		yes	no
Are information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?		yes	no

B Economic variables

Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	segments should be named according to appendix III; inactive vessels should not be listed twice	Yes	MS is advised to follow the guidelines in future AR
Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	clustering scheme confusing: 1. some segments are too big for being clustered (DTS0010, 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 segments; segments should be named according to appendix III; clusters not marked with asterisk;	Mostly	MS has to justify why segmensts with more than 10 vessels were clustered
Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Segments should be named 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	Yes	

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

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	No
Are the deviations explained?		NA	
Are the deviations justified?		NA	

**B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	No
Are the deviations explained?		NA	
Are the deviations justified?		NA	

**B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	No
Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	

**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

**REGION BALTIC SEA**

C Biological metier related variables

Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?		Yes	No
---	--	-----	----

**C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
--	--	-----	----

	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly filled. But inconsistencies between 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 ground codes not homogeneous with III.C.3, 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 occurrences 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 inconsistencies with table III.C.5. Total No of fish sampled in III.C.6 is 75649, in III.C.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 deficiencies 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	
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	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	
<b>C3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		Yes	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	MS to provide LM 2011 recommendations	No	NA
	Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
<b>REGION NORTH SEA &amp; EASTERN ARCTIC</b>				
<b>C</b>	<b>Biological metier related variables</b>			
	Are information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?		Yes	No
<b>C1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly filled. But inconsistencies between III.C.3 and III.C.4 (total numbers of trips in 2012 - respectively 19023 vs 18629 ; sampling frames KNSKE1).	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 (29 species listed in NP, 100 in AR). Most of the "new" specie in AR have low occurrences 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	No

	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Total number of fish sampled is greater in III.C.5 than in III.C.6. Table correctly filled. Some inconsistencies 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).	Mostly	MS to clarify inconsistencies between tables III.C.3 and III.C.6
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	33% only of the metiers and sampling frames were sampled as planned for 2012. All other are undersampled. Concerning stocks, achievement rates are correct for less than half of them. Main deficiencies are for <i>Coryphaenoides rupestris</i> and <i>Merlangius merlangius</i> .	Partly	no
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?		Yes	No
	Were CV targets met?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?		NA	
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	
<b>C3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		Yes	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	2011 LM recommendations not listed	No	MS to update list
	Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No

**Region BALTIC SEA**

**D Recreational fisheries**

	Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?		Yes	No
<b>D1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	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. 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.	Mostly	MS to explain the shark fishery situation
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?		NA	
	Are the deviations explained?	Not for sharks	Mostly	no
	Are the deviations justified?		NA	
<b>D2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were data quality targets provided?	No information on sharks	Yes	No
	Were data quality targets met?	No information on sharks	Mostly	no
	Are the deviations explained?	No explanation for sharks	Mostly	no
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>D3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		NA	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		NA	
	Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	
<b>D4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	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 & EAST ARCTIC;**

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

**D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

**D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

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

**D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

**E Biological stock-related variables**

	Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Yes	Yes	No
--	--	-----	-----	----

**REGION BALTIC SEA**

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

	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?	Over and under sampling reported in most of species	Mostly	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Expolanation is given to all of the stocks	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?	Full justification	Yes	No

**E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

	Were CV estimates provided?		Mostly	Missing cv's for salmon 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 limited 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**

	Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes. 2 derogations relevant to the Baltic stock listed	Yes	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
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes for pelagic stocks, salmon and eel	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No

**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?	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 protocols. Need to update on species listed above	Mostly	No

E2	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>				
	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@	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	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>				
	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	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>				
	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	<b>Transversal variables</b>				
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	No	
F1	<b>Capacity</b>				
	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	<b>Effort</b>			
		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?			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?		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	<b>Landings</b>				
	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?		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?		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	<b>Research surveys at sea</b>				
	G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	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?	79% of achieved targets for the UWTV surveys were due to the bad weather conditions	Yes	No	
	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.)?		NA		
	Are the deviations explained?		NA		
Are the deviations justified?					
G3 Follow-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			

**G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	MS refers of "A misunderstanding 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 described	Mostly	No
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Mostly	MS should ensure that in future this "agreement" will be solved in advance

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

**A 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	No
Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	The reference year is incorrect. The r	Partly	MS should resubmit table with CV indicator where non-probability sample survey was applied

**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

**A2 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

**A3 Follow-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	

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

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

**B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Is respective data quality information given?	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.	Mostly	MS has to clarify data collection method for each method
Are the deviations explained?		Mostly	MS needs to explain deviatios
Are the deviations justified?		No	MS needs to justify deviatios

**B3 Follow-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	

**B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Mostly	MS should focus more on reference year rather than on the previous years in future AR
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Mostly	MS should focus more on reference year rather than on the previous years in future AR

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

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

	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
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Are the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
<b>VI</b>	<b>Module for management and use of the data</b>		
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 proposal?	see general comment	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
<b>VII</b>	<b>Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	No
<b>VIII</b>	<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?		
<b>IX</b>	<b>IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?		
<b>X</b>	<b>X. References</b>		
	Is there a complete list of references?		
<b>XI</b>	<b>XI. Annexes</b>		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		



Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

SWEDEN

Source		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		- A_CATCH: Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 173 records with no gear 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.	no evident explanation for failure	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	- Fleet segment level capacity data for 2012 not submitted - Landings income data for 2011 not provided - Although Sweden has extensively used the guidelines on clustering, some issues on the clustering approach remain.	no evident explanation for failure: 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 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 (13-05) "master stock table" indicating that <i>cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed</i> . Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.	No action needed
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 (13-05) "master stock table" indicating that <i>cod and haddock stocks in ICES I and II are not relevant EU stocks and therefore no information is needed</i> . Additionally if country is fishing actively in the area, discard information cannot be given because discarding is prohibited by a Norwegian law.	No action needed
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 Landings Length Landings Weight Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sex Ratio	According to MS AR 2012, 1060 fish were measured for landings and 2785 for discards (metiers variables - table III.C.5). Although this species was planned for updating stock variables for 2012, no data were collected for that issue. No explanation provided in AR text by MS on that deviation. MS should provide metier-related variables collected through the DCF	MS asked to clarify why the data not provided
ICES	Sole in Division IIIa and Subdivisions 22-24 (Skagerrak, Kattegat, and the Belts)		Surveys at Sea	Sole is sampled and data is collected in IBTS survey in area IIIa, and data is available. Only few individuals are collected	MS asked to clarify why the data not provided
ICES	Demersal elasmobranchs in the North Sea, Skagerrak and eastern English Channel		Discards Age	Age reading is not applicable for Elasmobranchs in the DCF regulation!	No action needed
ICES	Whiting in Division IIIa (Skagerrak - Kattegat)		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

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



	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Text is confusing since it refers to transversal variables issues	Yes	No
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Text is confusing since it refers to transversal variables issues	No	No
<b>C3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	No
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No	MS to update text and provide relevant actions to avoid shortfalls
			NA	No
<b>Region Mediterranean and Black Sea</b>				
<b>D Recreational fisheries</b>				
<b>D1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>  Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are obtained derogations mentioned?  Are the deviations explained?		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
<b>D2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Were data quality targets provided? Were data quality targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Text is contradictory and confusing. It is difficult to follow	No	MS to amend text
			NA	No
			No	No
			NA	No
<b>D3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?		No	MS to provide list of derogations
			No	MS to provide list of recomme
			No	MS to provide actions required
			NA	No
<b>D4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Actions to take place from 2014 onwards	Yes	No
			Mostly	MS to provide more information on how this will be achieved
<b>Region Med &amp; Black Sea</b>				
<b>E Biological stock-related variables</b>				
<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>  Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No. For the future MS should always report the name of the Region as requested in the AR Guidelines 2013
		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
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Were CV estimates provided?  Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
		CVs are very low. Is this stock related?	Yes	Yes. MS should better explain the methods to calculate CV
			NA	No

		NA	No
<b>E3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Were the relevant derogations listed?  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  Are the responsive actions described ?	No No Partly	No Yes. MS should report any recommendations relevant for the AR year Yes. MS should clearly report the recommendation (that is only mentioned in the text) with the responsive action
<b>E4</b>	Are the responsive actions acceptable? <b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No NA	Yes. MS should explain the actions to avoid shortfalls in the future (i.e. low number of individuals collected during 2012) Yes. MS should explain the actions to avoid shortfalls in the future (i.e. low number of individuals collected during 2012)
<b>F</b>	<b>Transversal variables</b>	Yes	No
<b>F1</b>	<b>Capacity</b> 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?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No
<b>F2</b>	<b>Effort</b> 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 Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No No No No No
<b>F3</b>	<b>Landings</b> 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 Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No No No No No
<b>G</b>	<b>Research surveys at sea</b>	Yes	No
<b>G1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> 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 ?	Yes Yes NA NA Yes	No No No No No
<b>G2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> 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 justified?	Yes NA NA	No No No
<b>G3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA NA	No No No
<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA NA	No No
<b>IV</b>	<b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>		

**A Collection 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?  
**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?

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

**A2** Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  
 Is respective data quality information given?  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	NA	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

**A4** 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

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**B2** Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  
 Is respective data quality information given?  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**B4** 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

**V 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?

	Yes	No
	NA	No

**2** 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	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?  
 Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

	Yes	No
see general comment SG3	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) ?  
 Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

The existing data storage is described but no description on progress is given.	Partly	MS to provide information on data storage.
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**2** 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

**VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations**

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

Only 3 STECF recommendations are listed with no year and expert group name.MS also lists recommendations from the GFCM.	Partly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**VIII 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 ?

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

**X X. References**

Is there a complete list of references?

	Yes	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		SLOVENIA				
		STECF & DG MARE - Comments		EWG comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task	MS - Comments
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital &amp; investment</li> <li>Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings</li> <li>Recreational catches: catches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant amount of expenditure parameters not submitted for most of the years requested. Expenditure data for 2008 and 2009 not provided.</li> <li>Fleet segment clustering information not provided</li> <li>Economic performance indicators not estimated for 2008 and 2009 due to insufficient data (no cost items provided for those years).</li> <li>Effort data submitted only for 2010</li> <li>Reported landings value data higher than Eurostat statistics</li> </ul>	no evident explanation for failure	MS asked to clarify why the data for 2008 and 2009 not provided. MS asked to clarify the differences between DCF and Eurostat data.	
JRC/DG 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&S 2012: "RCMMed&S, 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." / Concerning survey 2012 data MS reported in the NP that "Data for each annual survey is inputted into ATRIS software by the end of the same year". So at the period of the data call (November) these data were not available. RCMMed&S 2012 stated that: "RCMMed&S, 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 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 these meters should be available/ Regarding surveys (both MEDITS and MEDIAS), JRC/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 year. RCMMed&S 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. JRC/DG MARE should be aware that not all meters present in the Appendix IV of the EU Decisions 93/2010 are sampled. In order to identify the meters to be sampled, the ranking system is yearly applied by MS and for sampling purpose, only the major meter will be considered. So not all	MS to explain missing data	
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.1	Segment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fleet segment</li> <li>Vessel number</li> <li>Capacity (measure, value)</li> </ul> GSA-Segment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Geographical Sub-Area</li> <li>Fleet segment</li> <li>Vessel number</li> <li>Capacity (measure, value)</li> </ul>	All Task 1.1 data - not provided		MS to explain missing data	
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.2	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fishing gear class</li> <li>Group target species</li> <li>Vessel number</li> </ul> GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fishing period month (start-end)</li> <li>Fishing gear class</li> <li>Vessel number</li> <li>Species</li> </ul>	All Task 1.2 data - not provided		MS to explain missing data	
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.3	Segment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engine power</li> <li>Employment</li> <li>Salary share %</li> <li>Landing weight</li> <li>Landing value</li> <li>Vessel value of total fleet</li> <li>Working days/year per vessel</li> <li>Working hours/days per vessel</li> <li>Variable costs of fishing/days per vessel</li> <li>% of V.C. from fuel costs</li> <li>Yearly fixed costs per vessel</li> </ul>	All Task 1.3 data - not provided		MS to explain missing data	
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.4	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effort measure</li> <li>Catch or Landing</li> <li>CPUE/LPUE</li> <li>Discard</li> <li>Bycatch</li> </ul> GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPUE/LPUE</li> </ul>	All Task 1.4 data - not provided	MS should provide the available data collected through the DCF	MS to explain missing data	
GFCM	GFCM - Task 1.5	GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Length range of captured species</li> <li>Length average</li> <li>Sex</li> <li>Maturity</li> </ul>	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 State:	Spain
Reference year	2012
Version of the AR reviewed	
Version of the NP proposal	
Overall compliance	EWG Answer XXX

**Judgement levels**

Compliance class	Compliance level
No	<10%
Partly	10-50%
Mostly	50-90%
Yes	>90%
NA	not applicable

**I General framework**

**II National data collection organisation**

**A 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 to the guidelines?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**B Regional and International coordination**

**B1 Attendance of international meetings**

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?

**B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations**

- Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?
- Are the responsive actions described?
- Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Give information about attendance on planned meetings. Example: WKMSSEL-2, WKAMDEEP should have information on attendance or not.	Mostly	Yes. Give information about attendance on planned meetings.
Reason for non participation needs to be clarified by meeting.	Mostly	Yes. MS should clarify reason for non attendance
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic**

**III 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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

fleet register indicates 10850 vessels (over all supraregions), table has 9456 (13% less); to be briefly clarified	Mostly	MS to clarify number of vessels
	Yes	No
table IIIB3 should contain information on unclustered segments	Mostly	MS should to provide information on unclustered segments

**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?

is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

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 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

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		

**B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		
is not possible to evaluate because the text is in spanish		

**SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea**

**III 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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

fleet register indicates 10850 vessels (over all supraregions), table has 9456 (13% less); to be briefly clarified; supra-region should be named "Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea" (negligible)	Mostly	MS to clarify number of vessels (see Comments)
supra-region should be named "Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea" (negligible)	Yes	
table IIIB3 should contain information on unclustered segments	Mostly	MS should to provide information on unclustered segments

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		

**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?

B4 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**

**III 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?

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?

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?

**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.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 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		

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 suprapregions), table has 9456 (13% less); to be briefly clarified	Mostly	MS to clarify number of vessels
table IIIB3 should contain information on unclustered segments	Mostly	MS should to provide information on 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		

	Yes	No
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		

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

	Yes	No
No real inconsistencies 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 (see Comments)
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
Oversampling on Sebastes mentella.	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
Low level of discards for Sebastes mentella.	Mostly	No

	Yes	No
CVs met for unsorted catches but not for cod discards. No Cvs for Sebastes mentella discards.	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
Low level of discard sampling.	Mostly	No

	NA	NA
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	No	No
	NA	NA



**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 NORTH ATLANTIC - ICES areas VI, VII (excl. VIIId), VIII, IX**

**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 MEDITERRANEAN SEA & BLACK SEA**

**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?

	Yes	No
No real inconsistencies 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 split in different lines.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify why sampling intensities are split in different lines.
MS to clarify why for several species the sampling intensities are split in different lines.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify why sampling intensities are split 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
	Yes	No
	Mostly	No

	NA	NA
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	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	NA
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	Yes	No
MS could review the number of fish to be sampled to find better coherence between planned and achieved targets.	Mostly	No. MS could review the number of fish to be sampled to find better coherence between planned and achieved targets. <b>Are you saying the MS should do this and resubmit? Or is this just a suggestion that the MS could do in future?</b>

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

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

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 targeting swordfish and albacore highly oversampled. Most stocks are oversampled. No discard sampling.	Partly	Yes. MS to clarify (see Comment)
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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?

	Yes	No
	Partly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	NA	NA
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	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 achieved targets.

**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?

**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?

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)
---	--------	-----------------------------------

Inconsistencies in fishing ground codes between table III.C.6 and other tables. Some inconsistencies 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
--	--------	----

Good achievement rates reached in terms of trips sampled for OTB in CECAF, but other metiers appears heavily undersampled. For tunas fisheries good achievement rates in ICCAT region except for LHP_LPF in Cantabrian Sea and Canarias, good only for longliners in IOTC region (failure for PS_LPF, especially at sea), good in IATTC+WCPFC regions. Concerning stocks, good achievement rates are obtained for well sampled metiers. Cephalopods, shrimp and anchovy are undersampled in CECAF, commercial LPF were correctly sampled in ICCAT, only albacore was sampled as planned and other tunas or swordfish heavily undersampled in IOTC, swordfish is OK in Pacific ocean.	Partly	No
--	--------	----

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?

	Yes	No
	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	NA	NA
	No	No
	NA	NA
	NA	NA

**C4 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 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 implementing monitoring programme in these regions.	Mostly	No

D Recreational fisheries

	No recreational fishery is declared in Baltic Sea and North Sea Regions	Yes	No
D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes NA NA NA	No No No No
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?	Yes NA NA NA	No No No No
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?	NA Yes Yes Yes	No No No No
D4	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

Region Mediterranean and Black Sea

D Recreational fisheries

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?	Yes NA Yes Yes	No No No No
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?	Yes NA Yes Mostly	No No No No
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?	NA NA NA NA	No No No No
D4	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
E	Biological stock-related variables Are information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Yes	No

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?	Yes Yes Yes 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. No No No
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?	Mostly Mostly Yes Yes	No No No No
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?	NA Yes Yes Yes	NA No No No
E4	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

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - NAFO and adjacent areas

E Biological stock-related variables

E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	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.
----	--	-----	--

	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	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 parameters was performed during scientific surveys, without planned targets.	Mostly	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 biological sampling are also explain when vessel skipper decides changes in fishing areas or target species.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes for the two types of data collection, surveys as observers.	Yes	No
	Were CV targets met?	Mostly. Achievement rates are in general obtained for weight@length and maturity@length, but never for sex ratio@length.	Mostly	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Variability with fish sizes in samples, difficulties for planning efficient sampling plans for these industrial fisheries.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>E3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation listed in section 1	NA	NA
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	2 recommendations of RCM NS&EA 2011 and 8th LM on task sharing are listed by MS.	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	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 protocols on board. But for surveys, it is impossible to change the protocols only to collect more biological samples.	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No
<b>REGION NORTH ATLANTIC - ICES areas VI, VII (excl. VIIId), VIII, IX</b>				
<b>E</b>	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>			
<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	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.
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Most of time, stocks were oversampled. But heavy undersampling for Nephrops and Pagellus bogaravero in IXa.	Yes	No
	Are the deviations explained?	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
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?	For most of parameters updated, when samples sizes permitted to calculate CVs.	Mostly	No
	Were CV targets met?	Precision target achieved for less than 50% parameters. Best achievement rates for weight@length and maturity@length, bad for sex-ratios@length.	Partly	No
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
<b>E3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	2 derogations listed in section 1 for stocks variables of whiting and for maturity of blue whiting.	Yes	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	3 relevant recommendations of RCM NA 2011 and 8th LM listed.	Yes	No

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?

	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

**REGION MEDITERRANEAN SEA & BLACK SEA**

**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?

Table properly filled 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 also 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 together), 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 parameters.	Yes	No
MS provided details on lightly oversampling of sardine, anchovy, monkfish and Nephrops, and lightly undersampling of red mullet.	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

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

**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?

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

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

To increase numbers of samples for stocks and parameters for which CVs were not achieved.	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**REGION OTHER REGIONS - RFMOs CECAF, ICCAT, IOTC, IATTC+WCPCF**

**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?

Table fulfilled. 10 stocks planned to be updated in CECAF, only BFT, albacore and swordfish in LDF LPF fisheries. An extra column added for comments.	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.
Good achievement rates for SPF and squid. Other Cephalopods appear as undersampled, hake as not sampled at 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 renewing of fishing agreements between EU and third countries are the more important reasons given for CECAF. Difficulties for building efficient sampling plans for LDF fisheries. For swordfish maturity, few females were fished and not during the spawning season.	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

According to DCF regulation, CVs of concerned stocks shall be provided on triennial basis, ie in the 2013 AR.	NA	NA
	NA	NA
	NA	NA
	NA	NA

**E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

	Were the relevant derogations listed?	6 derogation listed concerning tunas fisheries, and more precisely exemptions for sex ratio and maturity in ICCAT and IOTC and all stock related variables in IATTC+WCPFC	Yes	No
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	1 relevant recommendation of RCM LDF 2011 and 8th LM listed concerning CECAF.	Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Difficulties met are usual for LDF fisheries and do not come often under scientific issues.	Yes	No
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No
<b>F</b>	<b>Transversal variables</b>			
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table III.F.1 is not consistent with the guidelines, wrong template used. Table III.F.1 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 below.	Yes	No
<b>F1</b>	<b>Capacity</b>			
	<b>F11</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	The design and achievements are consistent however the information is incomplete. There's no information for capacity variables in Other Fishing Regions (OFR).	Partly	MS to complete the table.
	Are the deviations explained?		No	Yes, see main comment.
	Are the deviations justified?		No	Yes, see main comment.
	<b>F13</b> 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?			
<b>F2</b>	<b>Effort</b>			
	<b>F11</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Partly.	MS to complete the table.
	Are the deviations explained?		No	
	Are the deviations justified?		No	
	<b>F12</b> 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
	<b>F13</b> 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
	<b>F14</b> 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>F3</b>	<b>Landings</b>			
	<b>F11</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the 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.	Mostly	MS to clarify if price and value per 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 explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		No	MS to clarify why the use of sales notes for vessels landing abroad (Reg.(CE) 1224/2009) is not used as a data source.
	<b>F12</b> Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?		Mostly	MS to provide missing information on quality for the price and values per species.
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	<b>F13</b> 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
	<b>F14</b> 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>G</b>	<b>Research surveys at sea</b>			
	<b>G1</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	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?		Yes	No
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ?		Yes	No
	<b>G2</b> 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
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No

**G3 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	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**G4 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

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

**A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture**

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
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%
Miscalculations of response rate in line 15	Mostly	MS has to provide correct sample rate

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?

**A2 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?

**A4 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?

**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?

**B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

**V 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?

	Yes	No
	NA	
	NA	
	NA	

**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?

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?

**2 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

See general comment on data transmission	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No
In section II.A	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	NA	
	NA	

**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 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



Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

SPAIN

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 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 (costs), capital & investment • Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings • Recreational catches: catches	- Major quality issues as significant amount of missing datasets - Incomplete economic analysis for Spain, affecting EU overview and regional analysis - Volume and value of landings at FAO area level and national totals not submitted for any of the years requested - Capacity and capital values not submitted for all years - Effort data for 2011 not submitted; only partial effort data (energy consumption) for all years - Landings income and fishing enterprise data for 2011 not provided - Recreational catch data not submitted	no evident explanation for failure; contradictory to the AR information where it was indicated that all data have been collected submission of recreational catch data was not mandatory	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. - Discards at length information was not provided. - Effort data was not submitted. - MEDITS and other surveys data are lacking for 2012.	PS1: Regarding Medits 2012, may be MS followed the output of the RCM Med& BS 2012: "RCM Med&BS, recalling its 2011 recommendation and also the STECF EWG 11-20 recommendation on a harmonized time period required for data to be available for transmission to end-users, recommends that the time period of 6 months following the end of the collection of transversal and biological data is respected by the data calls and the end users". Regarding discards: for some métiers selected, data should be available (i.e. all OTB vessel) and MS should send it. Effort data should be submitted. Regarding GSA 2, MS should answer why data before 2009 are not available. PS2: According to MS AR 2012, discarding levels are low for most of métiers in Mediterranean. MS carried out a pilot study on this subject. Now MS continue to sample mainly OTB métiers for discards issues.3 / Regarding surveys (both MEDITS and MEDIAS), JRC/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 year. RCM Med&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. JRC/DG MARE should be aware that not all métiers 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 métier will be considered. So not all métier are sampled during the year and this could imply that data (i.e. length) for species caught by those métier are not available. Consequently, no data should be requested for those métiers/species. Regarding discards, JRC/DG MARE should be aware that RCM Med&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 métiers coverage. Moreover, the RCM Med&BS identified the key métiers important to sample for discards, providing scientific justification for not sampling certain métiers. RCM Med&BS 2010 (Varna, Bulgaria 2010) reported that "A discards behaviour table is used to provide justification for not sampling certain métiers. This justification could be based in the discards behaviour or in the non selection of métier in the regional ranking system" and recommends "to strictly follow the proposed table to sample métiers for discards" (ref- Table 7, RCM Med&BS Report, Varna 2010). Following this issue, not all métier are sampled for discards and no discards data should be requested for those métiers.	MS to clarify missing data
JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Economic data on salt water aquaculture for the years 2008-2010, including: • Income, • Personal costs, • Energy costs, • Raw material 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 tabis 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 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 (13-05) "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.	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 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.	None
ICES	Red fish <i>Sebastes mentella</i> Subareas I and II		Landings Age Landings Length Landings Weight Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity 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

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

SPAIN

STECF & DG MARE - Comments				EWG comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		
ICES	Cod in Division Vlb (Rockall)		Landings Weight Commercial Fleets		MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Cod in Division Via (West of Scotland)		Landings Age Landings Length Landings Weight Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight	According to MS NP 2011-2013, cod Via was not selected for metier and stock variables data collection. However, MS mentioned in its AR table III.C.6 that 36 fish were measured as discards of metier OTB_DEF_100-119_0_0.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Haddock in Divisions Vllb-k		Landings Weight	Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Megrim (Lepidorhombus spp) in Subarea Via (West of Scotland) and sub-area IV (North Sea)		Landings Weight Discards Weight	Transversal data to be checked. According to MS NP 2011-2013, megrim in IV and Via was not selected for metier variables data collection. However, MS mentioned in its AR table III.C.6 that 727 L. whiffiagonis and 42 L. boscii were measured as landings of metier OTB_DEF_100-119_0_0 in area VI.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Megrim (Lepidorhombus spp) in Subarea Vlb (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 mentioned in its AR table III.C.6 that 727 L. whiffiagonis and 42 L. boscii were measured as landings of metier OTB_DEF_100-119_0_0 in area VI.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Spurdog (Squalus acanthias) in the Northeast Atlantic		Landings Maturity Discards Maturity	According to MS NP 2011-2013, spurdog was not selected for metier and stock variables data collection. MS mentioned no sampling at all of spurdog in its AR table III.C.6, even when applying wide concurrent at sea sampling.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Anchovy in Division Ixa		Landings Sex Ratio	According to MS AR 2012, 1228 fishes were sampled for updating sex-ratio@length parameter, when only 1000 were planned for NP 2012. However precision target for this parameter was not achieved.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Division Ixa (Southern stock)		Landings Age Landings Length Landings Weight	According to MS AR 2012, 22927 fishes were sampled in fishing ground VIIIc/Ixa for landings 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 or discards or both.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius budegassa) in Divisions Vllb-k and Villa,b		Landings Length Landings Weight Discards Length Discards Weight Commercial Fleets	Transversal data to be checked for landings weight. According to MS AR 2012, 7389 fishes were measured for landings caught in the relevant fishing grounds and 705 for discards.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius budegassa) 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 "Iberian".	MS to clarify missing data
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 "Iberian".	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius) in Divisions Vllb-k and Villa,b		Landings Length Landings Weight Discards Length Discards Weight Commercial Fleets	Transversal data to be checked for landings weight. According to MS AR 2012, 5464 fishes were measured for landings caught in the relevant fishing grounds and 121 for discards.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions VIIIa,b,d (Northern stock)		Landings Length Landings Weight Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sex Ratio	Transversal data to be checked for landings weight. According to MS AR 2012, 79082 fishes were measured for landings caught in the relevant fishing grounds and 5351 for discards. 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 collected from landings or discards or both.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Hake in Division VIIIc and Ixa (Southern stock)		Landings Weight Commercial Fleets	Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Megrim (L. whiffiagonis) in Subarea VII & Divisions VIIIa,b,d,e		Landings Age Landings Length Landings Weight Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio Discards Weight Commercial Fleets	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. Concerning stock variables, more than 2100 individuals were collected for every parameters. No mention by MS if these fishes were collected from landings or discards or both.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Nephrops in Division VIIIc (FU 25, North Galicia)		Landings Weight	Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Nephrops in Division Ixa (FU 30, Gulf of Cadiz)		Landings Weight Discards Weight	Transversal data to be checked. According to its AR 2012, MS provided DCF metier variables at fishing ground "Iberian" level, not by functional units. For VIIIc/Ixa, 3497 individuals were measured in 2012, but only 16 for discards.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Nephrops in Division VIIIc (FU31, Cantabrian Sea)		Landings Weight	Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Nephrops in Division Ixa (FU 26-27 West Galicia and North Portugal)		Landings Weight	Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Nephrops in Division Ixa (FU 26-27 West Galicia and North Portugal)		Landings Weight	Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Megrim (Lepidorhombus boscii) in Divisions VIIIc and Ixa		Landings Weight Commercial Fleets	Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Megrim (Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis) in Divisions VIIIc and Ixa		Landings Weight Commercial Fleets	Transversal data to be checked.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Red (-blackspot) seabream in Subarea IX		Commercial Fleets		MS to clarify missing data

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

SPAIN

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 VIIb,c,j,k (Porcupine Bank, FU 16)		Landings Length Landings Weight Landings Sex Ratio Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sex Ratio	Transversal data to be checked for landings weight. According to MS AR 2012, only 372 individuals 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.	MS to clarify missing data
ICES	Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb, VIIa, VIIa-c, e-k, VIIIa-e (Western stock)		Discards Age 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 stocks 170 individuals were collected for updating length@age and sex-ratio@length parameters, and 151 for maturity@length one. No mention by MS if these fishes were collected from landings or discards or both.	MS to clarify missing data
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 (measure, value)  GSA-Segment: • Geographical Sub-Area • Fleet segment • Vessel number • Capacity (measure, value)	Segment: • Capacity (measure, value) - not provided		MS to clarify missing 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 • Variable costs of fishing/days per vessel • % of V.C. from fuel costs • Yearly fixed costs per vessel	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/LPUE • Discard • Bycatch  GSA-Segment-GearClass-SpeciesGroup-Period-Gear-Species: • Catch or Landing • CPUE/LPUE	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
IOTC	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; Iridiodon species	According to MS AR 2012, only 122 swordfish measured in IOTC region. No data collected on sharks.	MS to clarify missing data
IOTC	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	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 Selacians were measured in 2012.	MS to clarify missing data

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

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

I General framework

II National data collection organisation

A 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 to the guidelines?

B Regional and International coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?

B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?  
Are the responsive actions described ?  
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic

III 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?

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?

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?

Region North Sea and 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.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? but there is no information on  
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?

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

Action needed?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	No	MS to provide list of derogations
	NA	No

	Mostly	MS to explain '?' for 6 meetings and update table
	No	MS to give explanation for non-attendance at PGECON and any others

2011 LM recommendations should be given	No	MS to update list
	NA	No
	NA	No

	yes	No
	yes	No

inactive vessels not contained in table	Mostly	MS needs to resubmit table or to clarify why data are not reported
more clustering than in NP; some segments would not require clustering (e.g. DRB & DTS & HOK <12m )	Mostly	No
several segments are missing (e.g. TBB1012, DRB1012...), response informations not correspond with those from table III.B.1	Partly	MS needs to clarify (see Comment)

other variability indicator provided in table III.B3, but no explanation provided;	Mostly	MS to clarify (see Comment)
	NA	No
	NA	No

	yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	Yes	No
	NA	No
	NA	No

	NA	No
	NA	No

Comment: No need to put tables in the text that are the same tables found in the excel sheets	Yes	No
---	-----	----

Inconsistencies between the planned number of trips in table III.C.3 vs III.C.3	Mostly	MS to clarify inconsistencies (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 inconsistencies (see comment) and update table accordingly
---	--------	--

Time stratification column is blank. Precision is expressed in precentage.	Yes	No
	Yes	No

Over-sampling of stocks was reported in almost all cases. Undersampling in few cases. Over-sampling of 2 meters and under-sampling in several meters.	Mostly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

	Yes	No
	Partly	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

Were the relevant derogations listed?

	Yes	No
2012 recommendations are not applicable.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**Region Atlantic Region**

**C Biological metier related variables**

**C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

Inconsistencies between the planned number of trips in table III.C.3 vs III.C.3	Mostly	MS to clarify inconsistencies (see comment) and update table accordingly
---	--------	--

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

Inconsistencies between the planned number of trips in table III.C.3 vs III.C.4	Mostly	MS to clarify inconsistencies (see comment) and update table accordingly
---	--------	--

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

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

Precision is expressed in percentage. Time stratification column is blank.	Mostly	MS to update table accordingly
	Yes	

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

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
--	--------	----

**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?

	Mostly	MS to provide explanation why some CVs were not calculated.
--	--------	---

Target CVs not reached for the vast majority of stocks	No	No
--	----	----

	Partly	MS to provide explanation why some CVs were not calculated.
--	--------	---

	Partly	No
--	--------	----

**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?

	Yes	No
RCM (2011,2012) recommendations are listed. MS should only list reccs directed to MS (not e.g. LM )	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**Region North Sea & Eastern Artic**

**D Recreational fisheries**

**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?

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

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

	NA	No
--	----	----

	NA	No
--	----	----

	NA	No
--	----	----

**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?

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

	Mostly	No
--	--------	----

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

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

**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?

	NA	No
--	----	----

	No	No
--	----	----

	NA	No
--	----	----

	NA	No
--	----	----

**D4 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
--	-----	----

**Region North Atlantic**

**D Recreational fisheries**

**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?

	NA	No
--	----	----

	Mostly	MS should provide supporting information for low seabass catches
--	--------	--

	NA	No
--	----	----

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

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

**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?

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

	Mostly	No
--	--------	----

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

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

**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?

	NA	No
--	----	----

	No	No
--	----	----

	NA	No
--	----	----

	NA	No
--	----	----

**D4 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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**Region North Sea and 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?

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?

Table not consistent with NP, some rows were added. Required precision targets are missing in the table, precision expressed as percentage. Why are some cells red?. it appears as if it indicates changes from NP, but it is not explained	Mostly	MS should only report the species planned in NP Proposal. MS to clarify the 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

Yes, what does CV 0 mean? Does it mean CV=0? 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, predominantly length@age	Partly	No
MS finds DCF targets unachievable (and costly) for many stocks at the MS level. It states 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 meter section but no explanation if the derogation affects the length sampling or if it affects all variables . Derogation for species less than 200 tons or less than 10% of TAC is not need to be asked for.	Partly	MS should follow the guidelines and provide an updated list of derogations in 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
	Yes	No

**Region North Atlantic**

**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?

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 percentage.	Mostly	MS should only report the species planned in NP Proposal. MS to clarify the 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 discrepancy from planned is it beneficial if MS expanded on eg if this is affecting assessment and how MS prioritise if there is a shortage in sampling time.	Partly	MS to extend the explanations about deviations, eg if this is affecting assessment and how MS prioritise if there is a shortage in sampling time.
Yes		see above

Yes, what does CV 0 mean? Does it mean CV=0? or does it mean that CV were not calculated?	Yes	MS to explain what CV 0 means or clarify if this is an error.
---	-----	---

Were CV targets met?

For approx one quarter of the stocks*parameters, predominately length@age	Partly	No
MS finds DCF targets unachievable (and costly) for many stocks at the MS level. It states 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

Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

**E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Derogations listed in meter section but no explanation if the derogation affects the length sampling or if it affects all variables . Derogation for species less than 200 tons or less tahn 10% of TAC is not need to be asked for.	Partly	Ms should follow the guidelines and provide an updated list of derogations in section I of AR texts.
Recommendations from RCM and PGCCDBS are listed . Recommendation of LM came from RCM.	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

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?

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 descrieb how to avoid shortfalls in the present situation as well	Partly	MS need to describe how to avoid shortfalls in the present situation as well
	Partly	see above

**F Transversal variables**

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

Table III.F.1 is not consistent with AR guidelines, MS is not using the correct template.	Yes	No
---	-----	----

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	Mostly	MS shall provide explanation/information on the process used to collect effort data for vessels of or under 10 meters.
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**F12** Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  
Is respective data quality information given?  
Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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	No
	Yes	No
	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	No
	Yes	No

**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?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**F12** Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal  
Is respective data quality information given?  
Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

	Yes	No
	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**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	No
	Yes	No
	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	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?

Next year, reference to maps is not in accordance with the guidelines	Mostly	No
Quitting DYFS is not mentioned in the text	Mostly	MS to update text on this (see comment)

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No
		Yes	No
	Next year, reference to maps is not in accordance with the guidelines	Yes	No
		Yes	No
		Yes	No
<b>G2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities ? 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 justified?		
<b>G3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>  Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes NA NA	No No No
<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA NA	No No
<b>IV</b>	<b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b> 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?	yes  no  no	No MS should provide information about quality indicators by resubmitting table MS should provide information about quality indicators by resubmitting table
<b>A1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	yes yes yes	No No No
<b>A2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>  Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	no information about quality indicators (Achieved no.sample, sampled rate...) yes NA	MS should provide information about quality indicators No No
<b>A3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA NA NA	No No No
<b>A4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	lack of information about how will the pilot study affect on a better quality of data. partly see comment above	MS needs to provide actions to avoid shortfalls
<b>B</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b> Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	yes  CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Mostly	No MS should provide clarification about missing data
<b>B1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	Some of the variables are not be collected Mostly not for all variables partly no information about the missing variables no	MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment)
<b>B2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>  Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained?  Are the deviations justified?	not for all variables - CV for debt for companies >=250 missing Mostly not for all variables partly no information about the missing variables no	MS should provide informations about missing data MS needs to clarify (see Comment) MS needs to clarify (see Comment)
<b>B3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No relevant arecommendations Yes Na NA	No No No
<b>B4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes Yes	No No
<b>V</b>	<b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	Yes NA	No No
<b>2</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA NA	No No
<b>VI</b>	<b>Module for management and use of the data</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>  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?	See general comment on data transmission Yes Yes Yes No Yes NA NA	No No No Information to be provided No No No No
<b>2</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		



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

	Yes	No
	Yes	No

**VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations**

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

Recommendations listed, is not consistent with the AR guidelines.	Mostly	To be updated
No clear action described	Mostly	To be updated
Since no clear action is described, it's hard to justify	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?

--	--	--

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

UNITED KINGDOM

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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UK (without SCL) Late submissions for all data tables.</li> <li>- UK (without SCL) data 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.</li> <li>- A_CATCH: (UK without SCL) Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 2186 records with missing mesh size information mainly for pots and dredges. Several records were submitted with an invalid combination for area BSA 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 'OTH'. Several records were submitted with an invalid combination for area BSA and specific condition DEEP which were ignored in the analysis.</li> <li>- B_EFFORT: (UK without SCL) Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 505 records with missing mesh size information for mainly for pots and dredges. Several records were submitted with an invalid combination for area BSA and specific condition DEEP which were ignored in the analysis. (SCL) Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 6 records with no area information, 20 records with no gear information and 24 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types. Several records were submitted with an invalid combination for area BSA and specific condition DEEP which were ignored in the analysis.</li> <li>- C_SPECIFIC EFFORT: (UK without SCL) Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 2130 records with missing mesh size information mainly for pots and dredges. Several records were submitted with an invalid combination for area BSA and specific condition DEEP which were ignored in the analysis. (SCL) Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 8 records with no area information, 108 records with no gear information and 48 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types. Several records were submitted with an invalid combination for area BSA and specific condition DEEP which were ignored in the analysis.</li> <li>- E_LANDINGS: (UK without SCL) Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 25608 records with missing mesh size information mainly for pots and dredges. Several records were submitted with an invalid combination for area BSA and specific condition DEEP which were ignored in the analysis. (SCL) Minor issues identified in the submitted data set were 1313 records with no gear information, 217 with no area information, 100 records with no rectangle information and 841 records with missing mesh size information for various gear types. Several records were submitted with an invalid combination for area BSA and specific condition DEEP which were ignored in the analysis.</li> </ul>	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic data: fishing enterprises, employment, income, expenditure (costs), capital &amp; investment</li> <li>• Transversal data: capacity, effort, landings</li> <li>• Recreational catches: catches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quite significant amounts of missing data:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recreational catch data not submitted</li> <li>- Energy costs for 2010 not submitted for national and fleet segment levels; only partial effort data submitted (fishing trips)</li> <li>- National level capacity data (number of vessels, GT, kW) significantly less than fleet level data in 2009-2012</li> <li>- Reported landings weight higher than Eurostat statistics</li> </ul> </li> <li>- STECF EWG-11-14 commented that the UK "did not provide a complete set of economic indicators".</li> <li>- UK did not provide any data on production volume as well as raw material. Most of the economic parameters were missing.</li> <li>- For DCF data, the following parameters were not submitted: imputed value of unpaid labour (2009-2010), Energy costs 2008-2010, Raw material costs 2008-2010, Repair and maintenance 2008-2010, Debt 2008-2010, Depreciation 2008-2010, Financial costs 2008-2010, Extraordinary costs 2008-2010, Net investments 2008-2010, Raw material volume 2008-2010, Total sales volume 2008-2010. All production parameters 2008-2010</li> <li>- Data provided at the national totals level only.</li> </ul>	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- STECF EWG-11-14 commented that the UK "did not provide a complete set of economic indicators".</li> <li>- UK did not provide any data on production volume as well as raw material. Most of the economic parameters were missing.</li> <li>- For DCF data, the following parameters were not submitted: imputed value of unpaid labour (2009-2010), Energy costs 2008-2010, Raw material costs 2008-2010, Repair and maintenance 2008-2010, Debt 2008-2010, Depreciation 2008-2010, Financial costs 2008-2010, Extraordinary costs 2008-2010, Net investments 2008-2010, Raw material volume 2008-2010, Total sales volume 2008-2010. All production parameters 2008-2010</li> <li>- Data provided at the national totals level only.</li> </ul>	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 Maturity	Not applicable. MS have a bilateral agreement with DE (which is, in accordance with the contract, responsible 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.	None
ICES	Haddock in Subareas I and II (Northeast Arctic)		Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Not applicable. MS have a bilateral agreement with DE (which is, in accordance with the contract, responsible 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 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 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 ICES). Nevertheless, Northern Ireland carry out seasampling in the area and data should be available.	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

UNITED KINGDOM

STECF & DG MARE - Comments				EWG comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		
ICES	Haddock in Divisions VIIb-k		UK-England&Wales: Landings Maturity Discards Age Discards Weight Discards Maturity Commercial Fleets	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 Sex Ratio	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 ICES). England&Wales have submitted data to ICES 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 VIIa (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).	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted
ICES	Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)		UK-Northern Ireland: Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity	Applicable. Discard data available to ICES but data is considered to have low quality/representativity. To be explained. 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 available to ICES but the quality/representativity of the data is considered to be 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 sex-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 be 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, Subarea 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 ICES). England&Wales have submitted data to ICES 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)		UK-England&Wales: Landings Length Landings Weight Landings Maturity Landings Sex Ratio Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sex Ratio Commercial Fleets Surveys at Sea	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 Sex Ratio	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-dutch 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 lot of the landings take place in NL. There is a bilateral agreement between UK and NL on sampling of anglo-dutch 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

Evaluation of 2012 Data Transmission

UNITED KINGDOM

STECF & DG MARE - Comments				EWG comment	Action needed by MS, please specify task
Source	Data call/Stock/Fleet	Data requested	Missing DCF data*		
ICES	Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)		UK-England&Wales: Landings Length Discards Length	(Probably) Not applicable. Age based assessment. Landings- all MS involved in fishery have got the same comment. WG probably have not asked for the data. Discards- for other countries ICES has said that discard lengths are not relevant for the assessment method	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted
ICES	Herring in the Northeast Atlantic (Norwegian spring-spawning herring)		UK - Scotland: Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sex Ratio	Not applicable - UK do not sample pelagic fleet for discards (NP)	None
ICES	Herring in the Northeast Atlantic (Norwegian spring-spawning herring)		UK-Northern Ireland: Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight Discards Maturity Discards Sex Ratio	Not applicable - UK do not sample pelagic fleet for discards (NP)	None
ICES	Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb, VIIa, VIIc, e-k, VIIIa-e (Western stock)		UK-England&Wales: Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight	(Probably) not applicable - the discards that have been collected seems to be bycatches from demersal fisheries, no sampling of discards in the horse mackerel fishery	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted
ICES	Blue whiting in Subareas I-IX, XII and XIV (Combined stock)		UK - Scotland: Landings Maturity	Applicable. Unclear, data is not included in NP (why not?), but submitted to ICES and considered unrepresentative/low quality. Verbal agreement with DK on age and length sampling, what about maturity? No individuals sampled for age in the DK AR	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted
ICES	Mackerel in the Northeast Atlantic (combined Southern, Western and North Sea spawning components)		UK-England&Wales: Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight	(Probably) not applicable - the discards that have been collected seems to be bycatches from demersal fisheries, no sampling of discards in the mackerel fishery	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted
ICES	Mackerel in the Northeast Atlantic (combined Southern, Western and North Sea spawning components)		UK - Scotland: Discards Age Discards Length Discards Weight	(Probably) not applicable - the discards that have been collected seems to be bycatches from demersal fisheries, no sampling of discards in the mackerel fishery	MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted
IOTC	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: • Size frequency data - no data reported  Sharks: • Size frequency data - no data reported		MS asked to clarify why missing data are not submitted

\* 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>

<b>Invited experts</b>		
Name	Address	Email
Angeliki ADAMIDOU	NAGREF-Fisheries Research Institute, Greece	<a href="mailto:adamidou@inale.gr">adamidou@inale.gr</a>
Jung ARMELLE	Des requins et des Hommes, France	<a href="mailto:armelle@desrequinsetdeshommes.org">armelle@desrequinsetdeshommes.org</a>
Angeles ARMESTO	Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Spain	<a href="mailto:angeles.armesto@vi.ieo.es">angeles.armesto@vi.ieo.es</a>
Edo AVDIČ	Fisheries Research Institute of Slovenia, Slovenia	<a href="mailto:edo.avdic@zzrs.si">edo.avdic@zzrs.si</a>
Paolo CARPENTIERI	MIPAF, Italy	<a href="mailto:paolo.carpentieri@uniroma1.it">paolo.carpentieri@uniroma1.it</a>
Maria COZZOLINO	IREPA and NISEA scarl, Salerno	<a href="mailto:cozzolino@nisea.eu">cozzolino@nisea.eu</a>
Irina DAVIDJUKA	Fish Resources Research Department, Latvia	<a href="mailto:irina.davidjuka@bior.gov.lv">irina.davidjuka@bior.gov.lv</a>
Ingeborg DE BOOIS	IMARES, Netherlands	<a href="mailto:ingeborg.deboois@wur.nl">ingeborg.deboois@wur.nl</a>
Henrik DEGEL	Danish Fisheries Research Institute, Denmark	<a href="mailto:hd@difres.dk">hd@difres.dk</a>
Marina DIAS	IPMA - Instituto Português do mar e da Atmosfera, Portugal	<a href="mailto:mdias@ipma.pt">mdias@ipma.pt</a>
Christian DINTHEER	IFREMER, NANTES	<a href="mailto:christian.dintheer@ifremer.fr">christian.dintheer@ifremer.fr</a>
Michael EBELING	Institute for Seafishery, Germany	<a href="mailto:Michael.Ebeling@vti.bund.de">Michael.Ebeling@vti.bund.de</a>
Monica GAMBINO	IREPA Onlus, Italy	<a href="mailto:gambino@irepa.org">gambino@irepa.org</a>
Maria HANSSON	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden	<a href="mailto:maria.hansson@slu.se">maria.hansson@slu.se</a>
Edvardas KAZLAUSKAS	Agriinformation and Rural Business Center, Lithuania	<a href="mailto:edvardas.kazlauskas@vic.lt">edvardas.kazlauskas@vic.lt</a>
Tomasz NERMER	National Marine Fisheries Research Institute, Poland	<a href="mailto:nermer@mir.gdynia.pl">nermer@mir.gdynia.pl</a>
Gráinne NÍ CHONCHÚIR	The Marine Institute, Ireland	<a href="mailto:grainne.nichonchuir@marine.ie">grainne.nichonchuir@marine.ie</a>
Jukka PÖNNI	Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute, Kotka	<a href="mailto:jukka.ponni@rktl.fi">jukka.ponni@rktl.fi</a>
Francesca SPAGNOL GRAVINO	Independent expert, Malta	<a href="mailto:francesca.gravino@um.edu.mt">francesca.gravino@um.edu.mt</a>
Anne-Margaret STEWART	Sea Fish Industry Authority, United Kingdom	<a href="mailto:Anne.Stewart@seafish.co.uk">Anne.Stewart@seafish.co.uk</a>

Jens ULLEWEIT	von Thünen Institute, Institute of Sea Fisheries, Germany	<a href="mailto:jens.ulleweit@vti.bund.de">jens.ulleweit@vti.bund.de</a>
Sofie VANDEMAELE	Institute for agricultural and fisheries research, Belgium	<a href="mailto:sofie.vandemaele@ilvo.vlaanderen.be">sofie.vandemaele@ilvo.vlaanderen.be</a>
Maria YANKOVA	Institute of Oceanology "Fridtjof Nansen" - BAS, Bulgaria	<a href="mailto:maria_y@abv.bg">maria_y@abv.bg</a>

#### **JRC experts**

Name	Address	<a href="#">Email</a>
Cristina CASTRO RIBEIRO	EC JRC, Ispra, Italy	<a href="mailto:cristina.ribeiro@jrc.ec.europa.eu">cristina.ribeiro@jrc.ec.europa.eu</a>

#### **European Commission**

Name	Address	<a href="#">Email</a>
Amelie KNAPP	EC DG MARE, Brussels, Belgium	Amelie.KNAPP@ec.europa.eu
Bas DRUKKER	EC DG MARE, Brussels, Belgium	Bas.Drukker@ec.europa.eu

#### **STECF Secretariat**

Name	Address	<a href="#">Email</a>
Cristina CASTRO RIBEIRO	EC JRC, Ispra, Italy	<a href="mailto:cristina.ribeiro@jrc.ec.europa.eu">cristina.ribeiro@jrc.ec.europa.eu</a>
Fabrizio NATALE	EC JRC, Ispra, Italy	fabrizio.natale@jrc.ec.europa.eu

## **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., Ni 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 by sending a fax to (352) 29 29-42758.

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

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

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

---

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