



JRC SCIENTIFIC AND POLICY REPORTS

Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF (2) (STECF-13-25)

Edited by Michael W. Ebeling & Cristina Castro Ribeiro

This report was reviewed by the STECF 44th plenary meeting
held from 04 to 08 November 2013 in Brussels, Belgium.

Report EUR 26333 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
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 86119

EUR 26333 EN

ISBN 978-92-79-34657-6

ISSN 1831-9424

doi:10.2788/38245

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 (2) (STECF-13-25). 2013. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, EUR 26333 EN, JRC 86119, 21 pp.

Printed in Italy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF (2) (STECF-13-25)	4
Background	4
Request to the STECF	4
STECF observations	4
STECF conclusions	5
Expert Working Group EWG-13-07 report.....	6
1 Executive summary	7
2 Introduction	9
2.1 Terms of Reference for EWG-13-07.....	9
3 Discussions and Results of TOR 3, 4 and 5	11
3.1 TOR 3	11
3.2 TOR 4.....	17
3.3 TOR 5.....	18
4 EWG-13-07 List of Participants.....	19
5 List of Background Documents.....	21

SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF)

Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF (2) (STECF-13-25)

THIS REPORT WAS REVIEWED DURING THE PLENARY MEETING HELD IN BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, 4-8 NOVEMBER 2013

Background

Member States must submit Annual Reports to the Commission under the provisions of the Data Collection Framework Council Reg. 199/2008. These reports shall be reviewed by the STECF. The STECF EWG13-07 reviewed these reports and the STECF Plenary is invited to review the report of the EWG13-07. Note that the Member State evaluation sheets, which were prepared during the EWG13-07, have already been reviewed by STECF, but this request concerns only the outstanding ToR of the EWG13-07.

Request to the STECF

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

STECF observations

STECF notes that a detailed evaluation of MSs' data transmissions requires that the following is prepared in advance:

- a detailed list of the data specified (including e.g. segmentation) in the different data calls,
- a list specifying which data were not submitted and
- a list of derogations from the NP that have been agreed by the EC.

Such information needs to be provided to the pre-screeners by the Commission.

STECF notes that concerning section VII of the AR (follow-up of STECF recommendations), all MSs are selective with regard to which recommendations they choose to act upon and it is currently problematic to check which MSs have followed which recommendations. A first step to improve the situation could be the preparation of a list of the relevant recommendations by MS by ad-hoc contract before the meeting. For the future one may think about the storage and update of this information in a central electronic document, e.g. in the Master Reference Register or similar which MS can refer to.

STECF notes that there is an obligation to sample recreational shark fisheries.

STECF conclusions

STECF concludes that the issues highlighted by the EWG 13-07 regarding TOR 3 should be forwarded by the EC to MS for consideration in their AR 2013.

STECF considers that it is highly desirable that the current pre-screening arrangements are maintained as they proved to be very helpful for the evaluation process over the last 3 years. STECF agrees that the suggested improvements to the pre-screening process listed in chapter 3 of the EWG report would be worthwhile to make the process more efficient.

STECF concludes that a detailed evaluation of MSs' data transmissions is complex and time-consuming and requires more time and effort than is available during the EWGs dealing with these issues. In order to reduce the effort at the EWG-Meeting it should be considered if parts of the evaluation of MSs' data transmission can be done in advance by ad-hoc contracts or other means.

To improve the evaluation of ARs, STECF suggests for the next EWG dealing with AR evaluation that a request should be added to the ToRs for the EWG to discuss and decide whether the current system of compliance judgment needs a change, e.g. the application of a 5-grade scale and the introduction of a weighting system for the calculation of the overall compliance from the results for the single modules.

STECF considers that the report of the EWG 13-07 represents a thorough review of the data provided by Member States in their annual reports and endorses the findings in the report of the EWG.

REPORT TO THE STECF

**EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON
Evaluation of 2012 MS Technical Reports under DCF (2)(EWG-
13-07)**

Brussels, Belgium, 1-5 July 2013

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

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The EWG 13-07 took place from the 1st to the 5th of July 2013 in Brussels. The report is presented in two parts. The first report about this meeting contained 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 this separate second part of the report.

The expert group worked through a series of Sub Groups, presentations and plenary discussions.

The evaluation of the data transmission turned out to be problematic for several reasons. Firstly, the provided compilation table showed some wording that was difficult to understand, secondly, the information provided has not been exact in some cases and as a general comment, EWG 13-07 agreed on the following 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 has 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 with 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 overview is necessary in order to assure the pre-screener comments are valid (that the pre-screeners have similar problems is evident from the comments provided for the EWG).

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

EWG 13-07 discussed the current form of the pre-screening and concluded it to be very helpful and it should be maintained. Some suggestions for improvement to increase further consistency between the different pre-screeners have been made, e.g. a detailed list of issues to be checked and a common phrasing for frequent comments. Details are given in chapter 3.

Furthermore, the form of the evaluation sheet has been dealt with and proposals in order to harmonize the evaluation and standardize the judgment when compiling the different module evaluation results are given. This includes a change in the judgment levels to a 5 point scale per module and a weighting when the module judgments are compiled to the overall compliance judgment. For the individual issues to be checked under each module it is proposed to change to the items “done well”, “minor issues” and “serious problems”.

For the guidelines and the standard tables EWG 13-07 made several proposals in order to increase consistency and avoid misunderstanding. The details are given in chapter 3.

EWG 13-07 also dealt with the future format/process of the evaluation of the execution of the National Programmes/Annual Work Plans. It is suggested to have this issue to be dealt with in depth at the next EWG meeting dealing with the new DCMAP. It is suggested to consider end-user needs, the possibilities of automatic reports from Regional Data Bases and automatic checking of right format of entries respectively to restrict entries to valid formats and wordings.

Finally, some general remarks are made, e.g. to provide a table with the evaluation results for the whole National programme period, and to send out a VMS data call or if not, to not evaluate VMS data during the EWG meeting. More details are given in chapter 3.

2 INTRODUCTION

This part of the report contains the results of the work carried out to address the TOR 3,4 and 5 of the EWG 13-07 meeting. It mainly consists of the remarks, comments, proposals and suggestions for recommendations of the EWG 13-07 to STECF. If it was necessary, some details of the discussion and key arguments in order to support and explain the results are presented. As there have been no relevant comments from STECF Plenary to the EWG 13-07, the TOR 5 did not need further consideration.

2.1 Terms of Reference for EWG-13-07

The reader might be reminded that only the TOR 3,4 and 5 are addressed within this report.

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

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

Terms of Reference (Version 1 July)

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

1. Evaluate Member States Annual Reports for 2012 in accordance with Article 7.2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008, taking into account;
 - a. The execution of the National 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 DISCUSSIONS AND RESULTS OF TOR 3, 4 AND 5

In this part of the report the main arguments and conclusions of the discussions concerning possible improvements of the pre-screening process, the evaluation of the Annual Reports, the improvement of the current guidelines and the format and process of reporting the actions taken by the MS to implement and execute their National Programme are presented. Also some remarks and thoughts on the future of the evaluation process are given.

3.1 TOR 3

Pre-screening

The Pre-screening was concluded to be very helpful and shall be remained. The following suggestions have been discussed and are proposed to be implemented in the future:

- There shall be explicit and clear guidelines for the pre-screeners
- For the comments of the pre-screeners' language standards should be introduced
- The experts felt that at times the language used to describe data failure issues was too strong or unjustified. Some experts felt that diplomatic language should be used at all times.
- A module by module approach with regional expertise and a summarizing session by MS during the EWG is suggested to be retained. However, the EWG 13-07 suggests that for the pre-screening of the biological parameters it should be checked if it could be done by country based on the regional expertise of the pre-screeners. This approach is assumed to improve consistency of the evaluation within one country.
- The transversal module should be checked by both Economists and Biologist
- Change judgment levels to “done well“, “minor issues” and “serious problems”

EWG 13-07 would welcome an electronic tool in order to support pre-screening with respect to terminologies and formats used and with NP figures. But it is still questionable if an electronic check can do all the pre-screening exercise beside simple compare content of cells and cross-checking. Maybe human skills are still superior and so a mix would be more adequate. Pre-screeners could then concentrate on conceptual and compliance issues.

General issues

- Many of the issues were minor and related to formatting. The economic components of the technical tables were often not completed in the standardized manner. All MS should follow the guidelines when compiling the tables.
- It was common for most MS to forget that there is an obligation to sample recreational shark fisheries. It is not considered sufficient to say that no fishery exists. Member States must

provide evidence of this to support the request for derogation not to sample sharks in module III.D

- Many Member States only included the meetings they attended in Table II.B1. Table II.B1 should contain the full list of DCF eligible meetings, showing planned attendance by the MS and also which meetings were actually attended in the current year.
- In the case where Multi – lateral agreements on sampling exist between several MS, each MS involved should highlight in their respective report where the sampling can be found, e.g. which MS is reporting the sampling in their annual report.
- Some MS added additional stocks sampled to Table III.C.5, even though these were not planned and not in the NP. This should be avoided. The same applies for tables III.E.2; III.E.3. All deviations should be reflected in the text. Additional stocks sampled are to be reported in Table III.C.6.
- Achieved sample rate, response rate, CV and other variability indicators in table III.B.3 were often not completed or only partially completed with no explanation as to why.
- Spain is the only country providing its AR not in English but in Spanish. This situation prevented the EWG experts to duly evaluate the Spanish Technical Report, specifically the components related with fleet economic, aquaculture and fish processing industry. For the future at least a translation should be available for the EWG during the meeting
- On section VII (follow-up of STECF recommendations): All countries seem to pick out different recommendations, and it is not possible to check for all countries if this list is complete.

Suggestion:

To STECF-EWG: clearly address recommendations to MS (either by listing specific countries, or address to ‘all MS’ or to ‘all MS involved in sampling in Mediterranean/Black Sea/North Sea/North Atlantic/other areas’)

To JRC/EC: provide list of relevant STECF recommendations by MS to STECF-EWG on evaluation of AR and to MS before compiling the AR.

Guidelines

- In the Guidelines it is stated: “List the shortfalls (if any) in the achieved actions compared to what was planned in the relevant NP proposal, and explain the reasons for the shortfalls.”
- It is suggested to add “If no shortfalls are encountered, state explicitly”.
- All changes of NP, in particular minor changes and amendments should be reported in a table in section I of the AR.

- The guidelines which MS follow when completing the economic technical tables should clearly state the format in which Response Rate and Achieved Sample Rate should be reported. At present, it is unclear whether the figure should be reported in % or number format. One table “Description of fields” does not mention about percentage value whereas table “Definition of accuracy indicators” refer to %.
- To be considered for new guidelines: It is not clear why in III.B.1 there is a prefix “active gear” or “passive gear” to the segment gear characterization. This is not requested in III.B.2 or III.B.3 (and makes little sense anyway).
- The methodology for clustering segments should be clearly explained in the guidelines. Experts recommend that this issue is given a dedicated section in the guidelines. At present there is a real issue with the formatting which included clustered and unclustered segments in tables III.B.1, III.B.2 and III.B.3 (asterisk and without asterisk).
- It can be difficult to evaluate the Recreational Fisheries module III.D as there is currently no common format for presenting this data. Levels of details provided by MS vary widely. The guidelines need to be updated in this module, e.g. currently under heading III.D.2 “Data Quality” the guidelines ask the MS to merely list any shortfalls. This is the section where the achieved recreational fishery sampling should be detailed.
- If the guidelines are updated the relevant section in the evaluation form has also to be updated.
- CV calculations formulas were at times questionable.
- In Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 EWG suggests that each metier is assigned to one row only and the distinction between concurrent sampling at sea and concurrent sampling in the market should be made in the columns. Also Table III.C.4 should be sufficient for evaluation; there is no reason to also have the same details in Table III.C.3.
- Tables III.C.5 and Table III.C.6 essentially report the same data. The only additional information reported in Table III.C.6 is a list of by – catch species sampled, by metier, EWG 13-07 questioned if this information is needed? Conclusion: To be reviewed in detail whether III.C.6 shall be kept!
- Appendix VI (economic variables) contains some variables which are characterized as transversal. It has to be clarified whether they should be presented in III.B.3 (called “economic data collection...”) or in III.F.1 (called “transversal data...”). Both approaches have been followed by MS.
- To be clarified in guidelines: Gross value of landings should no longer be presented in III.B.3, it is contained in III.F.1.
- In III.F.1 there is no clear nomenclature for fleet segments. It should be harmonised all through the document (applying also to III.B.1-3), i.e. it should always be two cells, one for 3-letter gear code, one for length class. Moreover, several MS used “ALL” as segment name to characterize figures which apply to all segments. This approach should be allowed.

- The column “Region” in III.F.1 requires clarification. The template suggests the understanding of regions in the sense of RCM regions. Most MS, however, interpret it as supra-region. To be clarified by guidelines.
- Footnote c) in III.F.1 is often being ignored. It should be followed. There is a bit of contradiction to footnote a). Maybe both footnotes could be combined to one clear explanation/remark.
- Table VI_1 (transmission of data) cannot be checked against NPs as the table is only provided as a template in the NPs. Clear guidelines on the level of detail should be provided for Table VI_1, if it will be kept (see below):

Suggestion (also relevant for data transmission evaluation):

Remove Table VI_1. The evaluation should rely on the outcome of the evaluation of Data Transmission done by end-users. DT2012 sheet in pre-screening document can be used as starting point. To be added in the DT2012: overview of uploaded data by MS in international databases (e.g. DATRAS, RDB, FishFrame, etc.). Standardized output reports from those databases are required for good evaluation.

Data transmission table should be provided by ICES, JRC, GFCM, RCMs for their respective data calls to MS, and follow-up should be put into the AR by MS. In this way the data transmission can be evaluated properly.

Evaluation form

- Some issues are recurrent for certain MS. They are often minor and therefore do not require action. As they are recurrent, it appears like MS have never been informed about minor issues. Nonetheless the issues should be forwarded to the MS – without requiring a response.
- To improve evaluation of MS Technical Reports under DCF it is suggested to change the judgment to a 5 point scale with qualitative explanation! In order to harmonize the evaluation, a weighting of modules for calculation of overall compliance shall be done. A suggestion is shown in the following table:

Module/Section	Weight
I. General framework	4%
II. National data collection organisation	1%
IIIA. General description of the fishing sector	0.5%
IIIB. Economic variables	15%
IIIC. Metier-related variables	15%
IIID. Recreational fisheries	5%

IIIE. Stock-related variables	15%
IIIF. Transversal variables	15%
IIIG. Research surveys at sea	15%
IVA. Collection of data concerning aquaculture	3%
IVB. Collection of data concerning the processing industry	3%
V. Module of evaluation of effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem	2%
VI. Module for management and use of the data	3%
VII. Follow-up STECF recommendations	3.5%

- The question relating to the presence or absence of the Table of Derogations should be presented under Module I.
- Module III G 1: check for relevant Survey Planning Group recommendations addressed to MS, instead of recommendations from LM meetings.
- Module V: it is hard to evaluate data availability for VMS data as there is no data call for VMS data.

Suggestion:

If interested in the evaluation of data availability, send out a data call for VMS data, and otherwise don't evaluate.

- Currently, it is not possible to detect minor issues that occur for a number of years in a row. It should be possible to alert a MS when recurring issues occur.

Suggestion:

Provide evaluation results for the full period of the program (as recommended by STECF-EWG 12-08).

- It is unclear why the question about the website is contained in Module VI? The updated guidelines state "Added: Information on a national DCF website (ref. Commission Regulation 665/2008 article 8(2)) should be given".

Suggestion:

- Move question to Module II.
- Rephrase the question to 'Is there a DCF website available?'
- Add question; is the information provided in line with the legal requirements?
- It is hard to evaluate information that is not in the report, especially regarding the "Actions to avoid shortfalls." Proposal: Add category 'Cannot be judged' in the evaluation sheet.

- The questions are not consistent throughout the modules.

It is proposed that the evaluation sheet is updated in a way that the following questions apply to each (sub)module:

- i. Is Table XXX in line with AR guidelines?
- ii. Is Table XXX complete?
- iii. Are the results consistent with the NP proposal?
- iv. Are deviations listed?
- v. Are deviations explained?
- vi. Are deviations justified?
- vii. Are responsive actions/actions to avoid shortfalls* described?
- viii. Are responsive actions/actions to avoid shortfalls* acceptable?

*terminology might depend on module

3.2 TOR 4

Concerning the data transmission evaluation exercise EWG 13-07 concluded:

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 has 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 with 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.

Some specific remarks may help to understand discrepancies in data submitted by MS in order to not qualify them as failures:

- The Eurostat data used for comparison of landings data in the transmission report are not appropriate as they refer to landings within the MS, but not to landings of the MS fleet. This type of comparison should be either cancelled, or the appropriate numbers and the source of those numbers should be provided. Furthermore, Eurostat data are maybe not converted to live weight.
- Provision of recreational catch data was not mandatory; they were included in call templates, but they were not listed in the official data call letter.

Currently, the AR is designed as the NP is being designed, and the data reporting follows the modules. It is suggested that data reporting by MS is maybe being done following the end-user requirements. This point should be a TOR at next EWG meeting dealing with DCMAP. Maybe RDBs could serve to provide a standardized output?

EWG 13-07 noticed (at least for III.B.1-3 and III.F.1) several problems with data formats and missing entries. This may be avoided if the AR had to be delivered in a format suitable for a database, similar to data call.

More emphasis of the evaluation should be given to the delivery of data in the calls rather than to simple formal issues.

Some AR tables (e.g. III.B.3, III.F.1) have become different from the NP tables – in contrast to the original intention. This makes a sound comparison almost impossible and should by all means be avoided in the future. (Reminder for further meetings dealing with AWP)

3.3 TOR 5

No comments relevant for EWG 13-07 have been made by STECF plenary.

4 EWG-13-07 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1 - Information on STECF members and invited experts' affiliations is displayed for information only. In some instances the details given below for STECF members may differ from that provided in Commission COMMISSION DECISION of 27 October 2010 on the appointment of members of the STECF (2010/C 292/04) as some members' employment details may have changed or have been subject to organisational changes in their main place of employment. In any case, as outlined in Article 13 of the Commission Decision (2005/629/EU and 2010/74/EU) on STECF, Members of the STECF, invited experts, and JRC experts shall act independently of Member States or stakeholders. In the context of the STECF work, the committee members and other experts do not represent the institutions/bodies they are affiliated to in their daily jobs. STECF members and invited experts make declarations of commitment (yearly for STECF members) to act independently in the public interest of the European Union. STECF members and experts also declare at each meeting of the STECF and of its Expert Working Groups any specific interest which might be considered prejudicial to their independence in relation to specific items on the agenda. These declarations are displayed on the public meeting's website if experts explicitly authorized the JRC to do so in accordance with EU legislation on the protection of personnel data. For more information: <http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/adm-declarations>

Invited experts		
Name	Address ¹	Email
Angeliki ADAMIDOU	NAGREF-Fisheries Research Institute, Greece	adamidou@inale.gr
Jung ARMELLE	Des requins et des Hommes, France	armelle@desrequinsetdeshommes.org
Angeles ARMESTO	Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Spain	angeles.armesto@vi.ieo.es
Edo AVDIČ	Fisheries Research Institute of Slovenia, Slovenia	edo.avdic@zzrs.si
Jörg BERKENHAGEN	VTI-Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Fo, Germany	joerg.berkenhagen@vti.bund.de
Paolo CARPENTIERI	MIPAF, Italy	paolo.carpentieri@uniroma1.it
Maria COZZOLINO	IREPA and NISEA scarl, Salerno	cozzolino@nisea.eu
Irina DAVIDJUKA	Fish Resources Research Department, Latvia	irina.davidjuka@bior.gov.lv
Ingeborg DE BOOIS	IMARES, Netherlands	ingeborg.deboois@wur.nl
Henrik DEGEL	Danish Fisheries Research Institute, Denmark	hd@difres.dk
Marina DIAS	IPMA - Instituto Português do mar e da Atmosfera, Portugal	mdias@ipma.pt
Christian DINTHEER	IFREMER, NANTES	christian.dintheer@ifremer.fr
Michael EBELING	Institute for Seafishery, Germany	Michael.Ebeling@vti.bund.de

Monica GAMBINO	IREPA Onlus, Italy	gambino@irepa.org
Maria HANSSON	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden	maria.hansson@slu.se
Edvardas KAZLAUSKAS	Agriinformation and Rural Business Center, Lithuania	edvardas.kazlauskas@vic.lt
Tomasz NERMER	National Marine Fisheries Research Institute, Poland	nermer@mir.gdynia.pl
Gráinne CHONCHÚIR	NÍ The Marine Institute, Ireland	grainne.nichonchuir@marine.ie
Jukka PÖNNI	Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute, Kotka	jukka.ponni@rktl.fi
Francesca SPAGNOL GRAVINO	Independent expert, Malta	francesca.gravino@um.edu.mt
Anne-Margaret STEWART	Sea Fish Industry Authority, United Kingdom	Anne.Stewart@seafish.co.uk
Jens ULLEWEIT	von Thünen Institute, Institute of Sea Fisheries, Germany	jens.ulleweit@vti.bund.de
Sofie VANDEMAELE	Institute for agricultural and fisheries research, Belgium	sofie.vandemaele@ilvo.vlaanderen.be
Maria YANKOVA	Institute of Oceanology "Fridtjof Nansen" - BAS, Bulgaria	maria_y@abv.bg

JRC experts

Name	Address	<u>Email</u>
Cristina CASTRO RIBEIRO	EC JRC, Ispra, Italy	cristina.ribeiro@jrc.ec.europa.eu

European Commission

Name	Address	<u>Email</u>
Amelie KNAPP	EC DG MARE, Brussels, Belgium	Amelie.KNAPP@ec.europa.eu
Bas DRUKKER	EC DG MARE, Brussels, Belgium	Bas.Drukker@ec.europa.eu

Cristina CASTRO RIBEIRO	STECF Secretariat, EC JRC, Ispra, Italy	cristina.ribeiro@jrc.ec.europa.eu
Fabrizio NATALE	STECF Secretariat, EC JRC,	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 (see also section 4 of this report – List of participants)

European Commission

EUR 26333 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 (2) (STECF-13-25).

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: EBELING M., ADAMIDOU A., ARMESTO A., AVDIČ MRAVLJE E., CARPENTIERI P., COZZOLINO M., DAVIDJUKA I., DE BOOIS I., DEGEL H., DIAS I. M., DINTHEER C., GAMBINO M., HANSSON M., JUNG A., KAZLAUSKAS E., NERMER T., NÍ CHONCHÚIR G., PÖNNI J., SPAGNOL GRAVINO F., STEWART A.-M., ULLEWEIT J., VANDEMAELE S., YANKOVA M. & RIBEIRO CASTRO C.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

2013 – 21 pp. – 21 x 29.7 cm

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

ISBN 978-92-79-34657-6

doi:10.2788/38245

Abstract

The Expert Working Group meeting of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries EWG 13-07 was held from 1 to 5 - July in Brussels, Belgium, to evaluate the MS Technical Reports for 2012 of the DCF. The EWG report was reviewed by the STECF during its 44th plenary meeting held from 4 to 8 November 2013 in Brussels (Belgium).

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.

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.



ISBN 978-92-79-34657-6

