



European  
Commission

JRC SCIENTIFIC AND POLICY REPORTS

## Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

# Evaluation of 2013 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission (STECF-14-13)

Edited by Cristina Castro Ribeiro & Arina Motova

This report was reviewed by the STECF during its 46<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting  
held from 07 to 11 July 2014 in Copenhagen, Denmark

Report EUR 26811 EN

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

Contact information

STECF secretariat

Address: Maritime Affairs Unit, Via Enrico Fermi 2749, 21027Ispra 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 91550

EUR 26811 EN

ISBN 978-92-79-39783-7

ISSN 1831-9424

doi:10.2788/12174

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2014

© European Union, 2014

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

How to cite this report:

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

Printed in Italy

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Request to the STECF .....	3
STECF observations .....	3
STECF conclusions and recommendations .....	5
Expert Working Group EWG-14-07 report.....	5
1 Executive summary .....	6
2 Introduction .....	8
2.1 Terms of Reference for EWG-14-07.....	8
2.2 Pre-screening exercise.....	9
2.3 General overview from Pre-screening exercise .....	9
3 ToR1: Evaluation of Member States Annual Reports for 2013 .....	12
3.1 Overall Evaluation.....	14
3.2 SUB GROUP 1 .....	15
3.3 SUB GROUP 2 .....	16
3.4 SUB GROUP 3 .....	18
3.5 SUB GROUP 4 .....	20
4 ToR 2: Evaluation of Member States transmission of DCF data to end users in 2013	23
5 ToR 3: Evaluate how the exercise of Annual Report preparation and evaluation by STECF could be simplified in future .....	26
6 EWG-14-07 List of Participants.....	27
7 List of Background Documents.....	32
ANNEX 1 – MEETING AGENDA .....	33
ANNEX 2 – DETAILED AR EVALUATION FORM BY MS.....	34
ANNEX 3 – DETAILED DT EVALUATION TABLE BY MS.....	156
ANNEX 4 –TEMPLATE OF THE EVALUATION FORM FOR THE ANNUAL REPORT EVALUATION .....	238
ANNEX 5 – EXERCISE ON THE USE OF A QUALITATIVE EVALUATION.	245
ANNEX 6 – REPORT ON IMPROVEMENT OF EVALUATION PROCESS, STECF EWG 14-07.....	247

SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF)

**Evaluation of 2013 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission (STECF-14-13)**

**THIS REPORT WAS REVIEWED DURING THE PLENARY MEETING HELD IN  
COPENHAGEN, DENMARK, 7-11 JULY 2014**

**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 acknowledges the intensive and thorough work performed by EWG 14-07. All three Terms of Reference have been fully addressed. The Annual Reports 2013 of 22 MS, excluding the Bulgarian Annual Report (withdrawn from evaluation), were reviewed in relation to MS National Programme proposals for 2011-2013 or updates for 2013. As in previous years, the Annual Reports were pre-screened by a group of experts before the meeting, which again facilitated an effective evaluation of the extensive material (report text and standard tables) provided by MS. STECF acknowledges that the EWG explored a first approach for a more quantitative evaluation of MS compliance with the DCF and the Annual Report guidelines, based on suggestions from EWG 13-07.

Additionally, the EWG 14-07 reviewed tables with information from end-users on data transmission by MS in 2013. STECF notes that the coverage of RFMOs in the end-user feedback has improved compared to previous years. In contrast to last year's evaluation of data transmission, the MS reply on end-user comments was already included in the tables. STECF acknowledges this progress, as the EWG was one step ahead in the process of communicating data transmission failures between end-users, the Commission and MS. Moreover, a complete list of MS derogations was available to the EWG, which facilitated judgements on the relevance of some end-user comments that indicated missing data from MS in cases where MS were not obliged to collect these data due to an approved derogation.

Altogether, the EWG 14-07 has reviewed more than 400 data transmission issues. STECF notes, however, that an indication of severity of data transmission failures or delays was not included in the

data transmission tables. This information would have allowed the EWG to appropriately comment on the likely negative effects of data transmission failures on the end-user work, which would help the Commission in applying financial sanctions to MS that are “proportionate to the degree of non-compliance” (Reg. 199/2008, Article 8.6).

STECF acknowledges that the EWG 14-07 has provided valuable input for improvements of the Annual Report evaluation process under its ToR 3, including a short-term and long-term scenario.

## **STECF conclusions**

### Annual reports

STECF concludes that the pre-screening of Member States’ DCF Annual Reports and Data Transmission issues should be continued. To ensure effective quantitative evaluation of compliance as started by EWG 14-07, STECF considers that this approach is further explored and addressed by the EWG 14-17 and that objective criteria are defined to categorise MS compliance.

To continue the improvements of the Annual Report evaluation process and to assess MS compliance, STECF considers that the guidelines and table templates for submission of MS’ Annual Reports and evaluation sheets be amended and guidelines for pre-screeners be established in accordance with the suggestions in the EWG 14-07 Report.

STECF concludes that the EWG 14-07 report provides sufficient information to identify cases of non-compliance and cases where additional information is needed from MS.

### Data transmission

STECF concludes that EWG 14-07 did its best in supporting the Commission in identifying relevant data transmission failures. To further improve the evaluation process, STECF urges the European Commission to seek feedback from end-users of DCF data analyses to indicate the severity of any impacts of data transmission issues on their work.

The EWG 14-07 Report identifies several issues associated with compliance of data transmission and STECF requests the Commission to provide further guidance and clarification on how to deal with such issues before next year’s evaluation.

### Compilation of STECF recommendations for consideration by MS in their Annual Reports

MS are obliged to respond to STECF recommendations in their Annual Reports. The EWG is then required to evaluate whether MSs have adequately addressed these in their ARs. Given that a compiled list of STECF recommendations for action by MSs is not currently available, STECF considers that it would be beneficial if an *ad hoc* contract could be provided to compile such a list. The compiled list could then be forwarded to the European Commission for consideration and transmitted to MS and EWG. To ensure that MSs are kept fully informed of any future actions arising through the evaluation process, STECF proposes that the Commission (DG MARE) maintains and amends the compiled list and circulates to MSs annually.

**EXPERT WORKING GROUP EWG-14-07 REPORT**

**REPORT TO THE STECF**

**EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON  
Evaluation of 2013 MS DCF Annual Reports  
& Data Transmission  
(EWG-14-07)**

**Oostende, Belgium, 23-27 June 2014**

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 STECF Expert Working Group (EWG 14-07) met in Oostende, Belgium, from the 23<sup>rd</sup> to the 27<sup>th</sup> of June to assess Annual Reports (AR) of the 23 non landlocked Member States. Under the process of evaluation and approval of the outcomes of the National Programmes (NP), the European Commission is legally bound to consult STECF about the execution of the NP approved by the Commission and about the quality of the data collected by the Member States (MS) in accordance with Articles 7.1 and 7.2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008. **The task of assessing the Member States AR constitutes the Term of Reference 1 (ToR1) of this EWG.**

In addition, annually the Commission needs to evaluate the level of compliance of the DCF Data Transmission (DT) by the Member States to the end users and its ability to meet the criteria set up by the end users. The EWG was requested to assess the feedback from seven end users on 2013 data transmission. Those end users are: ICES, GFCM, ICCAT, NAFO, STECF/DG MARE, IOTC and WCFCP. The total number of data transmission issues the group had to assess was 429, unevenly divided over the 23 MS. **This task constitutes the ToR2 for this EWG.**

Annual reports and Data Transmission reports were assessed by a group of pre-screeners before the EWG meeting. The pre-screening exercise took place beforehand and has proved to be an extremely important step to facilitate the EWG evaluation. However, questions on consistency and coherence across pre-screeners evaluation were raised in this meeting as they have had also been raised in the previous EWG 13-07. The need for a guiding document to support the pre-screening exercise is a major conclusion the pre-screeners group has drawn from their experience. The outcome of the pre-screening was presented to the group at the beginning of the meeting and their conclusions are included in this report under section 2.2. The results of the pre-screening were made available to the STECF EWG experts by the 17<sup>th</sup> of June.

Under the EWG, the assessment of the AR and DT issues were carried out in subgroups. The 30 experts attending the meeting were split into four subgroups and tasked with different modules from the annual report, in accordance with the expertise in the subgroup. The expertise was split into two subgroups of biologists, one subgroup of economists and a subgroup of economists and biologists. The latter subgroup, with mixed expertise, was in charge of the evaluation of transversal variables from the AR and the whole set of DT issues. This was the first time both biologists and economists worked together within a subgroup and at the end the format has proven to be effective to assess the issues related with both biological and economic data.

To thoroughly comply with ToR 1 and ToR2, the EWG was requested to produce two types of outputs, one template (excel file) for each Member State (MS) with the evaluation of their Annual Report and another template (excel file), for each MS with the evaluation of the Data Transmission exercise.

The EWG was able to thoroughly address ToR 1 and ToR2 and according to the request, two templates were produced for each MS. Those are included in the report under Annexes 2 and 3, and organized by MS in alphabetical order.

The conclusions from ToR 1 - Evaluation of the Annual reports, are:

- The annual reports from 22 MS were duly evaluated;

- Serious problems encountered in the Bulgarian Annual Report has prevented the group from evaluating the AR from this MS;
- Overall, the level of achievement of the 2013 Annual Reports shows an improvement compared with previous years; it shows an improvement in quality for both the achievements attained by MS and their reporting procedures.
- 3 MS scored with an overall evaluation of Yes (compliance level >90%), 15 MS with an overall evaluation of Mostly (50%<compliance level<90%), and 4 with Partial (10%<compliance level <50%) .
- However, three MS have shown a decrease in overall compliance compared with last year's evaluation. These MS are Finland, Malta and Romania.

The conclusions from ToR 2 – evaluation of Data Transmission Issues are:

- 429 data transmission issues were evaluated;
- From these, 320 issues were judged as satisfactorily justified by MS, 79 unsatisfactorily explained or justified, and there were 40 issues, that due to their nature, were not possible to judge and therefore were identified in the judgment as NA (Not possible to Assess).
- Even though the task has been accomplished, the group concluded that the exercise on the assessment of the data transmission compliance still needs to be fine-tuned by the Commission before it's being send to the EWG for the assessment. Moreover, there are several issues for which its clarification is paramount for the good development of the work. The EWG suggest these issued to be clarified and/or solved before next year's evaluation. These issues are identified under Section 4.

Apart from the exercise on the assessment of the AR and on the data transmission compliance, the group was also tasked with a **ToR3**, request to **identify actions that could improve this exercise in the future**, either by the use of some IT tools or by identifying how the process can be simplified in the future and also taking into account the outcomes and suggestion from STECF 13-25.

This ToR 3 was firstly addressed by a subgroup of experts and afterwards discussed in plenary. The EWG has succeeded in fully addressing the ToR by producing a stand-alone document, included in Annex 6. This document tackles the ToR by first describing the current reporting and assessing process for both the MS and the STECF EWG, and then by identifying actions and the way forward by suggesting two scenarios:

- 1) **a Short term scenario** (thoroughly exploited) that shall be implemented prior to December 2014 and for which a complete and very comprehensive description of the actions to be taken is included; and
- 2) **a Long term scenario** that goes along with the envisaged new DCF and briefly exploits the idea of having an IT platform dealing with data provisions and IT tools for the Member States' reporting activities and for the subsequent exercises of assessment; but that needs further developments when more information on the future DCF becomes available.

The EWG considers that the document produced must be seen as starting point for future developments and that it shall be addressed to one of the next two STECF EWG's that will take place in October and November 2014 (EWG 14-17 and 14-18), as a specific ToR, for further development and/or implementation.



## 2 INTRODUCTION

The STECF Expert Working Group (EWG 14-07) met in Oostende, Belgium, from the 23rd to the 27th of June 2014 to assess Annual Reports (AR) of the 23 non landlocked Member States. Under the process of evaluation and approval of the outcomes of the National Programmes (NP), the European Commission is legally bound to consult STECF about the execution of the NP approved by the Commission and about the quality of the data collected by the Member States (MS) in accordance Articles 7.1 and 7.2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008.

The work was developed by 30 independent experts; the list of participants is included in section 6. The agenda is included in Annex 1. Tasks to be addressed were split by subgroups and experts were allocated to each sub-group according to the expertise. For each sub-group, a rapporteur was identified who was in charge of the final responsibility to present the sub-group results.

### 2.1 Terms of Reference for EWG-14-07

#### Terms of Reference

1. Evaluate Member States Annual Reports for 2013 in accordance with Article 7.2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008, taking into account;
  - a. The execution of the National Programmes for 2013
  - b. The quality of the data collected by the Member States
2. Evaluate Member States transmission of DCF data to end users in 2013 based on information from end users and Member States' clarifications & explanations in response to the end-user feedback. 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,
    - Processing industry data call,
    - Mediterranean & Black Sea data call.
  - b. Data transmission to end-users in 2013 with a focus on feedback on data availability, quality, gaps and the data used in the scientific advisory process provided by ICES, GFCM, IOTC, WPCFC and other RFMO to where scientific fishery data is mandatorily submitted by MS;

The EWG should produce for every Member State a) an evaluation of the annual report in the (excel) template provided by the Commission b) an evaluation of the data transmission to end users in the (excel) template provided by the Commission. In these two files, 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 exercise of Annual Report preparation and evaluation by STECF could be simplified in future, including through electronic filling in, and pre-screening of the Annual

Reports, simplification of the Annual Report formats taking into account the achievements and conclusions from the STECF EWG 13-25

## 2.2 Pre-screening exercise

Prior to the EWG assessment, the AR and DT issues have been evaluated by a pre-screening group that worked on an ad-hoc contract basis to DG MARE. Seven experts pre-screened the MS annual reports and the data compliance feedback from the end users. The task allocation among the seven experts was split by module as follows:

- 2 fleet economists, dealing with modules III.B and III.F; 11-12 MS each, apart from their own, plus module IV for the MS of the aqua./proc. economist below; Data calls on fleet economics and effort.
- 1 aquaculture/processing industry economist, dealing with modules IV.A and IV.B; all MS apart from his own, Data calls on aquaculture and processing industry
- 3 biologists, dealing with modules I, III.C, III.D, III.E and VI; 7-8 MS each, apart from their own, plus all other general and biological modules for the MS of the biologist below; Data calls: ICES, Med&BS, GFCM, ICCAT, IOTC and WCPFC
- 1 biologist, dealing with modules II, III.A, III.G, V, VII, VIII-XI; for all MS apart from his own; no data calls

The group started its work on 4<sup>th</sup> of June, when most Annual Reports were available and delivered its result on 17<sup>th</sup> of June. All results were available one week in advance to the meeting to all the experts through the web folder for the EWG meeting at the STECF FTP facilities.

## 2.3 General overview from Pre-screening exercise

### 2.3.1 *Evaluation of Annual Reports with regard to fleet economic/transversal variables, guidelines and templates*

Overall, it appeared that some issues from previous AR evaluations have been fixed and thus the overall compliance has further increased slightly. However, some issues are recurrent for certain MS. Apparently; some MS either do not get informed about those or ignore these hints as the issues are regarded minor. This leads to a perpetuation of minor drawbacks. In future, these issues should either be ignored during the evaluation or amendment should be enforced consequently.

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.

The evaluation of economic variables per supra-region makes little or no sense. The presentation of supra-regions should be merged in the future.

The evaluation of the fleet economic and transversal tables of the ARs has proven to be mainly a scrutiny of terminology, completeness and consistency and, moreover, a comparison with the NP. This part is a typical task for IT routines. However, currently the tables are not designed in a way that would facilitate an automatic check.

In order to simplify or even overcome the necessity for that part of the evaluation it would be helpful to have a template for the AR provided which blocks any entry which is not in line

with the guidelines/naming conventions. This approach has been successfully pursued for e.g. the fleet economic data call.

Such a table could also be easily compared with the submitted NP if the NP were in the same format. Moreover, such a setup would also facilitate a comparison between AR and data transmission results. Any approved derogations could also be incorporated.

The Spanish AR was available only in Spanish language. Thus the text could be analysed only with some uncertainty, using online translation tools.

### 2.3.2 *Evaluation of Annual Reports with regard to economic data from the aquaculture and processing industry*

**Aquaculture:** Data collection under DCF/EU-MAP and Eurostat Regulation 762/2008 should be somehow harmonized and organized in a way that optimizes data collection and avoids if anyhow possible double data collecting and burden for the processors.

**Processing industry:** Structural Business Statistics (SBS) should be adapted with the missing variables depreciation (Spain stated that they are not part of the regulation), value of assets and debt.

### 2.3.3 *Evaluation of data transmission (data calls for fleet economics, effort):*

In general, it looks like several MS are still unable to timely deliver fleet economic data which were declared to be collected in both NP and AR. As this phenomenon is ongoing and causes gross inconsistencies in all kinds of applications, the reasons for these failures should be thoroughly investigated and finally amended.

The effort data call contains some variables that are not part of the transversal variables (e.g. discards, age). These aspects should additionally be judged by biologists, as these are biological data.

The data collection on recreational catches seems to require clarification. For several MS a transmission failure was flagged, but apparently the MS had good reasons. Ideally the obligation for collection of recreational catches would be documented and data submission would be compared against that information.

Several MS were unable to deliver certain effort variables for vessels without logbook obligation. This appears to be a recurring phenomenon. For this issue, a general handling should be developed and distributed – is it justified or not?

Failure in delivering data for 2013 should generally not be regarded as shortfall, as according to the approved NPs for 2013, data were only to be collected for 2012, and transmission of 2013 data is a voluntary input from MS.

### 2.3.4 *Evaluation of Annual Reports with regard to biological variables*

In general, there has been an improvement both in the AR text and tables for most MS. In some cases, there has been a progression in improvement in the past few years; in other instances, improvements are only relative to the last year.

It often seems to be challenging for MS how to report on sampling activities in 2013 that deviate from the NP 2011-2013, which was originally submitted in March 2010 based on 2007-2008 fisheries data and sampling experiences in 2009 (or 2008). Due to this time lag between reference years and actual sampling years, changes in fleet activities, status and quota of certain stocks etc. within this period often caused amendments in sampling plans that were more severe than foreseen.

For some modules without supporting tables, such as recreational fisheries (III.D) or data management (VI), evaluation is sometimes difficult because NPs were not updated and so planned objectives not really defined for the year evaluated. Some texts are summaries over several years; some others resumed precise actions carried out in 2013. Sometimes, there is no information on requested species. For data management, some MS consider that their IT system is fully operational and have nothing to report in the AR, some others carried out actions, but without traces in the last NP approved by the Commission. It could be relevant in the future that for each section of the AR, MS shall spell out first minor or major changes relating to NP objectives and clearly note if nothing was specially planned.

Table VI.1 is very heterogeneously filled. Even the five DG MARE data calls are not always reported. It would be helpful and advisable to have a minimal reference list provided by Commission, ICES and RFMOs, sent to MS to be included in their AR, as for Table II.B.1 on eligible meetings.

In the standard tables, some MS had filters still active in some of the sheets, or hidden columns in few cases. Sometimes, tables were also modified with added columns giving details by regions or by partners (see UK).

In contrast to the guidelines, CVs are still often reported in percentages instead of absolute numbers.

The range of CVs is very different from MS to MS, especially for discards (Table III.C.5), likely due to different calculation routines. It is, therefore, still doubtful if these values are comparable between MS. Some MS even wait for new COST tools/algorithms.

The minimum number of species and specimens planned in Tables III.C.5 and III.E.3 should be deleted, as these are numbers that with the concurrent sampling has not any meaning.

The correct application of naming conventions (region, species, métiers) has improved but still is an issue.

MS should check and report only those recommendations evidently addressed to them and not to all recommendations to other recipients. This should be also reported clearly in the format of the recommendations. If it is reported “to be addressed by RCM”, obviously a MS does right in reporting it, as MS representatives are participating in RCMs.

#### 2.3.5 *Evaluation of data transmission (data calls for fisheries/biological data)*

In many cases, the listed data transmission failures and MS comments on them represent a 'ping-pong' between MS and end users, with STECF and the Commission in-between, which is often not easy to follow.

Generally, the MS answers were quite clear and detailed, while the opinion of the end-user could be completely different.

Overall, there are too many comments of end-users not taking the DCF regulation into consideration. In several cases, end-user comments not clearly define the MS to be addressed, or they are not split by provinces, regions, or islands (see UK).

### 3 TOR1: EVALUATION OF MEMBER STATES ANNUAL REPORTS FOR 2013

The experts were organised in four subgroups. AR's were split by modules and then each module/group of modules was addressed by one subgroup according to the table below.

Module	Sub-group	Expertise
Modules IIIB and IV	Sub-group 1	Economist
Modules I, II, IIIA, IIIF, VI	Sub-group 2	Economist and Biologists
Modules IIIC and IIIE	Sub-group 3	Biologists
Modules IIID, IIIG, V and VII – XI	Sub-group 4	Biologists

**Table 1 – Allocation of Modules by sub-group and expertise.**

This year the EWG went through all parts of the annual reports. In the past, the modules VIII to XI had only been assessed by the pre-screeners. This time, in order to have a mirror of this assessment in the EWG report, it was decided to assess the AR in its whole extension and provide the feedback in the report. However, it shall be noted that the outcome of the evaluation of these modules (VIII to XI) is not considered for final overall evaluation attributed to each MS.

To carry out the evaluation, the group had access to some supporting information:

- the complete set of evaluation forms produced by the EWG13-07;
- the list of derogations the Commission has granted to the Member States, and
- a list of RCM recommendations and ICES expert group recommendations.

The availability of this information has proven to be essential for the good development of the work.

The evaluation form used for the assessment is included under Annex 4. This is an improved version of the evaluation form used in the past. The improvements done to the form were based on the suggestions from STECF EWG 13-07 and were done by the pre-screeners prior to the pre-screening exercise.

The criteria used for the evaluation of the AR are those presented in table below.

Compliance class	Compliance level	Score
No	<10%	<b>N</b>
Partly	10-50%	<b>P</b>
Mostly	50-90%	<b>M</b>
Yes	>90%	<b>Y</b>
NA	not applicable	<b>NA</b>

**Table 2 - Criteria for the assessment of Annual Reports.**

Though STECF EWG 13-07 has suggested a different approach for the assessment, for reasons of comparability with previous years' assessments and because the method suggested still needs further adjustments, the EWG has decided to stick to the official outcome of the evaluation to the criteria used previously (table 2). However, the EWG, as a mere exercise, used the methodology proposed by STECF EWG 13-07 and has prepared a parallel evaluation of the overall compliance in the AR 2013. The outcome of this exercise is shown in Annex 5 (Annex 5 - Exercise on the use of a qualitative evaluation) along with the comments arising from the exercise.

Section 3.1 outlines the compliance of Member States with regards to their data collection activities over 2013 and their annual reporting and constitutes the outcome of the EWG evaluation of the annual reports. The overall evaluation shown in section 3.1 is the summary evaluation of each MS based on the traffic light system and on the scale provided in Table 2.

Sections 3.2 to 3.5 give a brief report of the four evaluation subgroups. Each subgroup had to prepare the answer to six standard questions that were raised at the beginning. The evaluation questions are:

1. Overall comments on the pre-screening exercise – was it helpful? Was it thorough?  
How could it be improved – Provide Recommendations
2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 23 MS,  
How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?

Module	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	SUM

3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS? How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.
4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?
5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?
6. Do you consider that the quality of the data collected has effectively been evaluated through this assessment process? If yes, how. If not, how can this be considered for the future.

The detailed spreadsheets for each Member State are presented in Annex 2 and organized in alphabetical order.

The Annual Report for Bulgaria has not been evaluated by the EWG-14-07 given that it showed to be a repetition of the 2012 Annual report and not the Annual Report for the year 2013.

### 3.1 Overall Evaluation

2014 - OVERALL COMPLIANCE																							
	BEL	BUL	CYP	DEN	EST	FIN	FRA	GER	GRE	IRL	ITA	LAT	LTU	MAL	NLD	POL	POR	ROM	SVN	ESP	SWE	GBR	HRV
OVERALL COMPLIANCE	M	N	M	M	P	M	M	Y	P	M	M	M	M	P	M	Y	M	P	M	M	Y	M	M
Module I	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Module II	P	N	M	M	M	M	M	Y	M	Y	M	P	P	P	M	Y	M	M	P	M	Y	M	P
Module III.A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	Y
Module III.B	M	NA	M	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M	P	Y	Y	Y	M	M	Y	M	M	Y	Y	M	M	NA
IIIC	M	N	Y	Y	P	Y	P	Y	P	M	M	Y	P	P	M	M	Y	N	P	M	Y	M	M
IIID	P	NA	NA	P	Y	Y	M	P	Y	Y	M	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	M	Y	Y	M	P
IIIE	M	N	Y	M	P	Y	P	M	M	M	Y	M	M	Y	M	Y	M	P	M	M	Y	M	M
IIIF	Y	N	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	M	Y	P	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y
IIIG	M	N	Y	M	Y	M	Y	Y	P	Y	M	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	M	Y	M	Y	M	Y
Module IV.A	NA	NA	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	M	Y	NA	NA	N	M	Y	M	M	Y	M	Y	M	Y
Module IV.B	M	N	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	M	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	P	Y	M	N
Module V	Y	N	M	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	M	M	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y
Module VI	Y	N	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	Y	Y	M	M	M	Y	P	Y	M	M	Y	Y	Y
Module VII	Y	N	Y	Y	P	N	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	P	Y	M	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
<b>EVALUATION ON MODULES VIII-XI IS MERELY INFORMATIVE. IT WAS NOT CONSIDERED FOR THE OVERALL RESULT</b>																							
Module VIII	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Module IX	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Module X	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Module XI	Y	M	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

### 3.2 SUB GROUP 1

**Subgroup participants:** Monica Gambino (rapporteur), Constantin Stroie, Edo Avdič, Irina Davidjuka, Cecile Brigaudeau, Carlos Moura, Alexandra Sintori.

**Modules dealt with:** IIIB, and IV.

#### Questions to be addressed:

- Overall comments on the pre-screening exercise – was it helpful? Was it thorough? How could it be improved – Provide Recommendations:**

The Pre-screening exercise is in most cases very helpful; however the group feels that this pre-screening exercise would benefit from the definition of guidelines about the terminology and criteria to be used by the pre-screeners.

- Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 23 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?**

Module	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	NA	SUM
Module III.B	10	10	1	0	1	22*
Module IV.A	10	7	1	1	3	22*
Module IV.B	13	6	1	2	0	22*

\*The annual report from Bulgaria was not evaluated.

- Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS. How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.**

As already highlighted in previous meetings one of the main general issues that arose during the evaluation regards the presentation of CV's. In some cases the CV's were not presented even if mandatory (for example when the data collection scheme was a census and the response rate was lower than 70%). Furthermore, there are indications that the CV's were wrongly estimated (for example when the response rate is 100% and the CV is not zero). One reason for this could be that the CV of the sample is calculated instead of the CV of the estimator.

Another major issue concerns Table IV.B.1. The guidelines are not clear and can be misleading regarding the segmentation of the companies by the number of employees. The segmentation mentioned in the guidelines (Table IV.B.1) is not mentioned in the regulation.

Furthermore, it is still not clear whether the data presented in Table III.B.3 must refer to non-clustered as well as clustered segments. According to SGECA recommendation (STECF Expert Working Group EWG 11-18), Table III.B.2 should contain information on the clustering scheme. Tables III.B.1 and III.B.3 should contain information on segments which are not clustered or, in case of clustering, for clusters. In case clustering is used only for reporting purposes Tables III.B.1 and III.B.3 should be filled in with non-clustered segment names.”.

Finally, the EWG experts are not clear on how to evaluate B3“Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations”, in the cases that the MSs don't explicitly mention their recommendations of the Liaison Meeting. Specifically, when the MS states that there are no



relevant recommendations should the evaluation of the EWG be “Not applicable (NA)” or “YES”.

**4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?**

In their annual report, MSs are required to refer separately for each of their supra regions. The EWG suggests that this should only be mandatory when the MS does not apply the same methodology for all the supra regions. In all other cases the EWG suggests that there should be one common text for all supra regions under a heading that states all the supra regions.

It is the opinion of the EWG that the guidelines should be clearer regarding the format of accuracy indicators. The format can be expressed either as a percentage or as an absolute number in all tables.

It should be clear that in Tables III.B.1., III.B.2. and III.B.3. the reference year should be the same, i.e., 2012.

Data in Table III.B.1 has to be presented separately for active and inactive vessels.

**5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?**

Denmark, Germany, Slovenia, Italy be regarded as good examples for Modules III.B, IV.A and IV.B, considering the overall implementation of the AR guidelines.

**6. Do you consider that the quality of the data collected has effectively been evaluated through this assessment process? If yes, how? If not, how can this be considered for the future.**

In order to improve the efficiency of the evaluation process it is suggested that specific guidelines for filling the evaluation sheet have to be provided before the evaluation process begins. This will result in a more homogenous evaluation of all MS.

### 3.3 SUB GROUP 2

**Subgroup participants:** Henrik Degel (rapporteur), Paolo Carpentieri, Michael Ebeling, Jörg Berkenhagen, Tiit Raid, Edvardas Kazlauskas, Arina Motova and Armelle Jung.

**Modules dealt with:** Modules I, II, IIIA, IIIF and VI.

**Questions to be addressed:**

**1. Overall comments on the pre-screening exercise – was it helpful? Was it thorough? How could it be improved – Provide Recommendations**

The Pre-screening was concluded to be very helpful and should be retained.

It is recommended, that explicit and clear guidelines for the pre-screeners should be provided and pre-screeners should not require anything that exceeds the requirements, provided in the guidelines or DCF legislation.

The electronic tool in order to support pre-screening process with the respect to terminologies and formats used might be helpful.

**2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 23 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?**

Module	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	NA	SUM
Module I	18	1	0	3	0	22*
Module II	4	12	6	0	0	22*
Module III.A	19	1	2	0	0	22*
Module III.F	17	2	3	0	0	22*
Module VI	14	6	2	0	0	22*

\*The annual report from Bulgaria was not evaluated.

**3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS. How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.**

It is very difficult to evaluate consistency between AR and NP when there are differences between the reference years (i.e. the references years used for planning in the NP and the year of the implementation of the AR). Often there is a mismatch of several years between submission of NP and its implementation. It is advisable to submit by MS a “work plan” (may be only the tables in excel or similar....) at the beginning of each implementation year in order to make possible thereafter the comparison with the AR.

It is difficult to get a complete overview of all data calls relevant for the DCF. It is advisable to have a list of relevant data calls compiled on the basis of inputs from all end users (ICES, STECF, GFCM etc.) These lists should be available both for MS and EWG.

The results of pilot studies are often used as an argument in order do not to comply with the DCF. A proper evaluation of the results of the pilot studies (similar to the derogations process: approved or rejected) should be available, both for MS and EWG. Different RCM could provide a list of pilot studies, with the main outputs, conclusion and recommendations.

It was not clear if the complete list of STECF recommendations is available and which recommendations are either relevant and/or for which sections. Often there is an overlap and important recommendations might be missed if not allocated to a specific section. We recommend that complete list of STECF recommendations should be available both for MS and EWG.

**4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?**

How to deal with the reference year for transversal variables. There is no specific recommendation in the DCF regarding the reference year for transversal variables. However generally the reference year should be the same as AR in case when administrative data sources are used (e.g. logbooks, Fleet Register, sales notes etc.) and it is not clearly stated in the NP. It is recommended to define clearly the reference year for transversal variables and in particular for data coming from the administrative sources.

**5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?**

Sweden, Poland, Germany.

**6. Do you consider that the quality of the data collected has effectively been evaluated through this assessment process? If yes, how. If not, how can this be considered for the future.**

As a general issue, during the evaluation process it is almost impossible to evaluate the quality of the collected data. MS are requested to report the “quantity” (e.g. number of species, number of fishing trips sampled, etc.) of the data collected in order to compare the achieved with the planned ones. The only indicator (CV) is not enough to evaluate the quality. Without any other indicators, the quality of the data could be evaluated properly only by the end-users.

On the other hand there is no target quality levels defined for some variable groups (e.g. transversal). This was intended for good reason and should be continued that way. In that case the quality of data collected cannot be quantitatively evaluated. However, in order to evaluate the data quality in these cases, some guidance should be developed (e.g. desirable coverage rates with respect to fleet segment size and importance).

### **3.4 SUB GROUP 3**

**Subgroup participants:** Gráinne Ní Chonchúir (rapporteur), Christoph Stransky, Angeliki Adamidou, Angeles Armesto, Sofie Vandemaele, Marina Dias, Maria Yankova, Margaret Bell and Violin Raykov.

**Modules dealt with:** Modules IIIC and IIIE.

**Questions to be addressed:**

**1. Overall comments on the pre-screening exercise – was it helpful? Was it thorough? How could it be improved – Provide Recommendations**

The pre-screening was generally very thorough and accurate and helpful. The evaluation did have to be completely re – written in just a very small number of cases. However this does raise concerns regarding the quality and the consistency of evaluations amongst pre – screeners.

- Several issues across all modules are still causing confusion for MS’s so perhaps updating the guidelines with clearer directions will help
- In the end, it was agreed by all that the pre – screening process does significantly speed up the evaluation process during the EWG.

**2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 23 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?**

Overall performance per MS in Modules IIIC and IIIE was generally good, with a few exceptions. The performance per MS is presented below:

Module	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	NA	SUM
Module IIIC	7	9	6	0	0	22*
Module IIIE	6	13	3	0	0	22*

\*The annual report from Bulgaria was not evaluated.

**3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS. How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.**

- As MS are allowed to use different aggregations of sampling units (metiers, sampling frames etc.) in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4, these tables are often hard or impossible to compare, and as a result there is no value in having two tables. Suggestion: Data to be presented in one Table.
- There are different interpretations by MS how to fill in Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 (all species or just target and major by-catch species?). Suggestion: Only one table is needed. Guidelines should clearly define which species should be included. The guidelines could be updated with a sentence to highlight what should be reported in table III.C.6, e.g. “Table III.C.6 must include all species encountered during the implementation of concurrent sampling, even those species not required under Commission Decision 93/2010.”
- Many MS did not reach sampling targets, but this was justified due to a move towards “Statically Sound” sampling schemes, which we accepted as justified, e.g. Germany.
- Tuna sampled in the Mediterranean under ICCAT, should be reported under “other regions” in the DCF AR. According to decision 2010/93/UE, appendix II, other regions where fisheries are operated by EU vessels and managed by RFMOs to which the Community is a contracting party or observer; the region must be reported as “Other regions”;
- Tables not completed: “Total no of trips during the sampling year”, CV’s not calculated or reported.

**4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?**

1. Most MS commented on their prioritisation of their sampling efforts or lab work (e.g. age readings) in order to improve data quality in the most cost-efficient way. We should acknowledge any efforts of MS to focus on those fisheries, stocks etc. where achieving good data quality is possible. However there is still a necessity to provide all the requested data.
2. It is a time consuming process to find in the text of the AR the explanations for each shortfall. The evaluation process could possibly be improved if an extra column with comments/explanations on shortfalls were added to tables III.C and III.E.
3. France is still using the old versions of the standard tables, and has copied and pasted text exactly from last year’s report, just updating some numbers.
4. Latvia, also used an old version of the standard tables, and did additional, unnecessary work on calculating cv’s for volume of discards in Table III.C.5.

**5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?**

Module III.C: Cyprus, Germany, Denmark, Latvia, Finland, Portugal and Sweden.

Module III.E: Cyprus, Italy, Malta, Poland, Finland and Sweden.

**6. Do you consider that the quality of the data collected has effectively been evaluated through this assessment process? If yes, how. If not, how can this be considered for the future.**

Data quality can only be thoroughly assessed in close collaboration with end-users, with the help of statisticians and people that have in-depth knowledge on how the data have been collected.

Quality: in terms of planned sampling levels against achieved sampling levels, have been effectively evaluated. However a true evaluation of the quality of the data collected would require information such as, a detailed description of the sampling protocols/approach, e.g. random sampling, stratified sampling etc.... Are the sampling schemes in line with best practice guidelines and regionally or internationally agreed protocols? For example ICCAT have specific protocols regarding the collection of data on Large Pelagic Fish species: [www.iccat.int/en/ICCATManual.asp](http://www.iccat.int/en/ICCATManual.asp).

Also a quality evaluation would require information on the number of sampling events, sample coverage, and an estimation of bias, which are currently not readily available in the DCF AR's.

### 3.5 SUB GROUP 4

**Subgroup participants:** Ingeborg de Boois (rapporteur), Maria Hansson, Leyla Knittweis, Tomasz Nermer, Gheorghe Radu, Jens Ulleweit and Lucia Zarauz.

**Modules dealt with:** IIID, IIIG, V, VII-XI.

**Questions to be addressed:**

**1. Overall comments on the pre-screening exercise – was it helpful? Was it thorough? How could it be improved – Provide Recommendations**

- Pre-screening was done thoroughly and it was helpful for the screening exercise.
- To facilitate consistency throughout the evaluations it would be helpful to give guidance for pre-screening and screening. A decision tree could support the decision when to put 'Yes', 'No', 'NA' or 'No comments', or additional text in the evaluation tables.

**2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 23 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?**

Module	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	NA	SUM
IIID-recreational fisheries	11	5	5	0	1	22*
IIIG-surveys	12	9	1	0	0	22*
V-evaluation of effects of fishing sector	15	6	1	0	0	22*
VII-STEFCF recommendations	15	3	2	2	0	22*
VIII-acronyms	22	0	0	0	0	22*
IX-comments	22	0	0	0	0	22*
X-references	17	1	0	4	0	22*
XI-annexes	19	3	0	0	0	22*

\*The annual report from Bulgaria was not evaluated.

**3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS. How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.**

- The group recommends that a reporting table for recreational fisheries achievements is incorporated in the AR tables to support consistency and transparency and to facilitate comparison with NP proposal. Possible parameters that could be included are: region, species, sampling method, derogations, number of samples planned, number of samples achieved.
  - III.D (recreational fisheries):
    - i. Data quality targets: it is not clear how relevant the current quality targets are. It is recommended that either the evaluation questions are modified, or that sensible data quality targets are being developed.
    - ii. Questions on derogations in III.D.1 and III.D.3 are confusing. It is not clear what the difference is. It is recommended that one of the questions is deleted.
  - 1. Follow-up of recommendations (also in other modules than VII): recommendations should be stored in a database to easily identify all relevant recommendations for each MS. This is something that has already been done by ICES, with very good results. There could be one European database compiling all recommendations made by STECF, JRC and RCM; and different databases compiling the recommendations made by the relevant RFMO (ICES, GFCM, ICCAT, etc). A link to where to find these databases containing the recommendations should be included in the AR guidelines.
  - d. Module IX (comments, suggestions, recommendations):
    - The evaluation of Module IX cannot be done by using compliance classes. It is recommended that the comments, suggestions, recommendations from MS that need follow-up, are listed by the STECF-EWG in a format provided by the Commission, and are taken on board by STECF plenary and/or the Commission. If recommendations are stored in a database, this information can easily be imported into it.
    - Some MS write in section IX general comments which are not related to the AR (e.g. Romania). These are relevant comments but they are addressed to the wrong forum and they are likely to be lost. It seems that often MS do not know to which forum they should address their comments and suggestions. It is recommended that this communication problem is addressed, preferably by a short clarification in the AR guidelines. The current description is very broad ‘Use this section to comment on general problems encountered while planning or executing the NP, to indicate inconsistencies in the DCF, to suggest improvements, etc.’.
    - Some comments have been incorporated in this document, or in the document related to ToR3. It is however recommended that the Commission reads all comments, suggestions and recommendations done by MS (BEL, ESP, NED, ROM, SWE) as some apply to general issues, the NP and/or the financial forms.
- 4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?**
1. Issues related to the AR Tables:

- i. It is recommended that the header of column L of Table III G (“Planned target”) is changed into “Planned target according to NP” in order to be more specific and avoid misunderstandings.
  - ii. (based on comment from Spain) incorporate fishing stock in Table III\_C\_5 and III\_C\_6.
  - iii. (based on comment from Belgium) provide drop-down lists in the reporting tables to improve consistency throughout the tables (e.g. Table III\_E\_3).
- 2.(based on comment made by Spain) The stock area descriptions in the DCF do not always correspond with the ICES working group stock areas. At least for horse mackerel they are different. Especially for data transmission it is extremely important to compare the right stocks. It is recommended that stock description consistency between DCF/DC-MAP and ICES descriptions is checked for all stocks to prevent the same problem in DC-MAP.
- 3.(based on comment made by Spain) The recommendation by SGRN-ECA 09-01 ‘SGRN propose that a column indicating the length of the fishing season and the average fishing trip is included in the NP (Table III\_C\_1)’ does not seem to be taken into account. It is recommended that it should be clearly explained why this has not been implemented.
4. It is not clear how results of pilot studies should be presented, as countries now report on the pilot studies differently (sometimes in text, sometimes in Annex). Portugal serves as a good example for a suggestion: the pilot study reporting format is along the same lines as the AR reporting format.

**5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules ?**

- Ireland is a good example except for the recommendation section;
- Sweden is a good example;
- Pilot study reporting format: Portugal (Annex II, III, IV).

**6. Do you consider that the quality of the data collected has effectively been evaluated through this assessment process? If yes, how. If not how can this be considered for the future.**

The data quality is not effectively evaluated through this process, as the questions in the evaluation sheet often refer to completeness or consistency of the tables, which is a matter of reporting skills and accuracy to put the right things in the right cells following the guidelines. Suggestions for improvement: see ToR 3.

#### **4 TOR 2: EVALUATION OF MEMBER STATES TRANSMISSION OF DCF DATA TO END USERS IN 2013**

Under ToR2, the EWG was requested to evaluate the compliance of the data transmission by Member States to the end users over 2013 based on information from end users and Member States' clarifications & explanations in response to the end-user feedback.

Compared with the exercises from previous years, the inclusion of MS clarification and/or explanation is an improvement of the process. Providing this information allows a more comprehensive approach for the experts.

There were 439 (see table below) issues from seven different end-users addressed to the EWG for evaluation. The EWG was requested to evaluate if it consider **satisfactory** or **unsatisfactory** the explanation/feedback provided by the MS to the issue raised by the end-users.



End User/ Data requested	Number of Issues to be assessed
<b>GFCM</b>	<b>35</b>
Task 1 1 Fleet and area variables	3
Task 1 2 Main resource and activity components variables per Operational Units	6
Task 1 3 Economic component variables	7
Task 1 4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycatch	10
Task 1 5 Provisional biological parameters	9
<b>ICCAT</b>	<b>9</b>
Task 2	6
Task 1	3
<b>ICES</b>	<b>291</b>
Data call under Intercatch for	217
Ecoregion	84
<b>IOTC</b>	<b>5</b>
Artisanal and long line fleet	1
Longliners	2
Purse seiners	2
<b>JRC/DG MARE</b>	<b>83</b>
Aquaculture	16
Effort	14
Fleet economics	22
Med and BS	9
Processing	22
<b>NAFO</b>	<b>5</b>
Biological information (Sex, Length, Age)	5
<b>WCPFC</b>	<b>1</b>
TASK II data (Aggregate catch/effort data) and TASK III (operational data)	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>439</b>

While conducting the evaluation, the group felt the need to create a third category for the evaluation: **Not possible to assess (NA)**. This category was used to classify issues for which the information provided by the MS was in conflict with the information provided by the end user and for which the evaluation can only be done by accessing the supporting elements identified either by the MS or the end user. (e.g. email, official letters with DG MARE, etc)

In summary, the evaluation of the transmission issues concluded that **320** issues were **satisfactory**, **79** **unsatisfactory** and **40** as **Not possible to assess (NA)**.

The complete list of the issues for each MS together with EWG comment and assessment is included in Annex 3, as a table for each MS organized on alphabetic order.

Even though the task was accomplished, the group concluded that the exercise on the assessment on the compliance of the data transmission still needs to be fine-tuned by the Commission. Issues that are: (1) repetition of situations already assessed in the past; (2) situation depending on administrative procedures which are out of the scope of this EWG or

(3) issues that due to its nature are out of the framework of DCF should be filtered in advance by the Commission and not addressed to this EWG for the assessment.

Moreover, there are several issues for which clear guidance and clarification is paramount for the good development of the work and which the group would suggest to be solved before next year's evaluation, these are:

- How strict should one be concerning late submission? What are the evaluation criteria? (Shall the judgment take into account only the respect or not of the deadline, or also the impact the delay of the data has on the working groups?)
- Timing of data calls often conflicts with the timing of data collection in the NP. How shall this conflict be evaluated? Is this an issue to be considered by this EWG?
- What about data not collected in the past (for which the MS presumably already has faced cuts in funding) when this issue is raised again in the following years?
- Data requested by GFCM are not always in line with the data collected under the DCF (e.g. Vessel segmentation). The same applies to the effort data call. How should these issues be evaluated?
- How to deal with data requests including data prior to 2002 (the start of the DCR)?
- Should this EWG assess the compliance of data transmission compared with what has been requested under DCF or also compared with what is being requested under the RFMO data programmes?
- What about when a MS year after year promise to fix a problem and seem to do very little about it? A way to trace the history of certain issues is needed.
- Often more than one issue is included in one end user statement. This makes it difficult to evaluate in a streamlined way.
- Data call should in general be more target specific (e.g. not requesting data to a MS which is not involved in the actual fishery).

## **5 TOR 3: EVALUATE HOW THE EXERCISE OF ANNUAL REPORT PREPARATION AND EVALUATION BY STECF COULD BE SIMPLIFIED IN FUTURE**

This ToR was mainly addressed by a small subgroup of experts and then further in plenary. The experts taking part of this subgroup were requested to take into consideration the comments/issues arising in each subgroup over the evaluation of the Annual Reports (ToR1) and Data Transmission (ToR2) as starting point to feed into ToR3. Apart from that, experts were also requested to further elaborate this ToR around two main scenarios:

A short-term scenario: corresponds to what shall be implemented prior to December 2014, when the MS start to compile their ARs. The purpose is to improve the evaluation and reporting exercise, therefore the approach shouldn't be difficult to implement and should be possible to be dealt with by a sub-group over one or two EWG. Preferably, these envisaged developments must represent a step forward for the future; and

A long-term scenario: This scenario needs to go along with the envisaged new DCF and shall explore the idea of having an IT platform dealing with data provisions and IT tools for the Member States reporting activities and for the subsequent exercises of assessment.

The EWG has produced a stand-alone document, included in Annex 6, which tackles this issue by first describing the current situation for both the MS and the STECF EWG, and then by identifying actions and the way forward for the two scenarios.

For the short term scenario, a long but comprehensive list of issues to be dealt with in the short term was created, also the identification of AR standard tables that need some adjustments, the fields to be added and /or removed and list of nomenclatures that needs to be identified in order to foster an harmonized reporting across MS;

For the second scenario, given the still unclear situation on DCF, some considerations were made, but the group considers that this scenario shall be further developed when more detailed information becomes available.

The conclusions for the short-term scenario can be summarised as follow:

The outcome of current EWG shall be further developed and implemented throughout the upcoming DCF EWG meetings to be held by the end of the current year. The document produced by this STECF EWG, included in Annex 6, shall be considered as starting point for one Term of Reference. These developments shall include (see also Annex 6):

- Production of guidelines for the pre-screening and evaluation exercises. These guidelines shall include the principles to ensure a consistent, rigorous and quality-based assessment of the annual reports against the criteria set out by legal framework and best practices.
- Update the guidelines for the compilation of Annual Reports in accordance with EWG 14-07 suggestions.
- Improving the Standard tables for the annual reporting. These improvements shall be made by reviewing the usefulness of some of the tables and the needs to revise some others. The complete list of changes to be made is given in Annex 6. But also some improvements can be achieved by making use of dropdown menus to ensure the harmonization of the designation, codes, nomenclatures, etc. used by MS.

## 6 EWG-14-07 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>

STECF members:

Name	Address <sup>1</sup>	Tel.	Email
<b>STECF members</b>			
Abella, J. Alvaro (vice-chair)	ARPAT – AREA MARE Agenzia Regionale per la Protezione Ambientale della Toscana Articolazione Funzionale RIBM Risorse Ittiche e Biodiversità Marina Via Marradi 114, 57126 Livorno – Italia	Tel. 0039-0555- 3206956	<a href="mailto:alvarojuan.abella@arpat.toscana.it">alvarojuan.abella@arpat.toscana.it</a>
Andersen, Jesper Levring (vice- chair)	Department of Food and Resource Economics (IFRO) Section for Environment and Natural Resources University of Copenhagen Rølgghedsvej 25 1958 Frederiksberg Denmark	Tel.dir.: +45 35 28 68 92	<a href="mailto:jla@ifro.ku.dk">jla@ifro.ku.dk</a>
Bailey, Nicholas	Fisheries Research Services Marine Laboratory, P.O Box 101 375 Victoria Road, Torry Aberdeen AB11 9DB UK	Tel: +44 (0)1224 876544 Direct: +44 (0)1224 295398 Fax: +44 (0)1224 295511	<a href="mailto:baileyn@marlab.ac.uk">baileyn@marlab.ac.uk</a> <a href="mailto:n.bailey@marlab.ac.uk">n.bailey@marlab.ac.uk</a>
Bertignac, Michel	Laboratoire de Biologie Halieutique IFREMER Centre de Brest BP 70 - 29280 Plouzane, France	tel : +33 (0)2 98 22 45 25 - fax : +33 (0)2 98 22 46 53	<a href="mailto:michel.bertignac@ifremer.fr">michel.bertignac@ifremer.fr</a>

Name	Address <sup>1</sup>	Tel.	Email
<b>STECF members</b>			
Cardinale, Massimiliano	Föreningsgatan 45, 330 Lysekil, Sweden	Tel: +46 523 18750	massimiliano.cardinale@slu.se
Curtis, Hazel	Sea Fish Industry Authority 18 Logie Mill Logie Green Road Edinburgh EH7 4HS	Tel: +44 (0)131 558 3331 Fax: +44 (0)131 558 1442	<a href="mailto:H_Curtis@seafish.co.uk">H_Curtis@seafish.co.uk</a>
Delaney, Alyne	Innovative Fisheries Management, -an Aalborg University Research Centre, Postboks 104, 9850 Hirtshals, Denmark	Tel.: +45 9940 3694	<a href="mailto:ad@ifm.aau.dk">ad@ifm.aau.dk</a>
Daskalov, Georgi	Laboratory of Marine Ecology, Institute of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Research, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences	Tel.: +359 52 646892	<a href="mailto:gmdaskalov@yahoo.co.uk">gmdaskalov@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Döring, Ralf	Thünen Bundesforschungsinstitut, für Ländliche Räume, Wald und Fischerei, Institut für Seefischerei - AG Fischereiökonomie, Palmaille 9, D-22767 Hamburg, Germany	Tel.: 040 38905-185  Fax.: 040 38905-263	<a href="mailto:ralf.doering@ti.bund.de">ralf.doering@ti.bund.de</a>
Gascuel, Didier	AGROCAMPUS OUEST 65 Route de Saint Briec, bat.4 CS 84215, F-35042 RENNES Cedex France	Tel:+33(0)2.23.48.55.3 4 Fax: +33(0)2.23.48.55.35	<a href="mailto:Didier.Gascuel@agrocampus-ouest.fr">Didier.Gascuel@agrocampus-ouest.fr</a>
Graham, Norman (chair)	Marine Institute, Fisheries Science Services (FSS), Rinville, Oranmore, Co. Galway, Ireland	Tel: + 353(0) 91 87200	<a href="mailto:norman.graham@marine.ie">norman.graham@marine.ie</a>
Garcia Rodriguez, Mariano	Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Servicios Centrales, Corazón de María 8, 28002, Madrid, Spain		<a href="mailto:Mariano.Garcia@md.ieo.es">Mariano.Garcia@md.ieo.es</a>
Gustavsson, Tore Karl-Erik	Independent Consultant, Göteborg, Sweden		<a href="mailto:tore.gustavsson@hotmail.com">tore.gustavsson@hotmail.com</a>
Jennings, Simon	CEFAS Lowestoft Laboratory, Pakefield Road, Lowestoft Suffolk, UK NR33 0HT	Tel.: +44 1502562244 Fax: +44 1502513865	<a href="mailto:simon.jennings@cefass.co.uk">simon.jennings@cefass.co.uk</a>
Kenny, Andrew	CEFAS Lowestoft Laboratory, Pakefield Road, Lowestoft Suffolk, UK NR33 0HT	Tel.: +44 1502562244 Fax: +44 1502513865	<a href="mailto:andrew.kenny@cefass.co.uk">andrew.kenny@cefass.co.uk</a>
Kraak, Sarah	University College Cork Based at: Marine Institute, Rinville, Oranmore, Co Galway, Ireland	Tel: +353 (0)91 387392  Fax +353 (0)91 387201	<a href="mailto:Sarah.kraak@marine.ie">Sarah.kraak@marine.ie</a>

Name	Address <sup>1</sup>	Tel.	Email
<b>STECF members</b>			
Kuikka, Sakari	University of Helsinki, Department of Environmental Sciences, P.O. Box 65 (Viikinkaari 1), FI-00014 University of Helsinki, FINLAND	Tel.: +358 50 3309233 Fax. +358-9-191 58754	<a href="mailto:skuikka@mappi.helsinki.fi">skuikka@mappi.helsinki.fi</a>
Martin, Paloma	CSIC Instituto de Ciencias del Mar Passeig Marítim, 37-49 08003 Barcelona Spain	Tel: 34.93.2309500 direct line : 34.93.2309552 Fax: 34.93.2309555	<a href="mailto:paloma@icm.csic.es">paloma@icm.csic.es</a>
Malvarosa, Loretta	NISEA S.c.a.r.l.		<a href="mailto:malvarosa@nisea.eu">malvarosa@nisea.eu</a>
Murua, Hilario	AZTI - Tecnalia / Unidad de Investigación Marina, Herrera kaia portualdea z/g 20110 Pasaia (Gipuzkoa), Spain	Tel: 0034 667174433 Fax: 94 6572555	<a href="mailto:hmurua@azti.es">hmurua@azti.es</a>
Nord, Jenny	Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Centre SEAFDEC		<a href="mailto:jenny@seafdec.org">jenny@seafdec.org</a>
Nowakowski, Piotr	Maritime University of Szczecin. – Faculty of Food Science and Fisheries, Department of Fishing Technique, Szczecin		<a href="mailto:npfgd@poczta.onet.pl">npfgd@poczta.onet.pl</a>
Prelezso, Raul	AZTI - Tecnalia / Unidad de Investigación Marina Txatxarramendi Ugarteia z/g 48395 Sukarrieta (Bizkaia), Spain	Tel: 94 6029400 Ext: 406- Fax: 94 6870006	<a href="mailto:rprelezso@suk.azti.es">rprelezso@suk.azti.es</a>
Sala, Antonello	Fishing Technology Unit National Research Council (CNR) Institute of Marine Sciences (ISMAR) - Fisheries Section Largo Fiera della Pesca, 1 60125 Ancona - Italy	Tel: +39 071 2078841 Fax: +39 071 55313	<a href="mailto:a.sala@ismar.cnr.it">a.sala@ismar.cnr.it</a>
Scarcella, Giuseppe	Environmental Management Unit National Research Council (CNR) Institute of Marine Sciences (ISMAR) - Fisheries Section Largo Fiera della Pesca, 1 60125 Ancona - Italy	Tel: +39 071 2078846 Fax: +39 071 55313	<a href="mailto:g.scarcella@ismar.cnr.it">g.scarcella@ismar.cnr.it</a>
Somarakis, Stylianios	Department of Biology University of Crete Vassilika Vouton P.O. Box 2208 71409 Heraklion Crete Greece	Tel.: +30 2610 394065, +30 6936566764	<a href="mailto:somarak@biology.uoc.gr">somarak@biology.uoc.gr</a>
Stransky, Christoph	Thünen Institute [TI-SF] Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Institute of Sea Fisheries, Palmaille 9, D-22767 Hamburg, Germany	Tel. +49 40 38905-228 Fax: +49 40 38905-263	<a href="mailto:christoph.stransky@ti.bund.de">christoph.stransky@ti.bund.de</a>
Theret, Francois	Scapêche 17 Bd Abbé Le Cam 56100 Lorient France		<a href="mailto:fttheret@comata.com">fttheret@comata.com</a>

Name	Address <sup>1</sup>	Tel.	Email
<b>STECF members</b>			
Ulrich, Clara	DTU Aqua, National Institute of Aquatic Resources, Technical University of Denmark, Charlottenlund Slot, Jægersborg Allé 1, 2920 Charlottenlund, Denmark		<a href="mailto:cu@aqua.dtu.dk">cu@aqua.dtu.dk</a>
Vanhee, Willy	ILVO - Institute for Agricultural and Fisheries Research Unit Animal Sciences - Fisheries Ankerstraat 1, B-8400 Oostende, Belgium	Tel 00-32-59-34-22-55 Fax 00-32-59-33-06-29	<a href="mailto:willy.vanhee@ilvo.vlaanderen.be">willy.vanhee@ilvo.vlaanderen.be</a>
van Oostenbrugge, Hans	Landbouweconomisch Instituut-LEI, Fisheries Section, Burg. Patijnlaan 19 P.O.Box 29703 2502 LS The Hague The Netherlands	Tel: +31 (0)70 3358239 Fax: +31 (0)70 3615624	<a href="mailto:Hans.vanOostenbrugge@wur.nl">Hans.vanOostenbrugge@wur.nl</a>

#### EWG-14-07 participants

<b>STECF members</b>		
Name	Address <sup>1</sup>	Email
Stransky, Christoph	Hamburg, Germany	<a href="mailto:christoph.stransky@ti.bund.de">christoph.stransky@ti.bund.de</a>

<b>Invited experts</b>		
Name	Address	Email
Adamidou, Angeliki	Kavala, Greece	<a href="mailto:adamidou@inale.gr">adamidou@inale.gr</a>
Armelle, JUNG	Lampaul Plouarzel, France	<a href="mailto:armelle@desrequinsetdeshommes.org">armelle@desrequinsetdeshommes.org</a>
Armesto, Angeles	Vigo, Spain	<a href="mailto:angeles.armesto@vi.ieo.es">angeles.armesto@vi.ieo.es</a>
Avdič, Edo	Ljubljana, Slovenia	<a href="mailto:edo.avdic@zzrs.si">edo.avdic@zzrs.si</a>
Bell, Margaret	Aberdeen, United Kingdom	<a href="mailto:m.bell@marlab.ac.uk">m.bell@marlab.ac.uk</a>
Berkenhagen, Jörg	Hamburg, Germany	<a href="mailto:joerg.berkenhagen@ti.bund.de">joerg.berkenhagen@ti.bund.de</a>
Brigaudeau, Cecile	Lampaul-plouarzel, France	<a href="mailto:cecile@desrequinsetdeshommes.org">cecile@desrequinsetdeshommes.org</a>
Carpentieri, Paolo	Rome, Italy	<a href="mailto:paolo.carpentieri@uniroma1.it">paolo.carpentieri@uniroma1.it</a>
Davidjuka, Irina	Riga, Latvia	<a href="mailto:irina.davidjuka@bior.gov.lv">irina.davidjuka@bior.gov.lv</a>
de Boois, Ingeborg	IJmuiden, Netherlands	<a href="mailto:ingeborg.deboois@wur.nl">ingeborg.deboois@wur.nl</a>
Dias, Marina	Lisboa, Portugal	<a href="mailto:mdias@ipma.pt">mdias@ipma.pt</a>
Ebeling, Michael	Hamburg, Germany	<a href="mailto:Michael.Ebeling@ti.bund.de">Michael.Ebeling@ti.bund.de</a>
Hansson, Maria	Lysekil, Sweden	<a href="mailto:maria.hansson@slu.se">maria.hansson@slu.se</a>
Kazlauskas, Edvardas	Vilnius, Lithuania	<a href="mailto:edvardas.kazlauskas@vic.lt">edvardas.kazlauskas@vic.lt</a>
Knittweis, Leyla	Msida, Malta	<a href="mailto:leyla.knittweis@um.edu.mt">leyla.knittweis@um.edu.mt</a>
Moura, Carlos	Lisboa, Portugal	<a href="mailto:cmoura@dgrm.mamaot.pt">cmoura@dgrm.mamaot.pt</a>
Nermer, Tomasz	Gdynia, Poland	<a href="mailto:nermer@mir.gdynia.pl">nermer@mir.gdynia.pl</a>
Ní Chonchúir, Gráinne	Co. Galway, Ireland	<a href="mailto:grainne.nichonchuir@marine.ie">grainne.nichonchuir@marine.ie</a>
RADU, Gheorghe	Constanta, Romania	<a href="mailto:gpr@alpha.rmri.ro">gpr@alpha.rmri.ro</a>
Raid, Tiit	Slovenia	<a href="mailto:tiit.raid@gmail.com">tiit.raid@gmail.com</a>
Raykov, Violin	Varna, Bulgaria	<a href="mailto:vio_raykov@abv.bg">vio_raykov@abv.bg</a>
Gambino, Monica	Salerno, Italy	<a href="mailto:e.sabatella@nisea.eu">e.sabatella@nisea.eu</a>
Sintori, Alexandra	Athens, Greece	<a href="mailto:al_sintori@yahoo.gr">al_sintori@yahoo.gr</a>

Stransky, Christoph	Hamburg, Germany	christoph.stransky@ti.bund.de
Stroie, Constantin	Bucharest, Romania	cstroie@ymail.com
Ulleweit, Jens	Hamburg, Germany	jens.ulleweit@ti.bund.de
Vandemaele, Sofie	Oostende, Belgium	sofie.vandemaele@ilvo.vlaanderen.be
Yankova, Maria	Varna, Bulgaria	maria_y@abv.bg
Zarauz, Lucia	Sukarrieta (Bizkaia), Spain	lzarauz@azti.es
Degel, Henrik	Copenhagen, Denmark	hd@aqua.dtu.dk

<b>JRC experts</b>		
Name	Address	<u>Email</u>
Motova, Arina	JRC, Ispra, Italy	<a href="mailto:arina.motova@jrc.ec.europa.eu">arina.motova@jrc.ec.europa.eu</a>
Ribeiro, Cristina (chairperson)	JRC, Ispra, Italy	<a href="mailto:cristina.ribeiro@jrc.ec.europa.eu">cristina.ribeiro@jrc.ec.europa.eu</a>

<b>European Commission</b>		
Name	Address	<u>Email</u>
Drukker Bas	EC DG MARE, Brussels, Belgium	<a href="mailto:Bas.Drukker@ec.europa.eu">Bas.Drukker@ec.europa.eu</a>
Knapp Amelie	EC DG MARE, Brussels, Belgium	<a href="mailto:Amelie.KNAPP@ec.europa.eu">Amelie.KNAPP@ec.europa.eu</a>
Borg Greta	EC DG MARE, Brussels, Belgium	<a href="mailto:Nicolas.Sturato@ext.ec.europa.eu">Nicolas.Sturato@ext.ec.europa.eu</a>
Motova, Arina (STECF secretariat)	JRC, Ispra, Italy	<a href="mailto:stecf-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu">stecf-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu</a>



## **7 LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Background documents are published on the meeting's web site on:  
<http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/stecf/ewg1407>

List of background documents:

1. EWG-14-07 – Doc 1 - Declarations of invited and JRC experts (see also section 6 of this report – List of participants)

*STECF EWG 14-07*

**Evaluation of MS 2013 Annual Reports for Data Collection and data transmission to end users**

**Oostende, 23-27 Jun 2014**

**Agenda**

**Daily timetable:**

**Morning:** 9h00 – 12h30 (Tue, Wed, Thu and Fri)

**Afternoon:** 13h30 – 18h00

- Monday, 23 June  
**Plenary:** Welcome & Logistics  
Presentation & discussion on ToR and agenda  
Short presentation on the results from the pre-screening.  
Agreement on subgroups  
Identification of rapporteurs  
**Sub-groups:** Tor 1 & 2 in SG
- Tuesday, 24 June  
**Plenary: Summary on work carried out by each SG.**  
**Sub-groups: Tor 1 & 2 in SG (cont.)**
- Wednesday, 25 June  
**Plenary: Summary on the work carried out by each SG.**  
**Sub-groups: Tor 1 & 2 in SG (cont.)**
- Thursday, 26 June  
**Plenary:** Report by Sub-groups (expected final results to be presented by SG)  
**Parallel Sessions:** Compilation and verification of the evaluation sheets per MS;  
Sub-group working on ToR3.
- Friday, 27 June  
**Plenary:** Overview of the outcomes Tor 1 and 2.  
Presentation & Discussion on the results on ToR3  
Draft Report

**SUBGROUPS to address ToR1 & 2**

Sub-group 1 – ToR 1 Modules IIIB, and IV (Economists)

Sub-group 2 – ToR 1 Modules I, II, IIIA, IIIF, VI and ToR 2 (Economists and Biologists)

Sub-group 3 – ToR 1 Modules IIIC and IIIE (Biologists)

Sub-group 4 – ToR 1 Modules IIID, IIIG, V and VII – XI. (Biologists)

**ANNEX 2 – DETAILED AR EVALUATION FORM BY MS**

Member State:

Belgium

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	March-April 2010	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

I General framework

Are derogations listed?

3 derogations listed	Yes	No action needed
----------------------	-----	------------------

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Is there a national DCF website available?  
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?

Eventhough a website is given in section VII as response for recommendation 10 Topic: MS Website : "www.smartfisheries.be" does not serves its purpose.	No	Set up of a website
---	----	---------------------

Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?  
If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?

There is no website meaning the necessary information are not provided	No	Fill the the website with the necessary information
--	----	---

Only statement about informal contacts are given, no statement about content.	No	Give an overview of the national co-ordination meetings that have been held, and an outline of their main outcomes
---	----	--

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

B Regional and International coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

Not completely. Some cells, which should be filled in are empty: For SGPIDS and WGRFS the reason for non-attendance is missing. Information on PGECON meeting is missing. Information regarding "Regional database training workshops - 2013-?" is not provided in table II.B.1. A mysterious extra column is added.	Mostly	Missing information should be provided and a correct table should be resubmitted.
--	--------	---

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

For SGPIDS and WGRFS the reason for non-attendance is missing. Information on PGECON meeting is missing.	Mostly	MS to provide missing information
--	--------	-----------------------------------

B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

MS claims to have attended RCMNS&EA_OA_03: Quality issues: data raising methods, which is incorrect as stated before in text. This is indicated by "?" in Table II.B.1? MS attended only in 2012 and not in 2013.	Mostly	MS should follow recommendations.
---	--------	-----------------------------------

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?

No major changes.	Yes	No action needed
-------------------	-----	------------------

Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?  
SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic

Yes (but only supra-region "Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic" is relevant)		
--	--	--

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

Inactive vessels must be presented by each segment according to length class. Length class should be indicated in a separate column	Mostly	To fill the table according to the template and add inactive vessels by length. MS should resubmit TABLE III.B.1
---	--------	--

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

Segment names are different from Table III.B.1. The names of cluster fleet segment is not consistent with the Last version of the Guidelines	Partly	To fill the table according to the template MS should resubmit TABLE III.B.2
--	--------	--

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

CV for a few variables is not provided	Mostly	MS should provide explanation why CV is not 0 when response rate is 100% and why they did not provide CV when the response rate is below 70%. MS should resubmit TABLE III.B.3 and fill the achieved sample rate column
--	--------	---

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	Yes	No action needed
No deviations	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Yes	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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 action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

B4 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 action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

C Biological metier related variables

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

According to Table III.A.1, MS is operating in Regions NS&EA and NA		
---	--	--

Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Table complete but year 2012 is supposed to be an error. Some columns are given two times. Achievement rates are good for the three metiers sampled, both at sea and on shore. The fourth one, TBB_CRU, has derogation for not sampling crangon fishery.	Yes	MS should resubmit table IIIC3 with correct sampling year
--	-----	---

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

Table complete and consistent with III.C.3. Achievement rates are good for all activities sampled, both at sea and on shore, except sampling frame BEL17 a little bit undersampled. Frames rconcerning TBB_CRU have derogations for not sampling crangon fishery in IVc.	Yes	no action needed
--	-----	------------------

Member State:

**Belgium**

**Judgement levels**

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	March-April 2010	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

**EWG COMMENTS**

**EWG judgement**

**EWG**

NP proposal columns were masked and 3 columns of the AR part are fully blank : columns of CVs and total numbers of fish measured are blank. Bilateral agreements are correctly reported.	Partly	MS to resubmit table IIIC5 with total number of fish sampled and calculated CVs. Explanation required for the lack of sampling of rays
Achievement rates show that most of the species were highly oversampled (sometimes more than 3000% for example for sole and plaice), whilst rays not sampled at all.		
Some cells report zero achievement. MS seems to limit sampling at sea to a short list of species, so rays or other by-catches are not sampled (cells with 0). Total numbers sampled in table IIIC6 is lower than total numbers in table IIIC5 which does not reflect the concurrent sampling by MS	Mostly	MS to give explanation why the totals in table IIIC6 are lower than in table IIIC5 and how concurrent sampling is applied. Also report the lack of sampling of rays
No important deviations, except the implementation of concurrent sampling at sea. Ms wrote to see in the AR text in table III.C.5 but nothing found about the Baltic sea rows.	Yes	MS to give explanation why the totals in table IIIC6 are lower than in table IIIC5 and how concurrent sampling is applied. Also report the lack of sampling of rays
Explanations are provided for metiers and frames undersampled : few vessels, switch between figrounds... Oversampling of stocks due is a consequence of observers on board and without financial impact. When on board MS should explain why other by-catches species were not sampled	Mostly	MS to give explanation why the totals in table IIIC6 are lower than in table IIIC5 and how concurrent sampling is applied. Also report the lack of sampling of rays
Yes	Yes	no action needed
No CV provided in table III.C.5, neither for landings nor for discards.	No	CVs to be provided for all species
NA	NA	no action needed
Oddly enough, MS wrote in its AR 2013 to have done an effort to insert more CVs in 2013 compared to the previous years. No more explanation.	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
See section I.		
Most of the recommendations listed are not relevant to metier related parameters, also mostly from 2013 whereas the 2012 recommendations should also be listed	Partly	MS in future to list appropriate recommendations
NA	No	MS to describe actions
NA	NA	no action needed
MS plans to review its sampling programmes according to the most recent characteristics of its national fleet.	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

**Region North Atlantic**

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 complete but sampling year is 2012 - supposed to be an error. Some columns are given two times. Achievement rates are good for most of the metiers sampled, both at sea and on shore, except TTB_DEF_70_99 in VIIIab with only 57%.	Yes	MS to review the 'sampling year' from 2012 to 2013
Table complete and consistent with III.C.3. Achievement rates are good for all activities sampled, both at sea and on shore, except sampling frame BEL05 undersampled. Often more trips sampled at sea as planned. Frames concerning OTB_DEF in VIIg area have derogations for not sampling.	Yes	no action needed
NP proposal columns were masked and 3 columns of the AR part are fully blank : CVs ones and total numbers of fish measured. Bilateral agreements are correctly reported.		
Achievement rates show that most of the species were oversampled, whilst rays not sampled at all.	Partly	MS to resubmit table IIIC5 with total number of fish sampled and calculated CVs. Explanation required for the lack of sampling of rays
Some cells blank. MS seems to limit sampling at sea to a short list of species, so rays or other by-catches are not sampled (cells with 0).	Mostly	MS to report the lack of sampling of rays
No important deviations, except the implementation of concurrent sampling at sea.	Mostly	no action needed
Explanations are provided correctly by metiers and frames undersampled. Reasons for over- or undersampling of stocks not explained by MS, but to be supposed the same as in NS&EA. For on board sampling MS to explain why observers did not measure other by-catch species - it appears that only target species were sampled.	Mostly	For on board sampling MS to explain why observers did not measure other by-catch species - it appears that only target species were sampled.
Yes	Yes	no action needed
No CV provided in Table III.C.5, neither for landings nor for discards.	No	CVs to be provided for all species
NA	No	MS to describe actions
Oddly enough, MS wrote in its AR 2013 to have done an effort to insert more CVs in 2013 compared to the previous years. No more explanation.	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
See section I.	Yes	
MS did not list any relevant recommendations and there are at least 1 regarding metier descriptions. AR lists many recomms that are not relevant.	No	MS in future to list relevant recommendations and in future only list the appropriate ones
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
MS plans to review its sampling programmes according to the most recent characteristics of its national fleet, and to be effective in 2014.	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

D Recreational fisheries

<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Belgium</b>	<b>Judgement levels</b>	
AR year	<b>2013</b>	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	March-April 2010	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG</b>
Text is not always consistent and easy to interpret.	Yes	No action needed

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

<b>D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?		
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Updating for cod was planned in NP for 2013, but nothing found in the AR about this species. Only old data are provided and text seems as not reviewed since several years. No information on blue fin tuna sampling in the NP. Sharks not mentioned in the NP/AR	Partly
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No derogations apply	Yes
Are the deviations explained?	Deviations not explained. Even though the 2013 data are still preliminary we text on how the sampling was carried out is to be expected	No
Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA
<b>D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
Were data quality targets provided?	No information on data quality provided, data may not be public. This should not be a reason to not provide any insight on the data quality issues	Partly
Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA
Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA
Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA
<b>D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		
Were the relevant derogations listed?	No comments	Yes
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	NA
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA
<b>D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	In NP is stated that there is no seabass recreational fishery in MS.	Yes
<b>E Biological stock-related variables</b>		
Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	According to table III.A.1 MS is operating in Regions NS&EA and NA	

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

<b>E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	the CV column not complete: few values but mostly blank. Several shaded lines with no explanation what they are. Some have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of explanation	Partly
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No samples for ALKs of whiting and haddock in North sea, including those provided by bilateral agreements with DNK and UK. Less fish than planned for brill and sole in Vild. Length samples of haddock, whiting and turbot collected from landings but no otoliths collected.	Mostly
Are the deviations explained?	Text a little bit confusing between III.C and III.E issues and not finalized for 2013. For turbot and brill MS states it will use otolith drilling with no cooperation in 2012. MS should report what happened for this procedure in 2013	Mostly
Are the deviations justified?		Partly
<b>E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
Were CV estimates provided?	No CV provided.	NA
Were CV targets met?	NA	NA
Are the deviations explained?	No	NA
Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA
<b>E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		
Were the relevant derogations listed?	See section I.	Yes
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	One recommendation of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed, which is OK. But why to have not updated the task sharing agreement between BEL, DNK and UK on turbot and brill?	Yes
Are the responsive actions described?	Text a little bit confusing between III.C and III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.	Yes
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes
<b>E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	MS plans to improve otoliths collection for turbot and brill. MS is in charge to read the otoliths of these two species for several countries, but they are particularly expensive to buy on markets.	Yes
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes

**Region North Atlantic**

<b>E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	CV column not complete - mostly blank. Some lines have a comment n.a.(f) but no note of	Mostly
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No samples for ALKs of cod (Villab), hake, haddock, plaice, brill collected.	Mostly
Are the deviations explained?	text inconsistent with outcomes in tables eg age targets for haddock and hake not achieved but text states targets were met	Mostly
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	Mostly
<b>E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
Were CV estimates provided?	No CV provided.	No
Were CV targets met?	NA	NA
Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA

Member State:		Belgium	Judgement levels		
AR year		2013	Compliance class	Compliance level	
Version of the AR reviewed		30 May 2014	No	<10%	
Version of the NP proposal		March-April 2010	Partly	10-50%	
Overall compliance		EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%	
			Yes	>90%	
			NA	not applicable	
		<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG</b>	
		NA	NA	no action needed	
E3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the deviations justified? Were the relevant derogations listed?	See section I. Two recommendations are listed: one of RCM NS&EA 2012 which is not relevant and of RCM NA, which is OK. But AR text seems to have not been updated 2013, with some paragraphs highlighted in green and not really relevant. Text a little bit confusing between III.C and III.E issues and not finalized for 2013 regarding section E.3.	Yes Mostly Mostly	no action needed the text referencing Lophidae should appear under derogations. Also recommendation re bilateral agreements for NA is missing responsive action for only one recommendation is listed
E4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
F		Transversal variables	AR text referencing to 2012 seems not have been updated.	Mostly	MS to update text re wrong year.
F1	Capacity	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
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?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F2	Effort	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
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?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F3	Landings	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
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?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
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?	No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
G	Research surveys at sea	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Table is consistent and complete but report text is contradictory for offshore beam trawl survey data upload. Table: data not uploaded to DATRAS. Text: data uploaded to DATRAS.	Yes	Yes. MS to update text on data upload in DATRAS for offshore data.
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?	No, data upload in DATRAS has not taken place.	Mostly	Yes. MS to ensure upload offshore beam trawl data in DATRAS according to NP.
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?	No survey indices can be provided for offshore beam trawl surveys as data are not uploaded in DATRAS	Yes	Yes. MS to list not uploading data in DATRAS as a deviation
G3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Map numbers are not consistent in tables and text	Yes	AR2014: MS to check numbers of maps in tables and text
G4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
IV	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	Table is not consistent with Guidelines: no cell should be removed from the tables. The cells should be filled either with no or yes.	Mostly	MS should resubmit the table.
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?	NA	NA	No action needed
			NA	NA	No action needed

Member State:		Belgium		Judgement levels	
AR year		2013		Compliance class	
Version of the AR reviewed		30 May 2014		No	
Version of the NP proposal		March-April 2010		Partly	
Overall compliance		EWG Answer		Mostly	
				Yes	
				NA	
				Compliance level	
				<10%	
				10-50%	
				50-90%	
				>90%	
				not applicable	
		<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>		<b>EWG judgement</b>	
				<b>EWG</b>	
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?	NA	NA	No action needed	
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed	
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	No action needed	
A4	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 action needed	
B	<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry guidelines?</b>  Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	YES	No action needed	
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?	The collection scheme is not clear. Some cv's are missing		Mostly	MS has to clarify which type of a Collection scheme they used (that should be the same for IVB1) and explain why the CV is not provided
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	MS should consider other actions to increase the response rate including SBS data		Mostly	MS should consider other actions to increase the response rate including SBS data
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	Yes	No action needed	
B4	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 action needed	
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	CVs are missing		Mostly	MS should provide provide the CVs
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	No	MS should provide explanations about data quality	
B4	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 should provide explanations about data quality	
V	<b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>	No relevant recommendations		Yes	No action needed
1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	NA		NA	No action needed
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	No action needed
1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	No comments		Yes	No action needed
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No derogations listed although the MS has no survey to produce indicators 1-4 in the N-Atlantic.		Yes	No action needed
1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	No comments		Yes	No action needed
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	It is unclear why irrelevant maturity data were collected during the surveys. WKMSPDF and WKMSTB recommend NOT to collect maturity data for winter spawners in Q3. Only maturity data for summer spawners might be collected, but that species was not in the remit of both workshops.		Mostly	Yes, MS to clarify why maturity data in Q3 surveys are being collected, on which survey, and for which species.
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? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Table seems not updated for 2013. See many colors, why those colours? E.g. is AER updated?		Mostly	MS is asked to check and maybe update the table. If changes are necessary, table should be resubmitted.
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments		Yes	No action needed
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? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments		Yes	No action needed
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Only general information provided by MS. But MS detailed in its 2013 AR progress made in year 2013, under a concise but precise form.		Yes	No action needed
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? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No deviation.		Yes	No action needed
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments		Yes	No action needed
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? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	New IT system will avoid shortfalls.		Yes	No action needed
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments		Yes	No action needed
VII	<b>Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>  Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Not explicitly mentioned that there were no relevant recommendations in. Header refers		Yes	AR2014: MS to explicitly mention if there were no relevant recommendations for the MS in the reporting year
VIII	<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b> Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments		Yes	No action needed
IX	<b>Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>  Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments		Yes	No action needed
X	<b>References</b> Is there a complete list of references?	Comments passed on to Commission by STECF EWG 14/07		Yes	No action needed
XI	<b>Annexes</b>  Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments		Yes	No action needed



Member State:

Belgium

		Judgement levels	
AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	March-April 2010	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

Member State:

Croatia

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	May 2013	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	NA	not applicable
	Mostly		

I General framework

Are derogations listed?

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

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 a national DCF website available?  
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?  
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?  
If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

Reference not made to Liaison but to RCM meetings. Seems to be OK anyway.	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?  
Is information under III.B.1-4 for each supra-region given?

No changes are described	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed

B Economic variables

SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

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?

NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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?

NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

C Biological metier related variables

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

Yes	Yes	no action needed
-----	-----	------------------

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

MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column	Mostly	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year
MS should provide the Total No. of trips during the Sampling year in the right column	Mostly	MS to resubmit tables with total number of trips in sampling year
Yes	Yes	the precision targets should be given as numbers and not as %s
some information missing. 2 metier level 6 descriptions and 3 RFMO areas missing	Mostly	MS to complete table
The few deviations are represented by sampling trips for metier LLD_LPF_0_0_0 BFT and LLD_LPF_0_0_0 SWO	Mostly	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Yes	Mostly	in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate a precision CV
For 6 species was not reached the requested CV	Mostly	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

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

Mostly	Mostly	in future MS should ensure age sampling is sufficient to calculate a precision CV
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

C4 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 action needed
NA	NA	no action needed

D Recreational fisheries

Member State:

Croatia

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	May 2013	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	NA	not applicable
	Mostly		

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

Yes	Yes	no action needed
-----	-----	------------------

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

Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

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?

No informations on recreational fisheries for tuna are provided	Partly	Yes. MS to provide information on recreational fisheries of tuna.
Derogations are reported for eel and sharks	Yes	Yes. MS to provide more information on date and mechanism of derogation approval.
No relevant information provided.	No	Yes. MS to provide information on whether steps have been taken to improve data collection for tuna.
No comments	NA	No action needed

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?

No information provided for tuna fishery	Partly	MS should provide data quality targets for all relevant recreational fisheries
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No actions described although information is missing in the report.	No	Yes. MS to provide information on progress made regarding strengthening the system of registration of the catches for BFT made by the recreational fisheries in terms of robustness and data quality control as indicated in NP.
No comments	NA	No action needed

E Biological stock-related variables

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

Yes		
-----	--	--

Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

'Planned required CV' is given in % rather than numbers. Some achieved CVs given with an excess of decimal places. The % achievement column is given as % and as a number. %s should be given for all	Mostly	For future AR the MS should use correct units for planned CVs and the achieved CV column should have fewer and consistent decimal places. Achievements to be presented as a %
Yes	Yes	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed

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	Yes	no action needed
The requested CVs have not been achieved	No	no action needed
MS should provide informations for the deviations of planned CV	No	MS should provide informations for the deviations of planned CV
NA	NA	MS should provide informations for the deviations of planned CV

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	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

shortfalls for CVs not justified	No	MS should provide informations for the deviations of planned CV
NA	NA	NA

F Transversal variables

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

Accuracy indicators should be provided in percentage	Mostly	No action needed
--	--------	------------------

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

No recommendation addressed by RCM LDF to MS.	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

Member State:

Croatia

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	May 2013	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

Overall compliance

EWG Answer

Mostly

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
F14	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
F3	Landings	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
F11	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
F12	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
F14	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
G	Research surveys at sea	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
G1	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
G3	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?	No recommendations	NA	No action needed	
G4	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comments	NA	No action needed	
IV	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	Achieved sample rate should be expressed in the same form (percentage or absolute number) in all submitted tables	Mostly	MS has to put the right typing for achieved sample rate and achieved sample/Planned sample rate (for example 1 instead of 0,01)	
A1	Some of CVs are missing	Mostly	MS should provide the CVs		
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
A2	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
A3	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
A4	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
B	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
B1	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Collection of data concerning the processing industry	Data are missing	No	MS should collect data in the future	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Data are missing	No	MS should collect data in the future	
B2	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Data collection has started in 2013, so results are still pending as the collection is going on	Partly	MS is requested to resubmit the table	
	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	MS gave explanations on the delay and the new data col	Mostly	No action needed	
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Mostly	No action needed	
B3	Are the deviations explained?	For the reference year, MS could not provide data because MS has begun the data collection in 2013	NA	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed	
	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	NA	NA	No action needed	

Member State:

Croatia

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	May 2013	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer Mostly	NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	It could be very interesting for MS to take account of LM recommendations
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
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?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are the relevant derogations listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
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 comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No deviation.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
VII	Follow-up of STECF recommendations			
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No recommendations listed, and no information if there were no relevant recommendations.	No	AR2014: MS to list relevant STECF recommendations, including responsive actions
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
VIII	List of acronyms and abbreviations			
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
IX	Comments, suggestions and reflections			
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
X	References			
	Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
XI	Annexes			
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

Member State:

Cyprus

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	May 2010	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer Mostly	NA	not applicable

I General framework

Are derogations listed?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
Yes. No comments	Yes	MS should provide information if the listed derogations have been approved or rejected

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 a national DCF website available?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	No	MS is request to implement a DCF database and should provide the intended timeframe
No comments	NA	see comment above
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
None of the meetings been attended	Yes	MS should try to participate in the DCF meetings in order to improve the collaboration with the countries in the Region

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
Yes (only Med & BS relevant)	Yes	No action needed

B Economic variables

SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?  
Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Reference year should be 2012; unclear why two segments are listed twice; supraregion name incomplete; clustered segments should be marked with asterisk; Inactive vessels are not reported	Mostly	MS should resubmit the table according to the ewg comments
Reference year should be 2012; supraregion name incomplete; clustered segments should be marked with asterisk	Mostly	MS should resubmit the table according to the ewg comments
Reference year should be 2012; supraregion name incomplete; some CVs missing	Mostly	MS should resubmit the table according to the ewg comments

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?

Inactive vessels not listed. The reference year is 2013 instead of 2012	Mostly	MS should provide more information on the reference year of the economic variables and the number of inactive vessels
The MS should provide more information on inactive vessels and reference year	Mostly	MS should provide more information on the reference year of the economic variables and the number of inactive vessels
The MS provided no information for the deviations eg. Inactive vessels	Mostly	MS should provide more information on the reference year of the economic variables and the number of inactive vessels

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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 action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

More specific information should be provided for the actions to avoid shortfalls	Mostly	MS should be more specific regarding the procedure for improving the response rate
More specific information should be provided for the actions to avoid shortfalls	Mostly	MS should be more specific regarding the procedure for improving the response rate

C Biological metier related variables

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

Region Mediterranean Sea and 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?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

Yes. The ICCAT fishing grounds should be according to the RFMO divisions	Yes	No action needed
Yes. The ICCAT fishing grounds should be according to the RFMO divisions	Yes	No action needed
Merluccius merluccius is not reported in Table III.C.5 but does appear in Table III.C.6. The ICCAT fishing grounds should be according to the RFMO divisions. CV for large pelagic has been calculated, even if for 2012 data, during the PGMed 2013 and these output should be reported	Mostly	MS to ensure that all species are included from concurrent sampling in Table III.C.6 in future AR's, and that naming conventions are respected
Merluccius merluccius is not reported in Table III.C.5 but does appear in Table III.C.6. It does not appear that any concurrent sampling was carried out, in spite of the fact that sampling at sea trips were completed.	Mostly	MS to ensure that all species are included from concurrent sampling in Table III.C.6 in future Annual Reports
There are deviations in the planned sampling for longline targeting albacore and for OTB targetting demersal species	Mostly	MS to increase efforts to sample the undersampled or not sampled metiers.
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Member State:

Cyprus

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	May 2010	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer Mostly	NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
requested CVs were met for only two species	Partly	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

- C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations
- Were CV targets met?
  - 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 ?
  - Are the responsive actions acceptable?
- C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls
- Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?
  - Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

- D Recreational fisheries
- Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

- 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?

MS asked a derogation for all the three Rec Fishery (tuna, sharks and eel). It is not reported if, and when, the Commission has approved the requests for bluefin tuna and sharks, however the MS indicates that fishing for these species is prohibited according to recreational fishing licenses. A derogation for sampling eel recreational fisheries is in place.	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

- 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?

No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

- 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?

No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

- D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls
- Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?
  - Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

- E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal
- Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
  - Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?
  - Are the deviations explained?
  - Are the deviations justified?

No comments	Yes	The ICCAT fishing grounds should according to the RFMO divisions. And for LPF the RFMO should be assigned to ICCAT. MS to remember this for future DCF AR's.
The number of albacore specimens (the only species that should be regularly monitored) achieved is not consistent with the planned ones. For all the other species for which planned number is not achieved (M. barbatus, P. erythrinus, M. merluccius) should be underlined that they don't exceed the thresholds above which sampling is required	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

- 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, apart from Tuna	Yes	No action needed
planned CV has not been achieved for all the species/parameters, only three have reached the threshold	Partly	MS to increase efforts to achieve sampling targets, which will in turn help with the calculation of cv's
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

- 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 derogations are requested for this module	NA	No action needed
There were no relevant derogations proposed by the RCM	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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

CV is missing for Probability Sample Surveys carried out. According to the text this data is available, but not reported in the Excel tables.	Mostly	Provide missing quality indicators
---	--------	------------------------------------

- 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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

- F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls
- Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?
  - Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

- 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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

- F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Member State:

Cyprus

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	May 2010	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer Mostly	NA	not applicable

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?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
MS mentioned some issues appeared due to transition to the electronic reporting system.	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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  
Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups 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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No recommendations listed	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No shortfalls identified	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013	Mostly	MS should provide more information regarding the reference year
The reference year seem implausible, as data in 2013 can not be collected for 2013	Mostly	MS should provide more information regarding the reference year
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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

Reference year should be 2012	Mostly	MS should provide more information regarding the reference year
Reference year should be 2012 .	Mostly	MS should provide more information regarding the reference year
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed



Member State:

Cyprus

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	May 2010	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer Mostly	NA	not applicable

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
No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comment	Yes	No action needed
No comment	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
Derogations not listed. Indicator 9 (Fuel efficiency of fish capture) is not sampled even though this is indicated in NP	No	Yes. MS should request derogation for indicator 9 if not possible to estimate this.

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

No actions described	No	Yes. MS should request derogation for indicator 9 or address shortfall.
No comments	NA	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	Mostly	MS should better explain the situation of the national database and the implementation for the future
No comments	Mostly	see previous comment
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

IX Comments, suggestions and reflections

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

X References

Is there a complete list of references?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

XI Annexes

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Member State:

Denmark

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

I General framework

Are derogations listed?

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

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 a national DCF website available?  
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?  
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?  
If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
It is stated, but could not be checked as address is missing	No	Yes, please provide web address
URL (web address) not given, no check possible	No	Yes, please provide web address
Yes, briefly	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

Yes, however, according to the AR guidelines, the full reference list of eligible meetings sent by the Commission should have been used.	Mostly	No cells shall be deleted from the table, even if the meeting is not relevant to the MS. In the future please provide the total list.
In general, yes. More detail would have been helpful, e.g. why the relevant groups WGNEW and WKMSGAD have not been attended. WGSDAA has been attended by Denmark (error in Table II.B.1).	Mostly	Please provide the reasons for non-attendance in more detail and correct table II.B.1, then resubmit.

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

B Economic variables

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

Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?  
Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Yes (only supra-region 'Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic', however, is relevant for DK)	Yes	No action needed
---	-----	------------------

Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  
Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Column with number of vessels in the segment by the 1st of January of the sampling year is empty	Mostly	MS should resubmit the table with the number of vessels in column I
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes. From 2012, MS uses a different model (more pronounced) for economic data estimation which is improvement from NP	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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 recommendation	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

B4 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 action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

C Biological metier related variables

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

Yes	Yes	no action needed
-----	-----	------------------

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

Yes	Yes	MS should remove filters from III C tables before submission
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Most metiers undersampled	Partly	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

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	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Na	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed

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?

In section I	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	Recommendations from 2011 and 2010 should not be listed in this AR
Yes	Yes	no action needed
	Yes	no action needed

C4 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 action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic

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	Yes	MS should remove filters from III C tables before submission
Yes	Yes	no action needed

Member State:

Denmark

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	NA	not applicable

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

Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Most metiers undersampled	Mostly	no action needed
Missing samples from GNS_DEF_90-99_0_0 not explained (4 trips were planned for GNS_DEF, zero conducted).	Mostly	MS to explain shortfall in GNS_DEF sampling. MS to confirm metier name concerning OTB_MSD>=120 / OTB_MCD in text
Yes	Yes	MS to explain shortfall in GNS_DEF sampling. MS to confirm metier name concerning OTB_MSD>=120 / OTB_MCD in text
Yes	Yes	no action needed
in most cases (75 of 87)	Mostly	no action needed
not in detail, refer to new sampling design in general	Partly	sandeel fishery was reported in AR text as 2012. MS to confirm year. Details of deviations need to be more fully explained
Partly	Partly	sandeel fishery was reported in AR text as 2012. MS to confirm year. Details of deviations need to be more fully explained
in section I	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	Recommendations from 2011, 2010 and 2009 should not be listed in this AR
Yes	Yes	no action needed
	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

Region North Atlantic

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?

Yes, MS has only one metier (OTM_SPF_32-69_0_0 on boardfish)	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
in section I (derogation for discard sampling approved)	Yes	no action needed
NA	Yes	no action needed
NA	Yes	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed

D Recreational fisheries

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

Baltic and NS&EA are dealt with together)	No	AR2014: MS to separate the text by region
---	----	---

Region Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic

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?

It's a conflict in the way it is presented. Results from recreational fishery has been reported to the relevant assessment WG but not showed in the AR. AR is stating that no results can be provided since the data is not ready.	Partly	Yes. MS to update text with the results delivered to the ICES WG
No derogations	NA	No action needed
No results are provided, so deviations can not be checked	NA	No action needed
No results are provided, so deviations can not be checked	NA	No action needed
No text provided	No	Yes. MS to update text on data quality
No text provided	NA	Yes. MS to update text on data quality
No text provided	NA	Yes. MS to update text on data quality
No text provided	NA	NA
No derogations	NA	No action needed
The recommendations listed are not for MS	NA	AR2014: Only recommendations to the MS should be listed
No comment	NA	No action needed
No comment	NA	No action needed

E Biological stock-related variables

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

Yes	Yes	no action needed
-----	-----	------------------

Member State:

Denmark

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

Region Baltic Sea

**E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
 Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  
 Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

Yes	Yes	for future AR please present planned CVs as numbers rather than %s
Under-and over-sampling occurs. 11 from 52 variables are undersampled	Mostly	no action needed
no explanation of undersampling of herring from SD25-32 and eel from SD 22-24	Mostly	MS to give explanation on deviations concerning herring and eel as listed
yes except for herring and eel	Mostly	MS to give explanation on deviations concerning herring and eel as listed

**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?

some CVs provided. Only 24 stock variables from 46 have CVs provided	Mostly	Although MS states that CVs can only be used from calculations at regional level, this year there should still have been an attempt to provide these estimates nationally. The column 'required CVs' should not be given as %s
not many targets achieved	Partly	MS to explain deviations
no	no	MS to explain deviations
No	no	MS to explain deviations

**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 section I	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	in future the earlier years (eg 2010,2011) recommendations should not be listed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

Yes, well described	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic

**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	for future AR please present planned CVs as numbers rather than %s
Under-and over-sampling occurs	Mostly	no action needed
explanation missing for herring, lemon sole (wt /sex), sole and pout (age/mat)	Mostly	MS to provide explanations on deviations for these species
Mostly	Mostly	MS to provide explanations on deviations for these species

**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?

85 from 147 CVs not provided	Mostly	Although MS states that CVs can only be used from calculations at regional level, this year there should still have been an attempt to provide these estimates nationally. The column 'required CVs' should not be given as %s
most of the provided CVs are below the targets	Partly	no action needed
No	No	MS to explain deviations
No	No	MS to explain deviations

**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 section I	Yes	no action needed
partly - but for previous years which are not required. 1 recommendation from LM 2012 missing (bilaterals)	Partly	MS to list relevant recommendaions and provide responsive action
partly - but for previous years which are not required. 1 recommendation from LM 2012 missing (bilaterals)	Partly	MS to list relevant recommendaions and provide responsive action
partly - but for previous years which are not required. 1 recommendation from LM 2012 missing (bilaterals)	Partly	MS to list relevant recommendaions and provide responsive action

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

refer to Baltic section	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

Region North Atlantic

**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	for future AR please present planned CVs as numbers rather than %s
oversampling	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

**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	Yes	no action needed
No	No	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

**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 (none requested)	NA	no action needed
NA (none relevant)	NA	There was one recommendation from NA RCM 2012 re boar fish. This should have been listed even though MS already has a sampling scheme in place
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed

**E4 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 action needed
NA	NA	no action needed

F Transversal variables

**F1 Capacity**  
 Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

According to derogations from NP, some effort data is not provided, but as far as it is in line with NP, it is acceptable	Yes	No action needed
---	-----	------------------

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

Member State:

Denmark

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS EWG judgement EWG

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No deviations	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls  
 Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?  
 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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
Derogation is provided	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
Quality of data is expected to increase after introduction of compulsory to use e-logbooks.	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No deviations	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No deviations	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

G Research surveys at sea

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
In general: yes, within the margins of +/- 10%. The achieved length of the acoustic track of the 'International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Sea', however, represents only 65% achievement, which is not explained.	Mostly	Yes. MS Surveys to explain achievements below 90%
see above	No	MS to update text
see above	NA	MS to update text
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations  
 Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?  
 Are the responsive actions described ?  
 Are the responsive actions acceptable?

No but text refers to international survey manuals, which are followed.	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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 describing the identified deviations / shortfalls	No	Yes. MS to update text
No text describing the identified deviations / shortfalls	NA	NA

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

A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  
 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	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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?

No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
N.A.	NA	No action needed
N.A.	NA	No action needed

A4 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 action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

**Member State:**

**Denmark**

**Judgement levels**

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

**EWG COMMENTS**

**EWG judgement**

**EWG**

B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry			
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
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 NA NA	Yes NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes NA NA	Yes NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
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 NA NA	Yes NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
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	No action needed No action needed
V	<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?	No comments No derogation	Yes NA	No action needed No action needed
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No shortfalls No shortfalls	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
VI	<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? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Data calls for effort and processing industry data: old expert groups of 2010 and 2011 referred to; should be the 2013 groups. Response to aquaculture data call missing. WGNEPH doesn't exist anymore, <i>Nephrops</i> in the North Sea is now included in WGNSSK. Old WG names (WGPAND, WGNSDS, WGMHSA, WGNPBW) should be amended to the new ones. No comments No comments No comments No comments No comments	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes	Denmark is asked to clarify and to resubmit table with updated information No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
VII	<b>Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>			
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
VIII	<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>			
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
IX	<b>Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>			
X	<b>References</b>			
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
XI	<b>Annexes</b>			
	Is there a complete list of references?	No reference list available	No	AR2014: MS to insert reference list
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Bilateral agreement put in separate file	Mostly	AR2014: put bilateral agreement in Annex with the report.

Member State: **Estonia**

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal  
Overall compliance

		Judgement levels	
		Compliance class	Compliance level
2013	31 May 2014	No	<10%
	31 March 2010 (20 Sep 2010?), AR text section D	Partly	10-50%
	mentions a version of 2 June 2011	Mostly	50-90%
	EWG Answer	Yes	>90%
	Partly	NA	not applicable

I General framework

II National data collection organisation

A National correspondent and participating institutes

Are derogations listed?  
Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?  
Is there a national DCF website available?  
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?  
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?  
If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
Derogations are not listed in AR, but in contrary, NP 2011-13 contains such list.	No	List of derogations have to be provided

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No. An old list (2012) of meetings have been used. Only two meetings were attended.	Partly	No action needed
No comments	No	Reasons for not attendance have to be provided

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

B Economic variables Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic

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?

C Biological metier related variables

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

Region Baltic 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?  
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	Yes	No action needed
For inactive vessels indication of gear type is not necessary. Flows for clustered segments from A to F column have to be merged.	Yes	No action needed
For some variables CV is not provided when response rate was below 100%. Response rate for some variables which were collected is indicated as NR, which is not acceptable. Achieved sample rate should be provided for all variables.	Mostly	MS should resubmit the table according to ewg comments

There is a deviation from the NP proposal	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Yes	Yes	No action needed
-----	-----	------------------

Sampling year is 2013? (Table says '2011')	Mostly	MS should edit and re-submit Table III.C.3 according to EWG comments
--	--------	--

Sampling year is 2013? (Table says '2012'). Sampling frame 'BT': achieved no. of trips deviate from Table III.C.3: at sea 100 trips, on shore 25 trips (the other way round than in Table III.C.3). In the AR text, however, an oversampling of the metier "OTM_SPF_16-104_0_0" is being explained, while the overall achieved no. of trips exactly matches the NP proposal in both tables.	Mostly	MS should edit and re-submit Table III.C.4 according to EWG comments
---	--------	--

CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.11) instead of percentages (e.g. 11%), see guidelines p. 15.	Yes	MS should edit and re-submit Table III.C.5 according to EWG comments
---	-----	--

Metier codes deviate from those in NP proposal and in Tables III.C.1-3. New codes (GNS_FWS_0_0_0, FPN_SPF_0_0_0, FYK_FWS_0_0_0) should be used. AR text refers to 2012. GNS_DEF_>=36_0_0 is old metier code (now GNS_FWS_0_0_0)	Mostly	MS should edit and re-submit Table III.C.6 according to EWG comments
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Yes	Yes	No action needed
-----	-----	------------------

only for 3 out of 12	Partly	No action needed
----------------------	--------	------------------

No	No	MS to explain reasons for not achieving the CVs in most cases
NA	NA	No action needed

No	No	No action needed
No, there at least 2 relevant recommendations from the RCM Baltic 2012	MS to provide relevant 2012 recommendations	

No, only old recommendations	MS to provide responsive actions to the added recommendations	
NA	No	No action needed
NA	No	No action needed

MS request the use of test fishing of fixed sampling areas	Partly	MS to explain actions for avoiding shortfalls
No, actions for avoiding shortfalls not described.	No	No action needed

Region North Atlantic

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Member State: **Estonia**

		Judgement levels	
AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	31 March 2010 (20 Sep 2010?), AR text section D mentions a version of 2 June 2011	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer <b>Partly</b>	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

**EWG COMMENTS** **EWG judgement** **EWG**

	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Sampling year is 2013? (Table says '2011'). "Expected no. trips to be sampled at sea by MS" for metier "OTB_CRU_40_2_19-22" was 8 in NP proposal, while only 3 trips are listed here. NAFO areas should be referred to as North Atlantic	Mostly	MS should edit and re-submit Table III.C.3 according to EWG comments
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	sampling year is 2013? (Table says '2012'). NAFO areas should be referred to as North Atlantic	Mostly	MS should edit and re-submit Table III.C.4 according to EWG comments
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NAFO areas should be referred to as North Atlantic	Mostly	MS should edit and re-submit Table III.C.5 according to EWG comments
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NAFO areas should be referred to as North Atlantic	Mostly	MS should edit and re-submit Table III.C.6 according to EWG comments
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No explanation given in the AR text on additional sampling of cod	Mostly	MS to add AR text on cod sampling
	Are the deviations explained?	AR text refers to 8 trips, while 9 trips were conducted	Yes	amend AR text
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes. CV for <i>Pandalus</i> discards missing, but explained in AR text (cannot be analysed, damaged) only for 1 out of 7	Yes	No action needed
	Were CV targets met?		No	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes for shrimp, not for the other species	Partly	MS to explain why CV has not been achieved for the other species
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes for shrimp, not for the other species	Partly	No action needed
<b>C3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No, there is one relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendation.	MS to provide the relevant RCM recommendation
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No, only old recommendations (RCM NA 2008)	No	MS to provide responsive actions to the added recommendation
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	No	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
<b>D</b>	<b>Recreational fisheries</b>			
	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	Yes, (Estonian recreational fishery only present in the Baltic Sea)	Yes	No action needed
<b>Region Baltic Sea</b>				
<b>D1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	no derogations requested	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	no deviations	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>D2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were data quality targets provided?	Information on data quality provided. No specific target.	Yes	No action needed
	Were data quality targets met?	Not specified	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>D3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	no derogations listed	NA	NA
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>D4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
<b>E</b>	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>			
	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
<b>Region Baltic Sea</b>				
<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 action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Most stocks oversampled, some undersampled; lines 50-70: As these stocks were not included in the NP proposal, where do the planned numbers come from?	Mostly	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal
	Are the deviations explained?	Oversampling: yes, explained; Undersampling: yes for eel, not for the other species	Partly	MS to provide missing explanations
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes, for those cases where deviations were explained	Partly	MS to provide missing explanations
<b>E2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Were CV targets met?	No	No	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	The AR text claims that "...samples are too small to get accurate estimates.", but for most species, several hundred or thousand individuals were measured.	Mostly	MS to provide explanation for not achieving CVs
	Are the deviations justified?	No	No	No action needed
<b>E3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Only old recommendations from 2008 and 2011 listed.	No	Old (non-relevant) recommendations should be deleted
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes, but rather briefly (better planning needed).	Partly	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No, should be more detailed	Partly	MS to provide more details on avoidance of shortfalls
<b>Region North Atlantic</b>				
<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 action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Shrimp and redfish undersampled, Greenland halibut oversampled, cod sampled but was not planned; redfish and Greenland halibut were not included in NP proposal, so where do planned numbers come from?	Mostly	MS to explain where planned numbers come from, as they were not included in the NP proposal



Member State: **Estonia**

		Judgement levels	
		Compliance class	Compliance level
AR year	2013	No	<10%
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014 31 March 2010 (20 Sep 2010?); AR text section D	Partly	10-50%
Version of the NP proposal	mentions a version of 2 June 2011	Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer <b>Partly</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Undersampling of shrimp is explained; oversampling (and financial implications) of Greenland halibut and additional sampling of cod not explained	Partly	MS to provide missing explanations
		Yes for shrimp, not for the other species	Partly	MS to provide missing explanations
E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Were CV estimates provided?	No	No	No action needed
	Were CV targets met?	Not in detail, some information from NAFO on the assessment of international data quality would be helpful	No	MS to provide explanation for not achieving CVs
E3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No	No	No action needed
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No	No action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Only old recommendations from RCM NA 2008	No, there is one relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendation.	MS to provide the relevant RCM recommendation
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	No	MS to provide responsive actions to the added recommendation
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	No	No action needed
E4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Briefly, not addressing the shortfalls	No	MS to provide more details on avoidance of shortfalls
F	Transversal variables	No	No	No action needed
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Reference year is not correct	Mostly	No action needed
F1	Capacity			
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No deviations	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?			
F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
F2	Effort			
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Effort data for vessels below 12 m is missing	Mostly	Missing data have to be provided
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No deviation identified, although it was observed	No	MS needs to explain not provided information
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	No	MS needs to justify not provided information
	Are the deviations justified?			
F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is respective data quality information given?	Deviations identified, but not explained	No	MS needs to explain not provided information
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	No	MS needs to explain not provided information
	Are the deviations justified?			
F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Actions to avoid shortfalls is not comprehensive	No	MS needs to provide actions to avoid shortfalls
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	No	MS needs to provide actions to avoid shortfalls
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
F3	Landings			
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No deviations	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?			
F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is respective data quality information given?	No deviations	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?			
F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Listed recommendations not from LM	Yes	No action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
G	Research surveys at sea			
G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Information on Echo NM is missing in table. Confusing * in table. It seems to be no need for it	Mostly	Yes. MS to update table with information on Echo NM and clarify the need for *
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	the difference in number of hauls in NP and AR is explained	Yes	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?			
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
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.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?			
G3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No list presented (no relevant recommendations from WGBIFS 2012).	NA	No action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
G4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			

Member State: **Estonia**

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal  
Overall compliance

		Judgement levels	
		Compliance class	Compliance level
2013	31 May 2014	No	<10%
	31 March 2010 (20 Sep 2010?), AR text section D	Partly	10-50%
	mentions a version of 2 June 2011	Mostly	50-90%
	EWG Answer	Yes	>90%
	Partly	NA	not applicable

		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
<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	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table is not consistent with the AR guidelines because the	Mostly	MS should resubmit the table according to the guidelines
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
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 N.A. N.A.	Yes N.A. N.A.	No action needed No action needed No action needed
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes N.A. N.A.	Yes N.A. N.A.	No action needed N.A. N.A.
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?	No relevant recommendations NA NA	Yes NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes Yes, but MS should indicate which measures are taken in c	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
<b>B Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>				
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
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, even an improvement, from probability sampling to census. Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
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 NA NA	Yes NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
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 NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
<b>V 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?	North Atlantic region is not listed in NP but in AR. No survey in North Atlantic means that indicator 1-4 should be a "No" instead of a "Yes" in table. No comments	Mostly Yes	Yes. MS to update table for North Atlantic No action needed
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls				
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No shortfalls NA	NA NA	No action needed No action needed
<b>VI 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? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Not clear which data from ICES Sub-areas VII and VIII have been transmitted to the RCM NA (not RCM NE Atlantic), as Tables III.C.1 and III.E.1 do not list any Estonian fisheries in these areas. No comments No comments No comments No deviations No comments	Mostly NA Yes NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls				
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No shortfalls No comments	Yes NA	No action needed No action needed
<b>VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>				
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no recommendations from STECF meetings in 2012 is listed and not all relevant recommendation is listed (e.g. "EWG 11-08 recommends that information and descriptions of the method/software used for calculation of CV's should be included (or referred to) in the AR if not provided in NP"). No reference to description of method in AP or NP. Yes, if listed For some recommendation no concrete actions is described	Partly Yes Mostly	Yes. MS to update the list with relevant recommendations Yes. MS to update the list with relevant recommendations Yes. MS to update table and provide more concrete text about action taken.
<b>VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>				
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>IX Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>				
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>X References</b>				
	Is there a complete list of references?	No reference list provided	No	AR2014: MS to include reference list
<b>XI Annexes</b>				
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No annex provided	NA	No action needed

Member State:

**Finland**

**Judgement levels**

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	3 April 2013	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

**EWG COMMENTS**

**EWG judgement**

**EWG Action needed?**

I General framework	Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
---------------------	-------------------------	-------------	-----	------------------

**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 a national DCF website available?  
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?  
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?  
If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

**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?

Only meetings where Finland was supposed to participate were included.	Mostly	MS should not delete meetings, even if they were not relevant to the MS
Yes, but only very general.	Mostly	MS should indicate reason for non-attendance for each meeting specifically.

**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?

Only partly. E.g. issues about VMS data access (LM 9), Stock related variables: Setting up of Bilateral agreements and "RCM Baltic 2012 Métier related variables: Routines for establishing bilatereal agreement are not listed and commented.	Partly	MS should check LM report and reply to all respective recommendations.
Yes, but only for one recommendation	Partly	MS should check LM report and reply to all respective recommendations.
Yes, but only for the one mentioned recommendation	Partly	MS should check LM report and reply to all respective recommendations.

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

Only present situation is described. No description of changes.	Mostly	MS should also state, if there are relevant changes
Yes	Yes	No action needed

**B Economic variables**

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

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 III.B1 does not follow the AR guidelines. The planned sample number, the planned sample rate and the achieved sample number should be exact numbers. Achieved sample no / planned sample no is incorrect	Mostly	MS can resubmit the Table according to the guidelines and ewg comments
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

**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	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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

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

Yes	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

**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 action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

**B4 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 action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

**C Biological metier related variables**

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

NA (Finland only has fisheries in the Baltic Sea)	Yes	No action needed
---	-----	------------------

**Region Baltic 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. National sub-metiers were established to distinguish between whitefish (COREG) and perch/pike-perch (PERCIF) in the metiers FYK FWS >0 0 0 and GNS FWS >0 0 0.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Overall targets met within margins, apart from sea trout (129 sampled, 500 planned). Shifts from on-shore (undersampling) to at-sea sampling (oversampling) in the perch/pike-perch fisheries.	Mostly	No
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

**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	Yes	No action needed
Yes, although most of the stocks were undersampled	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

**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 (but in section I)	Yes	No action needed
Yes, but duplicates should be deleted	Yes	delete duplicates
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

**C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

Yes, for perch sampling	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

**D Recreational fisheries**

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

Finland only has recreational fisheries in the Baltic Sea	Yes	No action needed
---	-----	------------------

**Region Baltic Sea**

Member State:

**Finland**

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	3 April 2013	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

D1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments no derogations no derogations no derogations	Yes NA NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
D2	<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?	Information on data quality provided. No specific target. No specific text No deviations No deviations	Yes NA NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
D3	<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 derogations RCM Baltic 2012 recommendation No comments No comments	NA Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
D4	<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 real shortfalls (data collection every second year) No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
E	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b> Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
<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? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes, only salmon in SD 32 undersampled. Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
E2	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes, only age reading of perch missing. in 6 of 18 cases Yes, MS focuses on length@age where CVs were met Yes	Yes Partly Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
E3	<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?	Yes, for sprat (in section I and Table III.E.3) Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
E4	<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, for salmon in SD 32 Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
F	<b>Transversal variables</b> Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F1	<b>Capacity</b>			
F11	<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?	No comments No deviations No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
F13	<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 comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
F2	<b>Effort</b>			
F11	<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?	No comments No deviations No deviations	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
F12	<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 comments No deviations No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
F13	<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 recommendations No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
F14	<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 comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
F3	<b>Landings</b>			
F11	<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?	No comments No deviations No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
F12	<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 comments No deviations No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
F13	<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 comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
F14	<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 comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
G	<b>Research surveys at sea</b>			
G1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			

Member State:

**Finland**

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	3 April 2013	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

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**

Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups 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?

**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?

**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?

**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?  
 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?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
Mostly, Number of rectangles are presented instead of Echo NM	Mostly	MS to update table
NA (no recreational fisheries in this region)	Mostly	MS to update table
No comment	Yes	No action needed
Yes, since data was used and accepted by the end users	Yes	No action needed
Maps in annex and not in the main body text	Mostly	AR2014: add maps in the text
dispite change of vessel, no changes described	Yes	No action needed
technical problem and bad wether	Yes	No action needed
No comment	Yes	No action needed
No text	NA	AR2014: MS to explicitly mention even though no recommendations are established
No text	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
N.A.	NA	No action needed
N.A.	NA	No action needed
N.A.	NA	No action needed
N.A.	NA	No action needed
N.A.	NA	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
no relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
N.A.	NA	No action needed
N.A.	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No derogations identified	NA	No action needed
Text is missing in the report	NA	AR2014: MS to insert text on shortfalls in the report.
Text is missing in the report	NA	AR2014: MS to insert text on shortfalls in the report.
Aquaculture data call missing	Mostly	Update table with aquaculture call.
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Some relevant recommendations made for the period 2011-2012 are missing	No	Yes. MS to update table including relevant recommendations

Member State:

**Finland**

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	3 April 2013	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>	NA	not applicable

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

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

Some relevant recommendations made for the period 2011-2012 are missing	No	Yes. MS to update table including actions
No comments	NA	No action needed

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

IX Comments, suggestions and reflections

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

X References

Is there a complete list of references?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

XI Annexes

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Member State:

France

Judgment levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	4 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
	<b>Mostly</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

Overall compliance

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG Action needed?

I General framework

Are derogations listed?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

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 a national DCF website available?  
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?  
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?  
If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

B Regional and international coordination

B1 Attendance of international meetings

Is Table II.B.1 complete?

Yes, apart from two questionmarks	Mostly	No action needed
-----------------------------------	--------	------------------

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
MS doesn't give any response on recommendations	No	Some explanations should be given
No comments	No	No action needed

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

No changes in any areas.	NA	No action needed
Information is provided in general, not splitting to supra regions. Therefore comments for evaluation are repeated in each supraregion section.	No	MS should provide data by supra region

B Economic variables

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

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?

Inactive vessels are missing.	Mostly	MS should provide information about the inactive vessels and resubmit the table
Clustered segments provided in single cells, not merged, difficult to follow table. Minor	Yes	No action needed
The data presented in the table is confusing. The set of variables presented in the Table is incomplete e.g. unpaid labour, investments, debt and data related to fishing rights and quota value. Achieved sample rate and response rate must be presented in percentage. CV for all segments is missing.	Partly	MS should resubmit the Table according to the comments.

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?

The PIM method or other methodology have not been applied to estimate depreciation costs and capital value.	Mostly	MS should improve the methodology to estimate capital values and depreciation cost
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Mostly	MS should improve the methodology to estimate capital values and depreciation cost

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
Improved data quality	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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 comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

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?

Inactive vessels are missing.	Mostly	MS should provide information about the inactive vessels and resubmit the table
Clustered segments provided in single cells, not merged, difficult to follow table. Minor	Yes	No action needed
The data presented in the table is confusing. The set of variables presented in the Table is incomplete e.g. unpaid labour, investments, debt and data related to fishing rights and quota value. Achieved sample rate and response rate must be presented in percentage. CV for all segments is missing.	Partly	MS should resubmit the Table according to the comments.

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?

The PIM method or other methodology have not been applied to estimate depreciation costs and capital value.	Mostly	MS should improve the methodology to estimate capital values and depreciation cost
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Mostly	MS should improve the methodology to estimate capital values and depreciation cost

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
Improved data quality	Yes	No action needed

<b>Member State:</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>Judgment levels</b>	
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Compliance class</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	4 June 2014	No	<10%
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

	<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG</b>
<b>B3</b> Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations <i>Are the deviations justified?</i> <i>Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?</i> <i>Are the responsive actions described ?</i> <i>Are the responsive actions acceptable?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	No comments	Yes	No action needed

**SUPRA-REGION Other regions**

<b>B4</b> Actions to avoid shortfalls <i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?</i> <i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<i>Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?</i>	Inactive vessels are missing.	Mostly	MS should provide information about the inactive vessels and resubmit the table
<i>Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?</i>	Clustered segments provided in single cells, not merged, difficult to follow table. Minor	Yes	No action needed
<i>Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?</i>	The data presented in the table is confusing. The set of variables presented in the Table is incomplete e.g. unpaid labour, investments, debt and data related to fishing rights and quota value. Achieved sample rate and response rate must be presented in percentage. CV for all segments is missing.	Partly	MS should resubmit the Table according to the comments.

<b>B1</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal <i>Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</i>  <i>Are the deviations explained?</i> <i>Are the deviations justified?</i>	The PIM method or other methodology have not been applied to estimate depreciation costs and capital value.	Mostly	MS should improve the methodology to estimate capital values and depreciation cost
	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	No comments	Mostly	MS should improve the methodology to estimate capital values and depreciation cost

<b>B2</b> Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal <i>Is respective data quality information given?</i> <i>Are the deviations explained?</i> <i>Are the deviations justified?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Improved data quality	Yes	No action needed
	No comments	Yes	No action needed

<b>B3</b> Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations <i>Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?</i> <i>Are the responsive actions described ?</i> <i>Are the responsive actions acceptable?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	No comments	Yes	No action needed

<b>B4</b> Actions to avoid shortfalls <i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?</i> <i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	No comments	Yes	No action needed

**C Biological metier related variables**

<i>Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?</i>	Yes - the information is given by region, however, France have used old tables in it's 2013 annual report.	Yes	France must use the most recent version of the standard tables as outlined in the latest version of the DCF AR guidelines, when resubmitting the AR tables
---	--	-----	--

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

<b>C1</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal <i>Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?</i>	France is using an out dated version of the standard III.C tables. Sampling frame codes is not consistent between Tables; codes for sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly. For a particular metier, sampling frame code MNHN_NS, which is not defined in the table, have been carried out 22 trips, but no information on this metier are provided both in the text and in the table (at least for this Region). There are inconsistencies in the number of trips achieved: 223 in the text, 220 in the table III.C.3 and 201 in the table III.C.4 (see column Achieved number of trips). Also the total number of planned trips at sea and on shore reported in the text do not match with those reported in the table, as the 22 trips from the undefined sampling frame have not been included	Partly	MS to re submit Table III.C.3 with accompanying text and to describe the fishery/fisheries covered by the sampling frame code MNHN_NS
---	--	--------	---

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

	The values under the column "Total No. of trips during the Sampling year" are missing. Sampling frame codes is not consistent between Tables; Codes for sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly. For a particular metier, sampling frame code MNHN_NS, which is not defined in the table, have been carried out 22 trips, but no information on this metier are provided both in the text and in the table (at least for this Region). There are inconsistencies in the number of trips achieved between table C3 and C4	Partly	MS to re submit Table III.C.4 with accompanying text and to describe the fishery/fisheries covered by the sampling frame code MNHN_NS
--	---	--------	---



Member State:

France

Judgment levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	4 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
	<b>Mostly</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

Overall compliance

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

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
France has used an out dated version of table III.C.5. 3 species are undersampled (Pectin maximus, planned to sample 2,000, and achieved 112) and the others are over sampled quite significantly. No text is provided to explain either situation. There are less species reported in table III.C.6, this is incorrect. Table II.C.6 should also include all species included in III.C.5 with the addition of those species encountered during concurrent sampling.	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompanying text
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompanying text
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C.3, III.C.4, III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompanying text
Are the deviations explained?	No	MS to resubmit entire section text and tables.
Are the deviations justified?	No	MS to resubmit entire section text and tables.
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Mostly	No action needed
No requirement to calculate cv for volume of discards, as highlighted in the latest version of the guidelines.	Partly	Use the most updated version of the tables in future reports.
No comments	No	MS to provide text on CV's, deviations etc..

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

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?

Sampling frame codes is not consistent between Tables, codes for sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly. No information are provided (e.g. gear, metier) for the metier targeting all the chondrychians collected by the MNHN team. MS should add information.	Partly	MS to re submit Table III.C.3 with accompanying text and to descrip the fishery/fisheries covered by the sampling frame code MNHN_NS
The values under the column "Total No. of trips during the Sampling year" are missing. Sampling frame codes is not consistent between Tables. Codes for sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly. No information are provided (e.g. gear, metier) for the metier targeting all the chondrychians collected by the MNHN team. In this latter case, as stated also by MS in the text, more information are needed.	Partly	MS to re submit Table III.C.4 with accompanying text and to describe the fishery/fisheries covered by the sampling frame code MNHN_NS
France has used an out dated version of table III.C.5. Region should respect the naming convention, i.e. North Atlantic. The number of species and specimens reported in the two tables C5 and C6 is not the same. MS should revise the two tables. Table II.C.6 should also include all species included in III.C.5 with the addition of those species encountered during concurrent sampling.	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompanying text

Member State:

France

Judgment levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	4 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
	<b>Mostly</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

Overall compliance

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

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
The number of species and specimens reported in the two tables C5 and C6 is not consistent. In this table should be reported all the total number of species sampled per metier and area: "Number of fish measured during the year for the given species (all species of G1 G2 and G3), fishing ground and metier". MS has reported only the collected number of chondrychians. MS should revised the two tables.	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompanying text
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C.3, III.C.4, III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompanying text
Are the deviations explained?	No	MS to resubmit entire section text and tables.
Are the deviations justified?	No	MS to resubmit entire section text and tables.

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 comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Partly	No action needed
No comments	Partly	Very little information is given to explain under or over sampling. MS to provide more specific explanations.
No comments	Partly	Very little information is given to explain under or over sampling. MS to provide more specific explanations.

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?  
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?  
Were CV targets met?  
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

No comments	Mostly	MS to provide more specific details on actions to remedy shortfalls.
Mostly. Where actions are given they are acceptable, however several non conformities were identified which have not been explained at all.	Mostly	MS to provide more specific details on actions to remedy shortfalls.

Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Sampling frame codes are not consistent between Tables, codes for sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly. No information are provided (e.g. gear, metier) for the metier targeting all the chondrychians collected by the MNHN team. MS should add information. MSs participating in sampling of tuna fishery are not mentioned. Name of the region should respect the naming convention, i.e. "Mediterranean and Black Sea". Sampling strategies are not consistent with the guidelines.	Partly	MS to re submit Table III.C.3 with accompanying text and to describe the fishery/fisheries covered by the sampling frame code MNHN_NS
---	--------	---

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

Sampling frame codes are not consistent between Tables, codes for sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly. No information are provided (e.g. gear, metier) for the metier targeting all the chondrychians collected by the MNHN team. MS should add information. MSs participating in sampling of tuna fishery are not mentioned. The values under the column "Total No. of trips during the Sampling year" are missing. Name of the region should respect the naming convention.	Partly	MS to re submit Table III.C.4 with accompanying text and to describe the fishery/fisheries covered by the sampling frame code MNHN_NS
--	--------	---

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

The number of species and specimens reported in the two tables C5 and C6 is not consistent. MS should revise the two tables. In this table should be reported the total number of species (all species of G1 G2 and G3) and specimens achieved for all metier combined. No length data are reported for some species, where France has an obligation to sample, in the GSA 7 (see in the PGMed report 2012 the Percentage contribution (%) of landing per species eg. Eledone cirrhosa)	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompanying text
---	--------	---

Member State:

France

Judgment levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	4 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
	<b>Mostly</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

Overall compliance

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 Other regions IOTC

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 Other regions ICCAT

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
Name of the region should respect the naming convention. The number of species and specimens reported in the two tables C5 and C6 is not consistent. In this table should be reported all the total number of species sampled per metier and area: "Number of fish measured during the year for the given species (all species of G1 G2 and G3), fishing ground and metier". MS reported only the collected number of chondrychians. MS should revised the two tables.	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompanying text
MS should revise the text and tables to ensure coherency and consistencies between tables. The planned number of trips, species and CV's have not always been achieved	Partly	MS to re submit Tables III.C.3, III.C.4, III.C.5 and III.C.6 with accompanying text
Partly. They explain that sampling deviates from the planned targets in relation to changes in no of trips in the reference year, unfortunately, France has not included the number of trips in the tables, so it is not possible to evaluate this comment.	Partly	MS to resubmit entire section text and tables.
No comments	No	MS to resubmit entire section text and tables.
No comments	Yes	No action needed
CV targets were reached for only one species out of 10.	No	No action needed
Yes for GSA 7 but not for GSA 8.	Mostly	MS to provide detailed explanation on deviations for GSA 8 when resubmitting this section.
Yes for GSA 7 but not for GSA 8.	Yes	MS to provide detailed explanation on deviations for GSA 8 when resubmitting this section.
No relevant derogations requested	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
CV's were not written in Table III.C.5, instead there was a comment saying "Cf text". In the text, the quality of the data collected is expressed in terms of % coverage of effort or fishing sets, with a minor reference to cv's	Mostly	MS should in future provide the cv's in Table III.C.5 as requested in the guidelines.
No comments	No	No action needed
CV's were not written in Table III.C.5, instead there was a comment saying "Cf text". In the text, the quality of the data collected is expressed in terms of % coverage of effort or fishing sets, with a minor reference to cv's	Mostly	MS should in future provide clearer explanations regarding sampling levels that do not allow the cv to reach the required target.
Yes, minimum level of coverage of 5% as set by the RFMO has been reached.	Mostly	MS should in future provide clearer explanations regarding sampling levels that do not allow the cv to reach the required target.
No derogations requested	NA	No action needed
No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
No comments	No	MS to provide details on actions to avoid shortfalls
NA	NA	MS to provide details on actions to avoid shortfalls

Member State:

France

Judgment levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	4 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
	<b>Mostly</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

Overall compliance

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

**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?

No comments	Mostly	MS to use the latest version of the standard tables when resubmitting the tables.
Mostly as an old version of the tables are used.	Mostly	MS to use the latest version of the standard tables when resubmitting the tables.
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

**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 comments	No	
CV's were not written in Table III.C.5, instead there was a comment saying "CI text". In the text, the quality of the data collected is expressed in terms of % coverage of effort or fishing sets, with a minor reference to cv's	Mostly	MS should in future provide clearer explanations regarding sampling levels that do not allow the cv to reach the required target.
No comments	Mostly	More detailed explanations required in future reports.
Yes, minimum level of coverage of 5% as set by the RFMO has been reached.	Mostly	MS should in future provide clearer explanations regarding sampling levels that do not allow the cv to reach the required target.

**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 derogations requested	NA	No action needed
No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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

No comments	No	MS to provide details on actions to avoid shortfalls
NA	NA	MS to provide details on actions to avoid shortfalls

Region Other regions WECAF

**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 code is not consistent between Tables, codes for sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly (e.g. Obs-OTBCRU it is not present in C3 but it is present in C4). In the table C3 no planned trips are present for the metier FG-A1, whereas 50 are planned in table C4. MS should revised the two tables. Total No. of trips during the Sampling year is missing	Partly	MS to resubmit the Table
Sampling frame codes is not consistent between Tables, codes for sampling frames in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 should match exactly. Not all the planned trips have been achieved. Total No. of trips during the Sampling year is missing	Partly	MS to resubmit the Table
no data are reported for French Guiana	Partly	MS to resubmit the Table
no data are reported for French Guiana	Partly	MS to resubmit the Table
Not all the planned trips have been achieved	Mostly	MS to resubmit the Table
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

**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 comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
NA	NA	MS to calculate cv's

**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 derogations requested	NA	No action needed
No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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

No comments	No	MS to provide details on actions to avoid shortfalls
NA	NA	MS to provide details on actions to avoid shortfalls

D Recreational fisheries

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

MS reported the informations for all fishing Regions together, although for species split up by region (stock)	Yes	AR2014: report according to guidelines: 'Insert here region header, according to Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each region, sections III.D.1-4 should be given.'
--	-----	---

All regions

**D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
 Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  
 Are obtained derogations mentioned?

Derogations apply for cod, eel, salmon. Sea bass not sampled in 2013. General comment: NP is not specific on targets.	Partly	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

**Member State:**

**France**

**Judgment levels**

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	4 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
	<b>Mostly</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

Overall compliance

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

- D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?  
 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?

Information on data quality provided, no specific targets	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

- D4 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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No recommendation from RCM NS&EA or LM dressed to MS in 2012.	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

**E Biological stock-related variables**

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

- 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?

Mostly - Fishing Ground is not filled in, and inconsistencies in assigning the correct RFMO to the region.	Mostly	MS to fill in the table correctly and completely and resubmit Table III.E.3 and the accompanying text
not all the planned number of species to be collected have been achieved (e.g. <i>G. morhua</i> , <i>P. virens</i> , <i>D. labrax</i> ). There are three entries for Length@Age for one species, in one area, MS to clarify these entries	Mostly	MS to explain the triple entry for <i>D. labrax</i> .
Not for all the deviations (e.g. length at age for <i>P. virens</i> ) explanations are given	Partly	MS to provide more specific explanations for species where sampling targets have not been achieved.
Partly	Partly	Explanations given for <i>p. virens</i> are perfect, however nothing has been provided for other species.

- 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?

No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	No	MS to provide more details on the deviations and their justification, when re submitting the text and tables

- 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 comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	No	MS to provide a full list of relevant RCM recommendations with responsive actions when re submitting the section.
No comments	No	MS to provide a full list of relevant RCM recommendations with responsive actions when re submitting the section.
No comments	No	MS to provide a full list of relevant RCM recommendations with responsive actions when re submitting the section.

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

Partly, the MS focuses on explaining that a quality focus is in place however this does not give any real detail about the actions to remedy shortfalls.	Partly	MS to resubmit text and tables for Module III.E.
Partly, the MS focuses on explaining that a quality focus is in place however this does not give any real detail about the actions to remedy shortfalls.	Partly	MS to resubmit text and tables for Module III.E.

**Region North Atlantic**

- 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?

Mostly, No cv's reported and no fishing ground entered.	Mostly	MS to fill in the table correctly and completely and resubmit Table III.E.3 and the accompanying text
not all the planned number of specimens for stock related variables species have been achieved ( <i>N.norvegicus</i> , <i>P.pollachius</i> , <i>Molva spp.</i> , <i>D. labrax</i> , <i>Lophius spp.</i> should be presented separately, and there is no sampling achieved for maturity.	Partly	MS to fill in the table correctly and completely and resubmit Table III.E.3 and the accompanying text
Not all the deviations are explained	Partly	MS to fill in the table correctly and completely and resubmit Table III.E.3 and the accompanying text
NA	NA	MS to fill in the table correctly and completely and resubmit Table III.E.3 and the accompanying text

- E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
 Were CV estimates provided?  
 Were CV targets met?  
 Are the deviations explained?

No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
No comments	No	MS to fill in the table correctly and completely and resubmit Table III.E.3 and the accompanying text

<b>Member State:</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>Judgment levels</b>	
<b>AR year</b>		<b>2013</b>	<b>Compliance class</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>		4 June 2014	No
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>		3 September 2012	Partly
		<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly
<b>Overall compliance</b>		Mostly	Yes
			NA
			Compliance level
			<10%
			10-50%
			50-90%
			>90%
			not applicable

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?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
No comments	No	MS to fill in the table correctly and completely and resubmit Table III.E.3 and the accompanying text
NA	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Partly, action for calculating cv's but no actions for achieved numbers	Partly	MS to fill in the table correctly and completely and resubmit Table III.E.3 and the accompanying text
Partly, actions provided are acceptable for CV's	Partly	MS to fill in the table correctly and completely and resubmit Table III.E.3 and the accompanying text

**Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea**

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

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

**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?

Mostly, no cv's calculated. France's achievement for Tuna should be in table III.E.3, although the sampling is planned at the regional level.	Mostly	No action needed
only the planned numbers of specimens for the estimation of the Maturity @length for <i>P. elephas</i> has not been achieved	Yes	No action needed
No comments	No	MS to explain the deviations
No comments	No	MS to explain the deviations
No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
No comments	No	MS to provide explanations for deviations especially for tuna
No comments	No	MS to provide explanations for deviations especially for tuna
No derogation requested	NA	No actions needed
No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	No actions needed
No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	No actions needed
No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	No actions needed
No comments	No	MS to provide explicit explanations for shortfalls.
No comments	NA	MS to provide explicit explanations for shortfalls.

**Region Other regions (OTC)**

**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?

No cv's reported	Mostly	MS to provide cv's
almost all the planned number of specimens, for the estimation stock related variables, have not been achieved. only one out of three of the species of tropical tuna have reached the planned sampling levels.	Partly	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling.
No comments	No	MS to explain deviations.
No comments	No	MS to explain deviations.
No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
No comments	NA	MS to calculate cv's
No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets
No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets
No derogations requested	NA	No action needed
No relevant recommendations made by the RCM	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

**Region Other regions (ICCAT)**

**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?

No cv's reported and no sampling achieved.	No	MS to provide cv's
No comments	No	MS to explain deviations provide actions to remedy this under sampling.
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	No	MS to calculate cv's
NA	NA	MS to calculate cv's
NA	NA	MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets
NA	NA	MS to calculate cv's, and explain any deviations from targets
No derogation requested	NA	No actions needed
No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	No actions needed

Member State:

France

Judgment levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	4 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

**Region Other regions (WECAF)**

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

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

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

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

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

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

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

**Region Other regions (Inland waters)**

**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?

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?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	No actions needed
No relevant RCM recommendations	NA	No actions needed

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

No sampling achieved.	No	MS to resubmit both the text and tables for the WECAF area
In the table is mentioned only a species <i>Penaeus subtilis</i> and no data are reported (2000 specimens were planned). In the text France mentions three species and only one appears in the table.	No	MS to resubmit both the text and tables for the WECAF area, and clarify these discrepancies
MS should better explain the situation in the WECAF area and why no stock data have been reported	No	MS to provide explanations for the WECAF area
NA	NA	MS to provide explanations for the WECAF area

No comments	No	MS to resubmit both the text and tables for the WECAF area
NA	NA	MS to resubmit both the text and tables for the WECAF area
NA	NA	MS to resubmit both the text and tables for the WECAF area
NA	NA	MS to resubmit both the text and tables for the WECAF area

NA	NA	MS to resubmit both the text and tables for the WECAF area
NA	NA	MS to resubmit both the text and tables for the WECAF area
NA	NA	MS to resubmit both the text and tables for the WECAF area
NA	NA	MS to resubmit both the text and tables for the WECAF area

No comments	No	MS to provide explanations for the WECAF area
NA	NA	MS to resubmit both the text and tables for the WECAF area

Mostly, no cv's reported	Mostly	MS to calculate and report cv's
Mostly, eel sampling achievement only reached 48%	Mostly	MS to provide explanation for the deviation in achieved sampling for Eel.
No comments	No	MS to provide explanation for the deviation in achieved sampling for Eel.
NA	NA	MS to provide explanation for the deviation in achieved sampling for Eel.

No comments	No	MS to calculate and report cv's
NA	NA	MS to calculate and report cv's
NA	NA	MS to provide explanation for the deviation in achieved sampling for Eel.
NA	NA	MS to provide explanation for the deviation in achieved sampling for Eel.

No derogations requested	NA	No action needed
No relevant recommendations proposed	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

No comments	No	MS to provide explanation for the deviation in achieved sampling for Eel, and actions to avoid in the future.
NA	NA	MS to provide explanation for the deviation in achieved sampling for Eel, and actions to avoid in the future.

Achieved sample rate and response rate have to be provided in percentage.	Yes	No action needed
---	-----	------------------

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No deviations	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

Member State:

France

Judgment levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	4 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	3 September 2012	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
	<b>Mostly</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

Overall compliance

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
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?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
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?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
	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?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
	F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
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?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
	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?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
	G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?  Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Recommendation by WGBEAM 2011 on upload data beam trawl survey still not implemented	Mostly	Yes. MS to incorporate recommendation WGBEAM 2011, and put it into action: upload beam trawl survey data to DATRAS
		NA	NA	No action needed
		NA	NA	No action needed
G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	NA	NA	No action needed	
	NA	NA	No action needed	
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 comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		The CV's are missing	Mostly	Provide the cv's. MS should resubmit the Table.
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Yes, e.g. Sea bass & Sea bream in cages with too low response rate, small marine fish farm sector with confidentiality problems.	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
	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?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No CV's, maybe in some cases of low response necessary. MS states, it will be provided during data call.	Mostly	Further information regarding the cv should be provided
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
	A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?  Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Partly	More precise information about the cv should be given
		No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
		NA	NA	No action needed
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	No action needed	
	NA	NA	No action needed	
	NA	NA	No action needed	
A4 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	Yes, but maybe the mentioned measures should be more specific	Mostly	MS should provide more information about the measures that will be applied	
	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
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?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
	B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed



Member State: **France**

AR year Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	Judgment levels		
	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
4 June 2014	No		<10%
3 September 2012	Partly		10-50%
<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly		50-90%
Overall compliance	Yes		>90%
	NA		not applicable

	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
<b>B4</b> Actions to avoid shortfalls <i>Are the responsive actions acceptable?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>			
<b>1</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
<i>Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<i>Are the relevant derogations listed?</i>	No derogations apply	Yes	No action needed
<b>2</b> Actions to avoid shortfalls			
<i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>VI Module for management and use of the data</b>			
<b>1</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
<i>Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<i>Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</i>	No comments	NA	No action needed
<i>Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?</i>	Details should be given in the annex section	Mostly	No action needed
<i>Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<i>Are the deviations explained?</i>	No deviations indicated	Yes	No action needed
<i>Are the deviations justified?</i>	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>2</b> Actions to avoid shortfalls			
<i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>			
<i>Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<i>Are the responsive actions described?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<i>Are the responsive actions acceptable?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>			
<i>Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>IX Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>			
<i>Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>X References</b>			
<i>Is there a complete list of references?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>XI Annexes</b>			
<i>Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed

<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>Judgement levels</b>	
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Compliance class</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	27 May 2014	No	<10%
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	28 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
	<b>Overall compliance</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

	<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG Action needed?</b>
<b>I General framework</b>	Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes No action needed

<b>II National data collection organisation</b>			
<b>A National correspondent and participating institutes</b>	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?	No comments	Yes No action needed

<b>B Regional and international coordination</b>			
<b>B1 Attendance of international meetings</b>	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No comments	Yes No action needed
<b>B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Reference not made to Liaison but to RCM meetings. Seems to be OK anyway.	Yes No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes No action needed

<b>III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector</b>			
<b>A General description of the fishing sector</b>	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No changes are described	Yes No action needed

<b>B Economic variable</b>	Is information under III.B.1-4 for each supra-region given?	Yes	Yes No action needed
<b>SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic</b>	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Achieved sample rate should be reported in percentage.	Yes No action needed
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes No action needed
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Achieved sample rate and response rate should be reported in percentage.	Yes No action needed

<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes No action needed

<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes No action needed

<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	Yes No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA No action needed

<b>B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	NA No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA No action needed

<b>SUPRA-REGION Other regions</b>	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes No action needed
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes No action needed
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes No action needed

<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA No action needed

<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is respective data quality information given?	NA	NA No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA No action needed

<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	NA No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA No action needed

<b>B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	NA No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA No action needed

<b>C Biological metier related variables</b>			
	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	According to table III.A.1 MS is operating in Regions Baltic, NS&EA and NA including NAFO. But according to III.C.3 also in other Regions CECAF and South Pacific.	Yes No action needed

Member State: **Germany**

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

Overall compliance

		Judgement levels	
2013	Compliance class	Compliance level	
27 May 2014	No	<10%	
28 October 2011	Partly	10-50%	
EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%	
Yes	Yes	>90%	
	NA	not applicable	

I General framework

Region Baltic Sea

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

EWG COMMENTS      EWG judgement      EWG Action needed?

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

Table is complete but not consistent with the AR guidelines. Table complete but difficult to analyse because two different rows for concurrent at sea and on shore. Achievement rates are good even though some targets planned were not sampled at all for some metiers. Table III.C.3 is complete but not consistent with the AR guidelines for all metiers, as additional rows have been added. 2 metiers out of 8 metiers have not been sampled at all, and a third has no at sea sampling.	Mostly.	The MS need to clarify the reason for under or no sampling as the text is not clear.
---	---------	--

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

Table complete. Good achievement rates overall except for 2 sampling frames of small sizes which were not sampled at all. OTB_DEF>90 trawlers targeting whiting and flatfish has no achieved sampling. Derogation for GNS_FWS_0_0_0	Mostly.	MS to clarify the zero achievement rate of the OTB_DEF metier, as it would appear that their was increased activity in this metier when the average trips are compared with the achieved number of trips in the reference year.
---	---------	---

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

Table properly filled but precision level targets are wrong. Achievement rates are good except for SPF and eel. 3 of the 7 stocks in Table III.C.5 have been significantly undersampled, explained by the move towards random sampling.	Yes	No action needed
---	-----	------------------

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Table complete and consistent with other tables III.C.	Yes	No action needed
--	-----	------------------

Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

Achievement rates mainly good. Some deviations in terms of numbers of trips achieved and for three species undersampled.	Yes	No action needed
Yes, for each metier.	Yes	Clarification required for OTB_DEF>90_0_0

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	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Mostly	No action needed
NA	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	NA

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. See section I and table III.C.3	Yes	No action needed
Two recommendations from RCM Baltic 2012 listed.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
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?

Improvement of the sampling programmes by implementing recommendations of DCF workshops on sampling methods.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic

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?

Table complete. Good achievement rates.	Yes	No action needed
Table complete. Good achievement rates.	Yes	No action needed
Table properly filled. Most of the species were oversampled except herring I,II undersampled.	Yes	No action needed
Table complete and consistent with other tables III.C.	Yes	No action needed
Achievement rates mainly good. See comments above.	Yes	No action needed
Detailed explanations provided for each metier even though no deviation was registered. Undersampling of herring due to the self sampling system implemented. Oversampling of other sepecies is a consequence of the observer on board system and without financial impact on the NP costs.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Member State: **Germany**

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

Overall compliance

		Judgement levels	
2013		Compliance class	Compliance level
27 May 2014		No	<10%
28 October 2011		Partly	10-50%
EWG Answer		Mostly	50-90%
	Yes	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

I General framework

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?
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
No recommendation addressed by RCM NS&EA 2012.	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more randomly implemented. No explanation regarding none access to certain commercial vessels	Yes,	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Region North Atlantic

**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?

Table complete. Good achievement rates.	Yes	No action needed
Table complete. Good achievement rates.	Yes	No action needed
Table properly filled. All species were highly oversampled. Are the planned targets in the NP relevant ?	Yes	No action needed
Table complete and consistent with other tables III.C.	Yes	No action needed
Achievement rares good. See comments above.	Yes. See comment on Random sampling	No action needed
Detailed explanations provided for each metier even though no deviation was registered. Exceeded length measurements are a consequence of the observer on board system and without financial impact on the NP cost	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

**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, except for NAFO stocks.	Yes.	MS to explore other methodologies to report CV's from the NAFO area
Yes	Yes	MS to explore other methodologies to report CV's from the NAFO area
COST tool does not allow NAFO areas.	Yes	MS to explore other methodologies to report CV's from the NAFO area
No	No	MS to explore other methodologies to report CV's from the NAFO area

**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. See section I	Yes	No action needed
One recommendation addressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.	Partly.	MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.
One recommendation addressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.	Partly.	MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.
One recommendation addressed by RCM NA 2012, None of the other recommendations have been addressed.	Partly.	MS to list other relevant RCM NA 2012 recommendations and responses from Germany.

**C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

Improvement of the sampling programmes at sea for being more randomly implemented.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Region Other regions

**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 complete.	Yes	No action needed
Table complete.	Yes	No action needed
Table complete.	Yes	No action needed
NA. See below.	NA	No action needed
No fisheries occurred in 2013.	NA	No action needed
NA	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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

NA	NA	No action needed
----	----	------------------

Member State: **Germany**

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

**Judgement levels**

2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
27 May 2014	No	<10%
28 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
<b>Overall compliance</b>	Yes	>90%
	NA	not applicable

**I General framework**

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

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

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

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Yes. Derogation pending	Yes.	No action needed
-------------------------	------	------------------

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

Several recommendations of RCM_LDF from 2011 to 2013 on the implementation of multilateral agreements for sampling these particular fisheries.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

**C4 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 action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

**D Recreational fisheries**

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

MS is operating in Region Baltic and NS&EA	Yes	No action needed
--	-----	------------------

**Region Baltic Sea**

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

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

for cod, it is not clear what is done for 2013 and inconsistent with the text in NP. The pilot study undertaken for sea trout was not planned in NP and not in line with the list of species in Commission decision 2010/93. In NP it is a derogation for salmon but not mentioned in AR.	Partly	MS to clarify the text regarding salmon and eel. MS to clarify and justify the inclusion of sea trout and on what expenses.
--	--------	---

Are obtained derogations mentioned?

Derogation for sharks, but not for salmon (only in NP)	Mostly	MS to clarify if a derogation for salmon applies
--	--------	--

Are the deviations explained?

Derogation from the plan is not clear for eel. The pilot study undertaken for sea trout was not planned in NP and not in line with the list of species in Commission decision 2010/93. In NP it is a derogation for salmon but not mentioned in AR.	Partly	MS to clarify the text regarding salmon and eel. MS to clarify and justify the inclusion of sea trout and on what expenses.
--	--------	---

Are the deviations justified?

Only for cod, for the other species see text above	Partly	MS to clarify deviations for other species than cod
--	--------	---

**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?

information is provided for cod, but not for eel	Mostly	MS to update text on eel
No comments	NA	MS to update text on eel
No comments	NA	MS to update text on eel
No comments	NA	No action needed

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

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Derogation for sharks, but not for salmon (only in NP)	Mostly	MS to clarify
--	--------	---------------

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

No relevant recommendation addressed by RCM Baltic 2012.	NA	No action needed. MS to consider in AR 2014. Only recommendation from LM to be included in the list according to the guidelines
--	----	---

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

NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

**D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

Only explanation for cod	Partly	MS to clarify actions for other species than cod
Only explanation for cod	Partly	MS to clarify actions for other species than cod

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

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

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

NP text available concerns actions planned for 2012. So it is difficult to evaluate if the actions carried out in 2013 and if there are consistent with the NP proposal. For cod the new national phone survey begun in 2013 but no results presented.	Partly	MS to clarify the action taken in 2013
--	--------	--

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

no derogations mentioned	NA	No action needed
no derogations mentioned	NA	No action needed
no derogations mentioned	NA	No action needed

**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?

No information provided by MS.	No	MS to update text
No comments	NA	MS to update text
No comments	NA	MS to update text
No comments	NA	No action needed

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

Were the relevant derogations listed?

no derogations mentioned	NA	No action needed
--------------------------	----	------------------

Member State: **Germany**

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

Overall compliance

		Judgement levels	
2013		Compliance class	Compliance level
27 May 2014		No	<10%
28 October 2011		Partly	10-50%
EWG Answer		Mostly	50-90%
	Yes	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

I General framework

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?

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

Action needed?

No relevant recommendation addressed by RCM Baltic 2012.	NA	No action needed. MS to consider in AR 2014. Only recommendation from LM to be included in the list according to the guidelines
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

no information of the results	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

E Biological stock-related variables

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

According to table III.A.1 MS is operating in Regions Baltic, NS&EA and NA including NAFO. But according to III.C.3 also in other Regions CECAF and South Pacific.	Yes - multi lateral agreement covers the CECAF and South Pacific Regions	No action needed
--	--	------------------

Region Baltic Sea

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

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 complete	Yes	No action needed
Yes. To noted that two stocks were added due to stock assessment needs. A specific section on eel in freshwater inland is also given in an annex of the AR 2013.	Yes	No action needed
Most of the stocks oversampled., except for eel. It is a consequence of the choice to sample at sea by observers on board commercial vessels. Oversampling did not cause significant additional eligible costs.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Some CVs missing.	No cv's are given for sex ratio for four species. CV's are reported as a %	MS to report cv's as absolute number not % in future reports
Sometimes for ALK. No for other parameters.	No	No action needed
Some compatibility difficulties for using Cost tool for all stocks. No specific comments on the quality of the CVs estimated.	Yes	MS to investigate other methodologies to estimate cv's for this region
No	No	MS to investigate other methodologies to estimate cv's for this region

- three derogations were listed.	Yes	No action needed
One from RCM Baltic 2012. Two others from 2013. Recommendation from WGBAST not required.	Yes.	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Priority given by MS to sampling at sea. For statistical reasons, the achieved sampling intensities cannot be considered too high. The occurrence of oversampling rather reflects conservative planning.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic

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

Table complete	Yes	No action needed
Yes. To noted that several stocks were added due to stock assessment needs. A specific section on eel in freshwater inland is also given in an annex of the AR 2013.	Yes	No action needed
Most of the stocks correctly achieved or lightly oversampled., three lightly undersampled. Cod and saithe badly achieved for sex ratios and maturity parameters. Explanations given by stocks in the AR text : too optimistic objectives planned, less fish than expected	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Member State: **Germany**

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

Overall compliance

**Judgement levels**

2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
27 May 2014	No	<10%
28 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
Yes	Yes	>90%
	NA	not applicable

**I General framework**

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
--------------	---------------	--------------------

Were CV estimates provided?

Some CVs missing or null. MS to clarify "0" and also no CV's were reported for several parameters and species.	Partly,	Some CV's reported as "0" - MS to clarify if this is in fact a "0" cv.
--	---------	--

Were CV targets met?

Mostly for ALK. No for other parameters.	Partly.	Some CV's reported as "0" - MS to clarify if this is in fact a "0" cv.
--	---------	--

Are the deviations explained?

Some compatibility difficulties for using Cost tool for all stocks. No specific comments on the quality of the CVs estimated.	Yes	MS to investigate other methodologies to estimate cv's for this region
---	-----	--

Are the deviations justified?

No	No	MS to investigate other methodologies to estimate cv's for this region
----	----	--

**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?

See section I.	Yes	No action needed
One from RCM NS&EA 2012.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

Priority given by MS to sampling at sea. For statistical reasons, the achieved sampling intensities cannot be considered too high. The occurrence of oversampling rather reflects conservative planning.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

**Region North Atlantic**

**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?

Table complete	Yes	No action needed
Yes. To noted that three stocks were added due to stock assessment needs.	Yes	No action needed
Most of the stocks correctly achieved or lightly oversampled., but Greenlan halibut planned in NAFO highly oversampled for weigh@age and not sampled at all for ALK. Blue whiting (stock added) undersampled for all the parameters. Explanations given by stocks in the AR text. For halibut it is not possible to take otoliths for market reasons.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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?

Around 50 % of CVs provided in ICES areas but all CVs missing for NAFO.	Partly	MS to provide missing cv's
Only for few parameters*stock.	Partly	MS to provide missing cv's
Some compatibility difficulties for using Cost tool for all stocks. No specific comments on the quality of the CVs estimated.	Yes	MS to investigate other methodologies to estimate cv's for this region
No	No	MS to investigate other methodologies to estimate cv's for this region

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?

See section I.	Yes	No action needed
One from RCM NA 2012.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

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

Priority given by MS to sampling at sea. For statistical reasons, the achieved sampling intensities cannot be considered too high. The occurrence of oversampling rather reflects conservative planning.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

**Region Other regions**

**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 complete	Yes	No action needed
No fisheries occurred in 2013.	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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

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

NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>Judgement levels</b>	
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Compliance class</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	27 May 2014	No	<10%
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	28 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

**I General framework**

	<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG Action needed?</b>
<b>E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Are the deviations justified? Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
<b>E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes. See section I. No recommendation addressed by RCM LDF to MS. NA NA	Yes NA NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
<b>F Transversal variables</b> Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Accuracy indicators should be provided in percentage	Mostly	No action needed

**F1 Capacity**

<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?	No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
<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 comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed

**F2 Effort**

<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?	No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
<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?	No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
<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?	No recommendation addressed by RCM No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
<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?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed

**F3 Landings**

<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?	No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
<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?	No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
<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?	No relevant recommendations No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
<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?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed

**G Research surveys at sea**

<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?	Not clear what parameter is planned and reported for some surveys, e.g. in acoustic surveys both Echo NM and Fish hauls should be presented in table. No comments No comments No comments colour indication on vessels is wrong in Fig. III.G.8	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes	MS to update table No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
<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?	No comments No deviations No deviations	Yes NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
<b>G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b> Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed? Are the responsive actions described ?	rec. are seldom made by PGs concerning performance as everything is standard No comments	NA NA	No action needed No action needed



<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>Judgement levels</b>	
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Compliance class</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	27 May 2014	No	<10%
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	28 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
<b>Overall compliance</b>	Yes	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

	<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG Action needed?</b>
<b>I General framework</b>			
<b>G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	shortfalls only due to bad weather and tech. break downs	Yes No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes No action needed
<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>			
<b>A1 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?	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes No action needed No action needed No action needed
<b>A2 Data quality: 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 NA NA	Yes NA NA No action needed No action needed No action needed
<b>A3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes NA NA	Yes NA NA No action needed No action needed No action needed
<b>A4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No relevant recommendations NA NA	Yes NA NA No action needed No action needed No action needed
<b>B Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>			
<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes No action needed No action needed
<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes No action needed No action needed
<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes No action needed No action needed No action needed
<b>B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes No action needed No action needed No action needed
<b>V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>			
<b>1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Note (*) is missing in table V.1.	Yes	No action needed
Are the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations	NA	No action needed
<b>2 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
<b>VI Module for management and use of the data</b>			
<b>1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?	No deviation.	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>2 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>			
Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>			
Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>IX Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>			

Member State:

Germany

**Judgement levels**

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	27 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	28 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
	Yes	Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	Yes	NA	not applicable

I General framework

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?

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

X References

Is there a complete list of references?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

XI Annexes

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Member State:

Greece

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

Overall compliance

2013		Compliance class	Compliance level
31 May 2014		No	<10%
Oct 2012?		Partly	10-50%
EWG Answer		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
	Partly	NA	not applicable

Judgement levels

I General framework

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
Only one derogation requested by MS on BFT recreational fisheries.	Mostly	All the derogations affecting the reference year should be clearly reported in the AR. MS stated that a pilot study on Recreational fisheries of eel has been conducted but thereafter there is no any mention, on the basis of the results, if a derogation on it has been requested or not. MS should clarify it

II National data collection organisation

A National correspondent and participating institutes

Are derogations listed?  
Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?

Is there a national DCF website available?  
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?  
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
The national DCF website is under construction.	No	MS is request to implement a DCF database and should provide the intended timeframe
The website is not directed towards the DCF (under construction)	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Partly	MS should report the National Coordination meeting in the right way, fulfilling all the requested columns, under table II.B.1

B Regional and international coordination

If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?

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?

No comments	Yes	Not all the planned meeting have been attended by MS
No comments	Mostly	MS should clarify if the non participation to the planned meetings (11 attended out of 48 planned) was linked only to financial problems
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
Yes (only Med & BS relevant)	Yes	No actions needed

B Economic variables

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

SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

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?

Inactive vessels are not listed	Mostly	Information about inactive vessels should be provided
NA	Yes	No actions needed
Response rates appear to be incorrect	Mostly	Table should be corrected and resubmitted
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Text refers to incorrect table III.B.3. and no information about data quality is given	Mostly	Text should be updated, if needed, according to the new table and some qualitative information should be given about data
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
No relevant recommendations	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

C Biological metier related variables

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

Region Mediterranean Sea and 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?

MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No actions needed
Table complete, except column total numbers of trips during the year. All metiers are highly undersampled comparing to NP objectives (achievement under 35%), except metier targeting swordfish (achievement 82%). Although low, achievement rates are better for sampling at sea than on shore.	Partly	Greece is operating in very difficult circumstances, and the EWG appreciate the year on year improvements made, the action required is to fill in the "Total No. of Trips during the sampling year" in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4.
Table complete, except column total numbers of trips during the year. All activities appear highly undersampled comparing to NP objectives (achievement under 35%), except metier targeting swordfish (achievement 82%). Although low, achievement rates are better for sampling at sea than on shore.	Partly	Greece is operating in very difficult circumstances, and the EWG appreciate the year on year improvements made, the action required is to fill in the "Total No. of Trips during the sampling year" in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4.
Table complete but difficult to analyse because NP objectives are not defined. If it is the case, why not to report these species only in table III.C.6 ? For species really planned, targets in numbers of fish are mostly achieved for GSA22, very heterogeneous for GSA20, and bad for GSA23. In general species really sampled are oversampled, mainly swordfish with an achievement rate of 744%.	Mostly	Under the heading "Planned min number of fish to be measured at National Level" MS should enter the planned number, and avoid acronyms which are not explained. MS to review sampling strategy and agree minimum planned numbers to allow for a proper assessment of achievements.
Table appears complete with a right implementation of the concurrent sampling method. Table consistent with III.C.5	Yes	No action needed

**Member State:**

**Greece**

**Judgement levels**

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	Oct 2012?	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Partly</b>	NA	not applicable

**EWG COMMENTS**      **EWG judgement**      **EWG**

See abovementioned comments on tables III.C.3 to III.C.6. After analysing the tables provided, it looks as MS allocated its 2013 data collection effort preferentially on longliners targeting large pelagics and on opportunistic sampling at sea for other metiers.	Partly	Under the heading "Planned min number of fish to be measured at National Level" MS should enter the planned number, and avoid acronyms which are not explained. MS to review sampling strategy and agree minimum planned numbers to allow for a proper assessment of achievements.
Not really. Metiers are detailed but reasons explaining their general undersampling justified only for some of them. MS confirms that sampling in length was carried out on an opportunistic basis except for large pelagics.	Partly	MS to provide clearer explanations for under sampling.
Partly	Partly	MS to provide clearer explanations for under sampling.

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	Yes	No action required
For around 15% of the stocks for landings, several of them being estimated with samples of very small sizes. CV met for swordfish. Concerning discards, CVs met only for some stocks with small samples. So not consistent except swordfish.	Mostly	No action required
Yes	Yes	No action required
Yes	Yes	No action required

No derogation requested	NA	No action required
only one is listed, that is not actually addressed to the MS's specifically	No	MS should be careful in future to ensure all relevant LM recommendations are listed, and should only respond to those targeted at the MS.
No	No	MS should be careful in future to ensure all relevant LM recommendations are listed, and should only respond to those targeted at the MS.
No	No	MS should be careful in future to ensure all relevant LM recommendations are listed, and should only respond to those targeted at the MS.

Delayed start of the NP which resulted in reduced coverage of fishing activities for 2013. But start on time in 2014.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

**D Recreational fisheries**

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

MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
---------------------------------------	-----	------------------

**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?

Yes. Recreational fishing for BFT is banned in Greece. A pilot study carried out in 2012 showed that eel is not a target species for this type of activity. According to recreational fishing associations, MS wrote in its AR that the capture of sharks and rays is rare and random.	Yes	No action needed
BFT recreational fishing is not legally allowed in Greece.	Yes	No action needed
No deviation.	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No recommendation addressed to MS by RCM MED&BS 2012.	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

MS plans to carry out in its NP 2015-20 a pilot study in order to investigate the existence of recreational fishery of sharks.	Yes	Yes. MS to implement planned pilot study on recreational fishery of sharks.
No comments	Yes	No action needed

**E Biological stock-related variables**

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

MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
---------------------------------------	-----	------------------

**Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea**

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

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

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

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

Yes	Yes	MS should be careful assign the correct RFMO to the various species.
Partly. Achievement rates in numbers of fish sampled are mostly achieved for GSA22, except for trawlable species like monkfish, hake, nephrops... but are generally heavily low for GSA 20 and 23. To be noted that results for eel and swordfish are good. As written in the AR objectives are only achieved for 7 out of 23 species (30%). Nevertheless more species/stocks updated than planned. Note that a specific section of the AR is dedicated to eel monitoring.	Partly	MS should try to improve the sampling achievements particularly for GSA 20 and GSA 23.
Yes by stock (species by GSA). Mainly due to the late implementation of the Greek NP in 2013, only in the second semester which cannot give relevant access to fish. Nevertheless progress in implementing the NP shall be supported.	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed, as programme has begun on time in 2014

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
-----	-----	-------------------

Member State:

Greece

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

Overall compliance

		Judgement levels	
		Compliance class	Compliance level
2013			
31 May 2014		No	<10%
Oct 2012?		Partly	10-50%
EWG Answer		Mostly	50-90%
	Partly	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

**EWG COMMENTS** **EWG judgement** **EWG**

In general, samples sizes are too low for achieving precision targets. Only for the variable length@age the CVs were most of time achieved.	Partly	No actions needed
Were CV targets met?		
Are the deviations explained?	No	More detailed explanations should be provided in future reports.
Are the deviations justified?	NA	More detailed explanations should be provided in future reports.

**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 requested by MS	NA	No action needed
No relevant recommendation made by RCM Med	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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

Delayed start of the NP which reduced samples collection in 2013. But start on time in 2014.	Yes	No action needed
Delayed start of the NP which reduced samples collection in 2013. But start on time in 2014.	Yes	No action needed

**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?

CV is missing	Yes	Resubmit the Table III.F.1 providing missing quality indicator (CV)
---------------	-----	---

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

**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?

No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

CV is missing	Mostly	Provide CV
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

**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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

CV is missing for all collected variables	Mostly	Provide CV
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

**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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
MEDITS survey was only carried out in GSA 22, not in GSAs 22 and 23 as planned. MEDIAS survey was carried out in early autumn instead of early summer and fewer stations were covered (79% of hauls).	Partly	MS to ensure that the MEDITS survey is carried out in all the relevant GSAs, i.e. GSAs 20, 22 and 23 and that the MEDIAS is carried out at all planned stations.
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Deviations were due to financial constraints and delays in funding.	Partly	MS to address delays in approving funding in future years by reviewing MS administrative processes.
Yes (for Medias a comprehensive report of the results is mapped)	Yes	No action needed

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?

The MEDITS survey was only carried out in GSA 22, not in GSAs 22 and 23 as planned. MEDIAS survey was carried out in early autumn instead of early summer and fewer stations were covered (79% of hauls).	Partly	The MEDITS survey should be carried out in all the relevant GSAs, i.e. GSAs 20, 22 and 23. MS to describe effects of only carrying out survey in some GSAs. MS to ensure that the MEDIAS survey is carried out during the usual survey time for acoustic surveys in Greece to make data comparable to the available time series and MS to ensure that all planned stations should be covered.
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Deviations were due to financial constraints and delays in funding.	Partly	MS to address delays in approving funding in future years.

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

**G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

**Member State:**

**Greece**

**Judgement levels**

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	Oct 2012?	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

**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	Yes	No actions needed
-----	-----	-------------------

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

Fixed panel type is not according to the guidelines. MS should clarify whether this is probability or non probability sampling scheme. Quality information not available	Partly	Table should be corrected and updated when the relevant data are available
--	--------	--

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

Quality information not available	Partly	Table should be updated when the relevant data is available
-----------------------------------	--------	---

**A1** Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  
 Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  
 Are the deviations explained?  
 Are the deviations justified?

Data for 2012 not available	No	MS should clarify the issue about 2012 data
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

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

NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

**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	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

**A4** 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 actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

**B Collection of data concerning the processing industry**

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

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
-----	-----	-------------------

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

Achieved sample rate is not clear. If different achieved sample rates existed then segments should be separated in different lines	Mostly	Table should be corrected and resubmitted
--	--------	---

**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	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

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

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

**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	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

**B4** 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 actions needed
Although shortfalls are identified, no actions to overcome them are described	Partly	MS should clarify which actions are to be made in order to avoid the identified shortfalls

**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?

No information is given for Fuel efficiency of fish capture (code 9). Data for indicators 1-4 collected through surveys which were only partly carried out.	Partly	MS to clarify how indicators 1-4 can be calculated accurately when surveys (MEDITS/MEDIAS) were not carried out (i) at all planned stations / areas and (ii) in different time periods to the past (making comparison with time series difficult). MS to clarify status of indicator 9.
No reference to derogations is made, not possible to judge whether there are any relevant derogations.	No	No action needed

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

No shortfalls given although there are shortfalls re indicators 1-4, 9. [To take into account results of other SGs. This only refers to shortfalls regarding module IIIG.]	Partly	MS to address problems with execution of surveys to ensure data availability for indicators 1-4. MS to indicate how shortfalls re indicator 9 will be addressed.
No comments	NA	No action needed

**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?

Only providing data for processing industry and surveys for SGMED are mentioned in the table. Nothing about other data calls : SGMOS, Aquaculture, AER, PGMED, GFCM Task1 and assessment WG....).	No	MS should provide in the table the missing information (end users, data call, species, fleet segment etc etc) and/or should explain why the requested data have not been sent to the end users
No comments	NA	No action needed

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

No comments	Partly	In the text are reported only information regarding the development of the national database, MS should add more information on the use and management of data
-------------	--------	--

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

Only general information provided by MS on its national DB. No specific work mentioned in the NP and AR for year 2013.	Partly	see previous comment
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

**VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations**

Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?

Only recommendations from STECF EWG 12-20 are listed. Not clear if other relevant STECF meeting reports were screened.	Mostly	AR2014: MS to list all relevant recommendations in future.
--	--------	--

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

No detailed responsive actions are described, MS states: 'MS supports the recommendation'	Mostly	AR2014: MS to include more details on responsive actions.
No comments	NA	No action needed

**VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations**

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Member State:

Greece

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	Oct 2012?	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	Partly	NA	not applicable

IX Comments, suggestions and reflections

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

X References

Is there a complete list of references?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

XI Annexes

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

Heading 'Annexes' is included in report although there are no annexes provided. No reference in text to information in annexes.	Yes	AR2014: MS to explicitly mention if no Annexes are being provided
---	-----	---

Member State:

Ireland

AR year Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	Judgement levels		
	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
29 May 2014	No	<10%	
28 March 2013	Partly	10-50%	
EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%	
Overall compliance	Mostly	>90%	
	NA	not applicable	

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

I General framework

Are derogations listed?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

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 a national DCF website available?  
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?  
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?  
If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

B Economic variables

Is information under III.B.1-4 for each supra-region given?  
SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic

Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	MS should provide explanations about the issues identified in the comments. Table should be completed with inactive vessels and corrected according to the explanations.
Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Clustering should be made only when it is not possible to provide information for individual fleet segments and there is statistical evidence of homogeneity between the clustered segments. Table should be updated with the relevant information
Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Table should be corrected and updated

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

It's not clear what type of data collection the MS is applying. The sample size is clearly not enough to calculate the estimates, due to low response rate. The sample size should be raised to take high non response into account. It's also not clear how the MS can calculate the estimates based on a non probability sampling scheme with only 6% coverage.	Partly	MS should consider revising their data collection strategy for the future. An adequate sampling scheme should be chosen before the start of the datacollection. Currently it's starts as PSS and then it's turned into a non probability sampling. This can turn into a lack of control of the data collection from the MS.
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

There is an effort from the MS to increase the response rate. This action doesn't appear to be sufficient in order to overcome all the short falls they have been facing.	Partly	MS should consider revising their data collection strategy for the future. An adequate sampling scheme should be chosen before the start of the datacollection. Currently it's starts as PSS and then it's turned into a non probability sampling. This can turn into a lack of control of the data collection from the MS.
MS refer to the tables, which need to be corrected	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

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?

Not relevant	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
There is a positive attitude toward the increase of the response rate, although the methodology to be used is not the best for a probability sampling scheme. The actions stated are unlikely to solve the MS problem with the data collection.	Partly	MS should consider revising their data collection strategy for the future. An adequate sampling scheme should be chosen before the start of the data collection. Currently it's starts as PSS and then it's turned into a non probability sampling. This can turn into a lack of control of the data collection from the MS.

C Biological metier related variables

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?  
Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?

AR text deals with NS&EA and NA regions in one section	Partly	MS should divide regions into separate sections
--	--------	---

Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Table complete and detailed by fishing grounds. Objectives planned in NP mostly achieved.	Yes	No actions needed
Table properly filled. Planned no. of trips sampled on shore should be 12 instead of 26 (cf. NP and AR Table III.C.3).	Mostly	amend table



Member State:

Ireland

		Judgement levels	
AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	29 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	28 March 2013	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS EWG judgement EWG

	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly filled. But no species planned in NP 2013 for the region and two found in AR tables ? Herring undersampled and mackerel oversampled.	Mostly	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Same results as in Table III.C.5 for only two species. Is it really concurrent sampling as specified in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4? Internal comments in cell A 4-5 (Blogs: ...).	Mostly	MS to clarify why only the target species (herring in I-II, mackerel in the North Sea) were sampled. Delete comment in cell A 4-5.
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Sampling effort targets in numbers of trips by metiers are mostly achieved, even if the planned coverage by sampling strategy is not strictly complied.	Mostly	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Weakness of the self sampling by skippers for herring.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Were CV estimates provided?	Only for mackerel. Herring sample too small for calculating consistent CV. CVs should be given in absolute numbers instead of percentages (cf. Guidelines).	Mostly	amend table (CVs in absolute numbers)
	Were CV targets met?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	One recommendation from RCM NS&EA 2012 listed.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed

Region North Atlantic

C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table complete and detailed by fishing grounds. Table difficult to analyse by multiplying the lines (only one sampling strategy by line). Objectives planned in NP mostly achieved. Some metiers oversampled. Some others not sampled at all for some fishing grounds : SSC_DEF_100-119, TBB_DEF_70-99, FPO_CRU. Concurrent sampling on the market for pelagic trawlers shows also bad achievement rates.	Mostly	In the next AR, MS should organise Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 in a comparable way that facilitates evaluation.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table properly filled. Table organised by sampling frames, which makes comparison with Table III.C.3 almost impossible. Sampling frame NW3 missing. Column B was masked and bilateral agreements given in AR text are not reported. Inconsistencies on total numbers of trips in the year, numbers of trips planned and achieved between III.C.3 and III.C.4. For those provided objectives planned in NP are mostly achieved.	Mostly	In the next AR, MS should organise Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 in a comparable way that facilitates evaluation.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table correctly filled. Planned targets are mostly achieved. Some failures in VIIa and VIIbcjk for several stocks and for small pelagics or rays. Not clear why herring and blue whiting were sampled by unsorted catches and discards (normal case is either sampling unsorted catches, or landings and discards).	Mostly	MS to explain why herring and blue whiting were sampled by unsorted catches and discards (normal case is either sampling unsorted catches, or landings and discards).
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table complete and correct. Inconsistencies between Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 in terms of the numbers of species and individuals reported.	Mostly	see general comment on filling Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	General oversampling, severe oversampling in some cases (e.g. sampling frames W3 Concurrent at sea, S1 Other). Sampling effort targets in numbers of trips by metiers and sampling frames are mostly achieved. See comments on table III.C.5 for stocks.	Mostly	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes, detailed by metier and by stock. Many reasons but relevant.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes for landings, mostly for discards but samples size were sometime small. CVs should be provided in absolute numbers instead of percentages (cf. Guidelines).	Yes	MS to amend table (CVs in absolute numbers)
	Were CV targets met?	Mostly for landings but very good CVs for discards when provided (because here, CVs are given in absolute numbers?). With which reliability ?	Mostly	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes for landings, no explanation on the good results for discards.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	See section I.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	3 recommendations from RCM NA listed.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Implementation of the recommendation on boarfish found in the AR text was not applied in table III.C.5. Table III.C.6, in contrast, is listing Capros aper.	Mostly	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	MS intends to improve the monitoring of its subcontractors and to ensure the most representative coverage possible of all target metiers and their landings.	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
D	Recreational fisheries			
	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

Region North Atlantic

D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	A large part of Salmon recreational fisheries were closed in 2013. Monitoring of these fisheries by rivers well detailed in the AR 2013.	Yes	No action needed
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Derogations for sea bass, eel and sharks (section I)	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Were data quality targets provided?	Data quality assurance implemented by MS along its monitoring system for salmon well described.	Yes	No action needed
	Were data quality targets met?	No specific sampling or precision targets associated with this process.	Yes	No action needed

Member State: **Ireland**

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

		Judgement levels	
		Compliance class	Compliance level
Overall compliance	2013	No	<10%
	29 May 2014	Partly	10-50%
	28 March 2013	Mostly	50-90%
	EWG Answer	Yes	>90%
	Mostly	NA	not applicable

**EWG COMMENTS**      **EWG judgement**      **EWG**

No comments	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No recommendation by RCM NA 2012	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
No shortfall raised by MS	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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

AR text: Sampling for widely distributed (small pelagic) stocks extending into the NS&EA region is dealt with in the North Atlantic section	NA	NA
---	----	----

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

**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?	No information provided on NS&EA stocks	NA	No action needed
	No planned objectives in 2013 NP proposal.	NA	No action needed
	Yes. Several stocks sampled cover in fact both region NS&EA and region NA. So actions carried out by MS are resumed in region NA.	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed

**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	No action needed
	NA	NA	No action needed
	NA	NA	No action needed
	NA	NA	No action needed

**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	NA	No action needed
	NA	NA	No action needed
	NA	NA	No action needed
	NA	NA	No action needed

**E4 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 action needed
	NA	NA	No action needed

**Region North Atlantic**

**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?	Strange naming of the biological parameters. Regional column P not filled in accordance with the guidelines. Good achievement rates with many stocks oversampled. Some deviations, mainly for sex ratio@age and maturity@age. Availability of samples or scarcity of landings for some species. For some stocks, samples were collected but not yet analysed. Explanations given by stock. MS states in its AR that oversampling has not financial effect on foreseen NP budget.	Mostly	Revise and re-submit Table III.E.3
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed

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

Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	Yes, except for stocks for which samples are not yet been analysed : hake, anglerfish for example because age reading was stopped at regional level. In general yes for ALKs and weight@length. Mainly no for other parameters. MS claimed that many of the precision targets are not achievable. It is simply not cost-effective to obtain the excessively high number of samples (PSUs) required to achieve all the precision targets.	Mostly	No action needed
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed

**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 in section I. Relevant recommendations from RCM NS&EA and RCM NA 2012 are listed under III.C, but should be inserted in III.E. Yes (but in III.C) Yes	NA	No action needed
		No	Stock related recommendations to be shifted from III.C to III.E.
		Yes	No action needed
		Yes	No action needed

**E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	MS intends to follow recommendations from WKACCU (2008), WKPRESISE (2009), WKMERGE (2010), WKPICS (2011), WKPICS2 (2012) and WKPICS3 (2013). These recommendations might result in deviations from the planned sample numbers. MS remains also focused on providing high-quality data to stock assessment working groups.	Yes	No action needed
	Yes	Yes	No action needed

**F Transversal variables**

**F1 Capacity**

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	CV should not be indicated in percentage.	Yes	No action needed
--	---	-----	------------------

**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?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	No deviations	NA	No action needed
	No comments	NA	No action needed

**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	Yes	No action needed
	No comments	NA	No action needed

**F2 Effort**

<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?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	No comments	NA	No action needed
	No comments	NA	No action needed

**F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**

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

**F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
--	-----------------------------	----	------------------

Member State:

Ireland

AR year	2013	Judgement levels	
Version of the AR reviewed	29 May 2014	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the NP proposal	28 March 2013	No	<10%
		Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable
Overall compliance	Mostly		

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

F14 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?

No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No deviations	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No deviations	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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?

No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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?

No information provided on 'Upload in international database'	Mostly	AR2014: MS to report on upload in international database in table IIIG
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?  
 Are the responsive actions described ?  
 Are the responsive actions acceptable?

AR text "All recommendations received through the affiliated survey planning groups IBTS, WGIPS and SGNEPS were addressed." Those recommendations, however, were not listed.	Yes	AR2014: MS to list relevant recommendations from survey planning groups
Not in detail, could be more specific	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

Table is not filled according to the guidelines. MS should use the table provided, without changing the lines and filled with yes/no.	Mostly	MS is asked to replace the table and resubmit
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

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

Some response rates are bigger than 100%, even in case of census. In one case, response rate is 64% but CV is 0.	Mostly	MS should clarify about response rates and CVs and it is asked to resubmit the table.
--	--------	---

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	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

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

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

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	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

A4 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 actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

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

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
-----	-----	-------------------

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

Response rate and achieved sample rate should be presented as percentage. Response rate appears to be incorrect because they are higher than 100%.	Partly	Table should be corrected and resubmitted
--	--------	---

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	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

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

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

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

MS doesn't comment on the low response rate for companies <= 10	Mostly	MS should consider raising the sample size for Companies <= 10, as the response rate is low and the planned sample is only 15% of frame population.
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

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

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
-----	-----	-------------------

Member State:

Ireland

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	29 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	28 March 2013	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
	Mostly	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable? Yes, improvement compared to last year	Yes	MS should consider raising the sample size for Companies <= 10, as the response rate is low and the planned sample is only 15% of frame population.

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

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

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?

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations

Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?

Are the responsive actions described?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

IX Comments, suggestions and reflections

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?

X References

Is there a complete list of references?

XI Annexes

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No derogations identified	Yes	No action needed

No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

No comments	Yes	No action needed
MS mentioned progress made in year 2013 in terms of IT developments for data storage, upgrading of the data quality procedures and transmission of the data to end users.	Yes	No action needed

No deviation.	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

MS will continue its effort for improving the national IT system and for maintaining good relationships with the fishing industry, and the State authorities who have primary responsibility for logbooks and VMS data.	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

		AR2014: MS to follow guidelines with respect to STECF recommendations: 'MS should summarise the follow-up given to STECF recommendations in a text table comprising on the left side the recommendations and on the right side the responsive actions.'
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Member State: **Italy**

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

		Judgement levels	
		2013	
Overall compliance	Compliance class	No	<10%
		Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
	EWG Answer	NA	not applicable
		Mostly	

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
Yes. 13 derogations or exemptions listed.	Yes	No action needed

I General framework

Are derogations listed?

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 a national DCF website available?  
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?  
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Outline of main outcomes missing	Mostly	Please submit outline of main outcomes of national coordination meetings.

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?

For non attendance "no" is missing, if it is correct	Mostly	Yes, please complete table with the missing entries.
No (30 out of 53 planned meetings were not attended)	No	The reason for non-attendance should be indicated.

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?

Yes - together with recommendations from the relevant RCMs as well	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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?

No major changes detected	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

B Economic variables

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

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

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

Reference year should be 2012	Yes	Update table with the correct year
Reference year should be 2012	Yes	Update table with the correct year
Nomenclature in col H inconsistent (e.g. sometimes 18-< 24 m, sometimes VL1824);	Mostly	Update table and resubmit

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	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

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	YES	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

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 actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

**SUPRA-REGION Other regions**

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

Reference year should be 2012	Yes	Update table with the correct year
Reference year should be 2012	Yes	Update table with the correct year
Nomenclature in col H inconsistent (e.g. sometimes 18-< 24 m, sometimes VL1824);	Mostly	Update table and resubmit

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	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

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	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

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 actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

C Biological metier related variables

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

**Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea**

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

According to table III.A.1 MS is operating in Region MED&BS and Other/CECAF	Yes	No action needed
---	-----	------------------

Table complete and consistent. Some differences in numbers of trips found between NP and AR tables III.C.3, respectively 1470 and 1245 trips to be sampled. Why GND_SPF sampling frame DS10_8 and FYK_DES sampling frame DS17_8 disappeared in the AR table? NP objectives mostly achieved both on shore and at sea. Except for metiers PTM_SPF heavily undersampled and PS_LPF not sampled at all.	Mostly	MS to clarify if the metiers/sampling frames that have been listed in the NP but not in the AR have been sampled.
Table properly filled. Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 are consistent. NP objectives mostly achieved both on shore and at sea. Except for metiers PTM_SPF heavily undersampled and PS_LPF not sampled at all.	Mostly	No action needed

Member State:

Italy

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	December 2010	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

Table complete with relevant footnotes. Regional sampling programmes for large pelagics correctly included in the table. CVs should be given in absolute numbers instead of percentages (cf. Guidelines).	Mostly	amend table (CVs in absolute numbers)
Table correctly filled according to AR guidelines.	Yes	No action needed
Design and achievements rates are consistent with the NP proposal, in terms of numbers of trips sampled. Only purse seine and deepwater trawling metiers appear as undersampled. Concerning stock sampling, if compared to national targets, achievement rates are good. Most of species appear as oversampled at national level (only the given reference) - up to 10000% for <i>Trigla lucerna</i> ! Nevertheless, some species were undersampled, even at national level: <i>Lophius piscatorius</i> , <i>Todaropsis eblanae</i> , large pelagics except swordfish and <i>Sarda sarda</i> .	Mostly	No action needed
Text very detailed on metiers to be sampled for landings and for discards, justifying also how Italy filled the tables III.C. Deviations for metiers PTM_SPF and PS_LPF are explained, as well about some minor changes concerning metiers and sampling frames included in the NP 2013. But no specific comments on undersampling of some stocks because it is impossible to identify real discrepancies between objectives planned at national level and results provided at GSA level.	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No action needed

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	No action needed
Were CV targets met?	No	No action needed
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	Yes
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ?	Mostly	Delete old recommendations
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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 action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Region Other regions

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.	NA	No action needed
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No information provided on CECAF sampling frames, neither in NP nor AR tables.	NA	No action needed
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.	NA	No action needed
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.	NA	No action needed
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No quantitative information provided on CECAF fisheries in 2013 AR.	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	MS states in its 2013 AR that RCM_LDF agreed in 2013 that Italian fishing activities in CECAF area can be considered as negligible. But this exemption was decided only in September 2013 and is not included in the tables of derogation in section I.	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	NA	No action needed

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	NA	NA	No action needed
Were CV targets met?	NA	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	NA	No action needed

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	NA	No action needed
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Only one recommendation former to 2012. Nothing about the recommendation made by RCM_LDF 2013 proving that MS has no more obligation regarding CECAF area.	No	add RCM LDF recommendation
NA	No	No	No action needed
NA	NA	NA	No action needed

C4 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	No action needed
NA	NA	NA	No action needed

D Recreational fisheries

Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
---	---------------------------------------	-----	------------------

Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Member State:		Italy		Judgement levels	
AR year Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal		2013	Compliance class	Compliance level	
		31 May 2014	No	<10%	
		December 2010	Partly	10-50%	
		EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%	
	Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%	
			NA	not applicable	
		<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG</b>	
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly. Monitoring for the 3 required species BFT, eel and sharks are detailed but no specific data collection programme for sharks in place.	Mostly	Yes. MS to implement GFCM data collection framework for recreational fisheries for coastal sharks and rays once this framework is finalised.	
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No reference made to derogations.	NA	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	Impossible to evaluate because MS provided limited quantitative data.	NA	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
D2	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>				
	Were data quality targets provided?	MS stated all is ok, but no quantitative data provided.	Mostly	AR2014: MS to provide more detailed information on data quality.	
	Were data quality targets met?	Impossible to evaluate because MS provided no quantitative estimates on recreational catches.	Mostly	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
D3	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>				
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No reference made to derogations	NA	No action needed	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No recommendation addressed to MS by RCM MED&BS 2012.	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
D4	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>				
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No shortfall raised by MS	Mostly	Yes. MS to implement GFCM data collection framework for recreational fisheries for coastal sharks and rays once this framework is finalised.	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed	
E	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>				
	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	According to table III.A.1, MS is operating in Region MED&BS and Other/CECAF	Yes	No action needed	
<b>Region Mediterranean Sea and Black 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 action needed	
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Table impossible to evaluate regarding NP objectives as AR results are not provided at the same scale. Most of the stocks listed in AR table III.E.3 appear as oversampled. Few stocks were partly undersampled, all in GSAs 9 and 17 (why ?). Information on biological variables from collection of eel (see AR text section III.E.5) to be added to Table III.E.3.	Mostly	add eel to Table III.E.3	
	Are the deviations explained?	MS states in its AR that oversampling has not financial effect on foreseen NP budget. For some species, it was not possible to reach in 2013 a "consistent" number of specimens for updating biological parameters.	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
E2	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>				
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes. CVs are provided by stock (by GSA). MS effort to estimate CVs for Elasmobranchs shall be underlined.	Yes	No action needed	
	Were CV targets met?	CVs were estimated by stock (GSA level). Precision target is reached only for 87 parameters on the 482 updated.	Mostly	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	Reasons given by MS are seasonality of catches for some metiers or some stocks and their low volumes of landings or availability for sampling.	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
E3	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>				
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	See section I.	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Only recommendations from RCM MED&BS and LM 2012 must be listed, not those given in the former years. No recommendations on stock variables were addressed to MS by these bodies in 2012.	Yes	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed	
E4	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>				
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	MS will continue to investigate at National and Regional level the best approach to estimate CVs.	Yes	No action needed	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed	
<b>Region Other regions</b>					
E1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>				
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No information provided on CECAF stocks, neither in NP nor AR tables.	NA	No action needed	
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No information provided in NP 2013. In its AR 2013, MS did not mention to have request a derogation for CECAF region.	NA	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	MS catch is a small part of the EU landings in the CECAF area. MS is ready to contribute to an international sampling programme implemented under the RCM_LDF umbrella.	NA	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed	
E2	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>				
	Were CV estimates provided?	NA	NA	No action needed	
	Were CV targets met?	NA	NA	No action needed	
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed	
E3	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>				
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation was requested by MS.	NA	No action needed	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No 2012 recommendation, even the 2013 one from RCM_LDF on the international agreement.	NA	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed	
E4	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>				
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	MS is ready to contribute to an international sampling programme implemented under the RCM_LDF umbrella.	NA	No action needed	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed	
F	<b>Transversal variables</b>				
	guidelines?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	

Member State:

Italy

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

Overall compliance

		Judgement levels	
		Compliance class	Compliance level
2013	31 May 2014	No	<10%
	December 2010	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

F13

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

F12

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

no relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

F14

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

F12

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

no relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

F14

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

G Research surveys at sea

G1

Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  
guidelines?  
proposal?  
Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?  
Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
No major deviations	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
Maps of hauls actually carried out are presented in Annex only.	Yes	No action needed

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	Yes	No action needed
Yes. MEDITS in GSA 16 started in September due to administrative and bureaucratic difficulties.	Mostly	Yes. MS to ensure administrative and bureaucratic difficulties do not delay surveys in future years.
No details given on 'bureaucratic difficulties encountered'	Mostly	No action needed

G3

Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations  
Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?  
Are the responsive actions described ?  
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

G4

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 action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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? guidelines?  
guidelines?

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

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	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

A2

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

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

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	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

A4

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 actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

B

Collection of data concerning the processing industry

guidelines?  
guidelines?

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
have 12% achieved sample rate	Mostly	Table should be corrected

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	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed



**Member State:**

**Italy**

**Judgement levels**

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	December 2010	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>	NA	not applicable

**EWG COMMENTS**

**EWG judgement**

**EWG**

<b>B2</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes NA NA	Yes NA NA	No actions needed No actions needed No actions needed
<b>B3</b>	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	Yes NA NA	No actions needed No actions needed No actions needed
<b>B4</b>	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	No actions needed No actions needed
<b>V</b>	<b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>			
	<b>1</b> Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	Yes Yes derogations are listed in text but under section 'general framework'	Yes NA	No action needed No action needed
	<b>2</b> Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No relevant information provided; not possible to assess. No comments	Mostly NA	AR2014: MS to provide more detailed information how to avoid shortfalls No action needed
<b>VI</b>	<b>Module for management and use of the data</b>			
	<b>1</b> 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? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Mostly, SGMOS or Processing call are for example not listed. What is about the MAREA project? Not relevant. Table VI.1 is only a sheet to be filled in AR. Data calls are mandatory. No comments Only general information provided by MS on its national DB in its NP. AR mentioned progress made in year 2013, under a concise but precise form. No comments No comments	Mostly Yes Yes Yes Yes	Please provide missing information. No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
	<b>2</b> Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
<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?	No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed
<b>VIII</b>	<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>			
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>IX</b>	<b>Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>			
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>X</b>	<b>References</b>			
	Is there a complete list of references?	No (MEDITS-Handbook, Revision n. 6, April 2012, MEDITS Working Group: 92 pp. is not included)	Mostly	AR2014: MS to ensure complete list of references is provided.
<b>XI</b>	<b>Annexes</b>			
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

Member State:

Latvia

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	5 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2011? (amended for 2012)	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	NA	not applicable

I General framework

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
Yes (in section II.A, though)	Yes	In the future MS should move derogations table to chapter I. Moreover, In the text, MS should consistently refer to 'Annual Report' instead of 'Technical Report'

II National data collection organisation

A National correspondent and participating institutes

Are derogations listed?

Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?

Is there a national DCF website available? Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?

Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings? If yes, is the list filled in according the guidelines?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	No	MS should install a DCF website
No comments	No	MS should install a DCF website
No comments	No	MS should provide requested information
No comments	No	MS should provide requested information

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
Attendance at all planned meetings	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

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

Only general description of fishery. No changes are described.	Partly	In the future MS should apply guidelines and describe major changes in the fishing sector, where applicable
No comments	Yes	No action needed

B Economic variables

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

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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 comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

SUPRA-REGION Other regions

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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 comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

Member State:

Latvia

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	5 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2011? (amended for 2012)	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

C Biological metier related variables

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

Yes		
-----	--	--

Region Baltic 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?

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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

Latvia is still using the outdated version of the III.C.3 table. There is no need to calculate precision for volume of discards. CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.11) instead of percentages (e.g. 11%), see guidelines p. 15. Not clear what the Latvian planned sample numbers are from Table III.C.5, as there are two different sampling intensities/levels given at the regional level and no National planned numbers appear in this Table	Mostly	MS to provide the National Planned Sample numbers.
Yes, but no evidence of concurrent sampling from this table.	Yes	No action needed

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

AR text mentions added metier 'GNS_DEF >=157' on turbot, but in the tables, it only occurs in Table III.C.6. To be added to Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4.	Mostly	No action needed
---	--------	------------------

Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

Explanations are general, but not by metier. There is extreme oversampling of FYK_FWS_0_0_0 and GNS_FWS_0_0_0. MS argues that many trips had to be sampled to reach sufficient numbers per species, but much more perch, pike-perch, sea trout and whitefish have been measured by MS than planned at regional level (Table III.C.5). Does this excess sampling have financial implications?	Mostly	MS to clarify if the excess sampling, is at National expense or is being charged to the DCF?
Yes	Yes	NA

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	Yes	No action needed
Mostly	Mostly	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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 action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

C4 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 action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Region North Atlantic

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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

CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.11) instead of percentages (e.g. 11%), see guidelines p. 15.	Yes	No action needed
Yes, but no evidence of concurrent sampling from this table.	Yes	No action needed

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

redfish: 5-times higher length sampling than planned	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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	NA	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Partly, the MS simply states "accomplished"	Partly	No action needed
Partly, the MS simply states "accomplished", so not able to judge the action	Partly	No action needed

C4 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 action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

Region Other regions

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?

Region should be 'Other regions', and RFMO 'CECAF'	Yes	No action needed
Region should be 'Other regions', and RFMO 'CECAF'	Yes	No action needed
Region should be 'Other regions', and RFMO 'CECAF'	Yes	No action needed
Region should be 'Other regions', and RFMO 'CECAF'	Yes	No action needed
MS refers to multilateral agreement	Yes	No action needed

<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Latvia</b>	<b>Judgement levels</b>	
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Compliance class</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	5 June 2014	No	<10%
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	October 2011? (amended for 2012)	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

		<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG</b>
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	MS refers to multilateral agreement	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
<b>C3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	MS refers to multilateral agreement	Yes	No action needed
	Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	MS refers to multilateral agreement	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	MS refers to multilateral agreement	Yes	No action needed
		NA	NA	No action needed
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Were the relevant derogations listed? Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	NA
	Are the responsive actions described ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	RCM LDF recommendations mentioned	Yes	No action needed
		Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Yes	Yes	No action needed
<b>D</b>	<b>Recreational fisheries</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	No action needed
	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	only Baltic Sea is relevant	Yes	No action needed

**Region Baltic Sea**

<b>D1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments derogation on cod sampling No comments No comments	Yes Yes NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed		
	<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?	Yes (exhaustive sampling) No comments No comments No comments	Yes NA NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed	
		<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 comments PGRFS/WGRFS recommendations mentioned No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
			<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?	No shortfalls NA	NA NA

**Region North Atlantic**

<b>D1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are obtained derogations mentioned? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA (no recreational fisheries in this region) NA NA NA	NA NA NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed		
	<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?	NA NA NA NA	NA NA NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed	
		<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?	NA Yes, but no recreational fisheries is undertaken by Latvia NA NA	NA NA NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
			<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?	NA NA	NA NA
<b>E</b>				<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each res	Yes	Yes

**Region Baltic Sea**

<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	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  Considerable oversampling of maturity@age for herring in SD 25-27, 28.2, 29, 32; eastern Baltic cod, perch, flounder and turbot Yes	Yes  Yes Yes	No action needed  No action needed No action needed		
	<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? Are the deviations justified?	Yes in less than half of the cases Yes Yes	Yes Partly Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed	
		<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 ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes No relevant recommendations made by RCM Baltic NA NA	Yes NA NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
			<b>E4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes

Member State:

Latvia

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	5 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2011? (amended for 2012)	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No action needed

Region North Atlantic

<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	MS has reported length only as a stock related variable, as opposed to length@age... redfish: oversampling >500%	Partly Yes Yes Yes	MS to correct this reporting error in future reports. No action needed No action needed No action needed
<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? Are the deviations justified?	Yes, but for length so not for any stock related variable No Yes, MS does not have age reading expertise, so cannot age the otoliths collected.	No No Yes Yes	MS to correct this reporting error in future reports. MS to correct this reporting error in future reports. MS should make an effort to collect weights at sea, when otoliths are being extracted by the contractor. No action needed
<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 ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA One RCM North Atlantic recommendation listed, others were also made by the RCM 2012, but these have not been included. Only for one recommendation Acceptable for the one recommendation listed	NA Partly Partly Partly	No action needed MS to ensure all relevant LM recommendations are addressed in future. MS to ensure all relevant LM recommendations are addressed in future. MS to ensure all relevant LM recommendations are addressed in future.
<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?	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed

Region Other regions

<b>E1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b> 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?	Region should be 'Other regions', and RFMO 'CECAF' MS refers to multilateral agreement MS refers to multilateral agreement Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
<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? Are the deviations justified?	MS refers to multilateral agreement MS refers to multilateral agreement MS refers to multilateral agreement NA	NA NA NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
<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 ? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No derogation required, as only one metier involved No relevant recommendations from RCM LDF NA NA	NA NA NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
<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?	No needed as a multilateral agreement is in place to cover this sampling. No needed as a multilateral agreement is in place to cover this sampling.	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed

F Transversal variables

<b>F</b>	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes. Footnote is not applied	Yes	MS should apply footnote c in the future
<b>F1</b>	<b>Capacity</b>			
<b>F11</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?	No comments No deviations No comments	Yes NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
<b>F13</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 shortfalls No comments	Yes NA	No action needed No action needed
<b>F2</b>	<b>Effort</b>			
<b>F11</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?	No comments No deviations No comments	Yes NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
<b>F12</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 comments No deviations No comments	Yes NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
<b>F13</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 recommendations No comments No comments	NA NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed
<b>F14</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b> Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No shortfalls	NA	No action needed

Member State:

Latvia

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	5 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2011? (amended for 2012)	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
	Mostly	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA No action needed

F3 Landings

F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed

G Research surveys at sea

G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Number of hauls planned and achieved in Acoustic surveys are missing	Mostly	Yes. MS to update table with number of fish hauls
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Number of hauls planned and achieved in Acoustic surveys are missing in AR but presented in NP	Mostly	Yes. MS to update table with number of fish hauls
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Maps put in annex 2 instead of in the main body text according to the Guidelines.	Mostly	AR2014: Maps to be put in main body text of the report.
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.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
G3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?	No relevant recommendations exists	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
G4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No shortfalls identified	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed

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?	No data collection due to derogation, only freshwater	NA	No action needed
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	NA	No action needed
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	NA	No action needed
A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	no comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	no comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	no comments	NA	No action needed
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	no comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	no comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	no comments	NA	No action needed
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	no comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	NA	No action needed
A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	no comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments	NA	No action needed
B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry			
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes, but according to text and table.IV.B.2 scheme A and B have been used. This should be indicated.	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			

**Member State:**

Latvia

**Judgement levels**

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	5 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2011? (amended for 2012)	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

**EWG COMMENTS**

**EWG judgement**

**EWG**

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the responsive actions described ?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>B4</b> Actions to avoid shortfalls			
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments	Yes	No action needed

**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?	Only Baltic Sea is presented in table. For areas CEEAF and North Atlantic the indicators 5,6,7 should be included	Mostly	AR2014: MS to include indicators 5, 6, 7 for CEEAF and North Atlantic. MS also to include this in NP
Are the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations	NA	No action needed

**2 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls identified	NA	No action needed
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed

**VI Module for management and use of the data**

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

Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes, apart from: Herring data should also go to ICES North-Western Working Group (NWWG). Table should also contain aquaculture as column header	Yes	MS should implement amendments in the future
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed

**2 Actions to avoid shortfalls**

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed

**VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations**

Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

**VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations**

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
--	-------------	-----	------------------

**IX Comments, suggestions and reflections**

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
--	-------------	-----	------------------

**X References**

Is there a complete list of references?	No reference list available	No	AR2014: MS to include list of references
---	-----------------------------	----	--

**XI Annexes**

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
---	-------------	-----	------------------

Member State:		Lithuania	Judgement levels		
AR year	Version of the AR reviewed	Version of the NP proposal	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			5 June 2014	No	<10%
			31 October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
			<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG Action needed?</b>
I	General framework	Are derogations listed?	No comments	No	MS should provide a table of derogations or a sentence, that no derogations have been asked for.
II	National data collection organisation	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
A	National correspondent and participating institutes	Is there a national DCF website available?	No comments	No	MS to create a DCF website
		Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments	No	MS to provide necessary content
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	The outline of outcomes are missing, no annex 2 provided	Mostly	MS is asked to provide outline of main outcomes
		If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?	No comments	No	MS to provide information according to the guidelines.
B	Regional and international coordination				
B1	Attendance of international meetings	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Not all necessary cells are filled in (Attendance at National Correspondent meeting 2013-2 and 2012-04?)	Yes	MS should provide information about attendance or non-attendance at mentioned NC meetings.
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	All planned meetings were attended	Yes	No action needed
B2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Missing recommendations and actions: RCM Baltic 2012 Météier related variables: Routines for establishing bilateral agreement, RCM Baltic 2012 – Météier related variables: Routines for establishing bilateral agreements, RCM Baltic - Sampling of Météier related variables including foreign landings ; Requirement of on-line information on fleet behavior, Météier variables: Metier Descriptions, Stock related variables: Setting up of Bilateral agreements	No	Please provide relevant recommendations.
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	No	Please provide information on actions taken
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	No	Can only be evaluated after submission of necessary information.
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?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
B	Economic variables	Is information under III.B.1-4 for each supra-region given?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations justified?	MS should identify clustered segments with *. Some variables missing (investment, fin. Pos)	Mostly	Table should be completed and resubmitted
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No actions needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No actions needed
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No actions needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No actions needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No actions needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No actions needed
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No actions needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations justified?	MS should identify clustered segments with *. Some variables missing (investment, fin. Pos)	Mostly	Table should be updated and resubmitted
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No actions needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No actions needed
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No actions needed
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No actions needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No actions needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No actions needed
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No actions needed
C	Biological metier related variables	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	Yes (but sampling in ICES V, VI, XII, XIV and NAFO should be described in the AR text under 'North Atlantic', not 'North Sea and Eastern Arctic')	Yes	MS to ensure the text for the different regions is clearly separated in the text
Region Baltic Sea	C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	Column K (Planned minimum no. of fish to be measured at national level): only length sampling should be included. CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.11) instead of percentages (e.g. 11%), see guidelines p. 15.	Yes	No action needed



Member State:

Lithuania

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

2013		Judgement levels	
	Compliance class	Compliance level	
5 June 2014	No	<10%	
31 October 2012?	Partly	10-50%	
EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%	
	Yes	>90%	
	NA	not applicable	

Overall compliance

Mostly

EWG COMMENTS EWG judgement EWG

Mostly as the same species are reported in both tables III.C.5 and III.C.6, with no indication that concurrent sampling actually took place. Concurrent sampling at sea is highlighted for 2 meters, in which case we would expect to see more species listed in Table III.C.6	Mostly	MS to ensure this is addressed in future AR's.
PTM_SPF_16-31_0_0: 8 trips achieved while only 5 were planned. AR text: "Extra trips to gather samples did not require any additional costs." Sprat and herring length sampling, however, was approx. double as high as planned.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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	Yes	No action needed
Yes (only slightly missed for eel in Fyke nets)	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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 derogations listed, so we assume none have been requested	No	MS to clarify if any derogations have been requested
RCM Baltic 2012 recommendations listed.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

C4 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 action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal guidelines?  
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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

CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.11) instead of percentages (e.g. 11%), see guidelines p. 15. Species name for pelagic redfish in ICES I-II is <i>Sebastes mentella</i> (instead of <i>S. marinus</i> ).	Yes	No action needed
Yes. Species name for pelagic redfish in ICES I-II is <i>Sebastes mentella</i> (instead of <i>S. marinus</i> ).	Yes	No action needed

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

OTB_CRU_32-69_0_0, OTM_DEF_100-119_0_0: Oversampling (2 trips achieved while only 1 trip was planned. AR text: "Sampling was performed in order to cover high season of fishery. However, this action did not require extra costs."	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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, cv not provided for <i>P. borealis</i>	Mostly	MS to provide all cv's in future reports
Mostly, cv not provided for <i>P. borealis</i>	Mostly	MS to provide all cv's in future reports
No, deviations explained for numbers of trips achieved only and not for cv's	No	MS to provide details relating to cv's in future reports.
No, deviations explained for numbers of trips achieved only and not for cv's	No	MS to provide details relating to cv's in future reports.

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 derogations listed, so we assume none have been requested	No	MS to clarify if any derogations have been requested
RCM Baltic 2012 recommendations listed.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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

No	No	MS to provide actions to address shortfalls (e.g in this year, no information was provided on the lack of cv's) in future reports
No	No	MS to provide actions to address shortfalls (e.g in this year, no information was provided on the lack of cv's) in future reports

Region North Atlantic

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal guidelines?  
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  
Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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

CVs should be reported in absolute numbers (e.g. 0.11) instead of percentages (e.g. 11%), see guidelines p. 15. The AR text is a little confusing as it combines the North sea & Eastern Arctic with the North Atlantic, under the same section.	Yes	MS to ensure the text for the different regions is clearly separated in the text
--	-----	--

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, as the same species are reported in both tables III.C.5 and III.C.6, with no indication that concurrent sampling actually took place. Concurrent sampling at sea is highlighted for 2 meters, in which case we would expect to see more species listed in Table III.C.6	Yes	MS to ensure this is addressed in future AR's.
--	-----	--

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

Oversampling (2 trips achieved while only 1 trip was planned. AR text: "Sampling was performed in order to cover high season of fishery. However, this action did not require extra costs."	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
NA	Yes	No action needed
NA	Yes	No action needed

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

No derogations listed, so we assume none have been requested	No	MS to clarify if any derogations have been requested
--	----	--

Member State:

Lithuania

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	5 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
	Mostly	NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS EWG judgement EWG

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	RCM North Atlantic 2012 recommendations have not been listed	No	MS to provide all RCM recommendations and actions taken in future reports. This happened as a result of both the NS&EA and NA regions being reported under the same heading. Ms to avoid this confusion in the future.
Are the responsive actions described ?	No	No	MS to provide all RCM recommendations and actions taken in future reports. This happened as a result of both the NS&EA and NA regions being reported under the same heading. Ms to avoid this confusion in the future.
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	MS to provide all RCM recommendations and actions taken in future reports. This happened as a result of both the NS&EA and NA regions being reported under the same heading. Ms to avoid this confusion in the future.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed

Region Other regions

C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal guidelines? guidelines? guidelines? guidelines?	Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	CECAF: MS refers to multilateral agreement. SPRFMO: no trip achieved (1 trip planned)	Partly	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Were CV estimates provided?	MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated for SPRFMO	Partly	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO, and then report cv's.
	Were CV targets met?	MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated for SPRFMO	Partly	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO, and then report cv's.
	Are the deviations explained?	MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated for SPRFMO	Partly	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO, and then report cv's.
	Are the deviations justified?	MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated for SPRFMO	Partly	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO, and then report cv's.
C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations listed, so we assume none have been requested	No	MS to clarify if any derogations have been requested
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	RCM LDF 2012 did not make any relevant recommendations.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	RCM LDF 2012 did not make any relevant recommendations.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	RCM LDF 2012 did not make any relevant recommendations.	Yes	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi - lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO

<b>Member State:</b>	<b>Lithuania</b>	<b>Judgement levels</b>	
<b>AR year</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Compliance class</b>	<b>Compliance level</b>
<b>Version of the AR reviewed</b>	5 June 2014	No	<10%
<b>Version of the NP proposal</b>	31 October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>	NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi-lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO

**D Recreational fisheries**

**Region Baltic Sea**

<b>D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	only Baltic Sea is relevant	Yes	No action needed
<b>D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Not clear which data (apart from estimated total annual catch weights) have been collected e.g. Number of boats involved etc.	Mostly	Yes. MS to clarify the achievement for the data collected in 2013 for the different species.
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No derogations	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No, only brief text on activities	Mostly	Yes. MS to describe deviations in the report
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
<b>D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Were data quality targets provided?	No clear text provided on data quality	Partly	Yes. MS to provide information on data quality
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
<b>D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Were the relevant derogations listed?	no derogation listed	NA	No action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed

**E Biological stock-related variables**

**Region Baltic Sea**

<b>E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes, but the species name for Baltic herring is presented as <i>Clupea harengus</i> in Tables III.E.1 - III.E.2 but as <i>Harengus membras</i> in Table III.E.3	Yes	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Undersampling for all four species, especially for cod (42-46%) and sprat (62%).	Partly	The MS should revise its planned numbers for the biological variables.
	Are the deviations explained?	General explanation for undersampling, but nothing specific to explain the undersampling of cod and sprat.	Partly	The MS should provide detailed explanations for the low achievement rates for cod and sprat.
	Are the deviations justified?	General explanation for undersampling, but nothing specific to explain the undersampling of cod and sprat.	Partly	The MS should provide detailed explanations for the low achievement rates for cod and sprat.
<b>E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Were CV targets met?	Yes, apart from a few (length@age for eel, weight@age and sex-ratio@age for sprat)	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
<b>E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations listed, so we assume none have been requested	No	MS to clarify if any derogations have been requested
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations proposed by the RCM Baltic	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	No relevant recommendations proposed by the RCM Baltic	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No relevant recommendations proposed by the RCM Baltic	Yes	No action needed
<b>E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	No	MS to provide a description of what actions they will take to solve the general undersampling of all species, especially for cod and sprat.
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	No	MS to provide a description of what actions they will take to solve the general undersampling of all species, especially for cod and sprat.

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

<b>E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes. Species name for pelagic redfish in ICES I-II is <i>Sebastes mentella</i> (instead of <i>S. marinus</i> ).	Yes	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Shrimp weight@length oversampled, redfish not aged but otoliths collected (which should be reported in Table III.E.3 according to AR guidelines).	Mostly	MS to provide details of otoliths and associated lengths in Table III.E.3
	Are the deviations explained?	Reason for oversampling shrimps not explained. AR text: "Oversampling did not require extra costs."	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
<b>E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Were CV targets met?	For shrimp, but not for redfish.	Mostly	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes, highly variable individual weights of redfish.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
<b>E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations listed, so we assume none have been requested	No	MS to clarify if any derogations have been requested
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
<b>E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	No	MS to provide details on shortfalls for redfish in the NS&EA
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	No	MS to provide details on shortfalls for redfish in the NS&EA

**Region North Atlantic**

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

Member State:

Lithuania

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	5 June 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
	<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>	NA	not applicable

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?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Shrimp and demersal fish in NAFO areas not sampled due to fisheries moratorium. Redfish not aged but otoliths collected (which should be reported in Table III.E.3 according to AR guidelines).	Yes	Redfish not aged but otoliths collected (which should be reported in Table III.E.3 according to AR guidelines). MS to take care of this issue in future reports
in section 'North Sea and Eastern Arctic'	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Yes	Yes	No action needed
No	No	No action needed
in section 'North Sea and Eastern Arctic'	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

No derogations listed, so we assume none have been requested	No	MS to clarify if any derogations have been requested
--	----	--

RCM North Atlantic 2012 recommendations have not been listed	No	MS to provide all RCM recommendations and actions taken in future reports. This happened as a result of both the NS&EA and NA regions being reported under the same heading. Ms to avoid this confusion in the future.
--	----	--

No	No	MS to provide all RCM recommendations and actions taken in future reports. This happened as a result of both the NS&EA and NA regions being reported under the same heading. Ms to avoid this confusion in the future.
----	----	--

NA	NA	MS to provide all RCM recommendations and actions taken in future reports. This happened as a result of both the NS&EA and NA regions being reported under the same heading. Ms to avoid this confusion in the future.
----	----	--

in section 'North Sea and Eastern Arctic'. MS does not have age reading expertise in readfish, so cannot age the otoliths collected. MS should endeavour to agree for another MS with expertise in reading redfish, to read their otoliths.	No	MS does not have age reading expertise in readfish, so cannot age the otoliths collected. MS should endeavour to agree for another MS with expertise in reading redfish, to read their otoliths, or request a derogation.
---	----	---

No	No	MS does not have age reading expertise in readfish, so cannot age the otoliths collected. MS should endeavour to agree for another MS with expertise in reading redfish, to read their otoliths, or request a derogation.
----	----	---

Region Other regions

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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?

Yes	Yes	No action needed
CECAF: MS refers to multilateral agreement. SPRFMO: no sampling achieved	Partly	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi-lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO

Yes	Yes	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi-lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO
-----	-----	---

Yes	Yes	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi-lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO
-----	-----	---

MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated for SPRFMO	Partly	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi-lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO, and then report cv's.
---	--------	--

MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated for SPRFMO	Partly	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi-lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO, and then report cv's.
---	--------	--

MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated for SPRFMO	Partly	MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi-lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO, and then report cv's.
---	--------	--

Member State:		Lithuania		Judgement levels	
AR year		2013		Compliance class	
Version of the AR reviewed		5 June 2014		No	
Version of the NP proposal		31 October 2012?		Partly	
Overall compliance		EWG Answer		Mostly	
		Mostly		Yes	
		NA		Yes	
				NA	
				not applicable	
		<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>		<b>EWG judgement</b>	
				<b>EWG</b>	
		MS refers to multilateral agreement which covers the CECAF region. No sampling, therefore no cv's calculated for SPRFMO		Partly	
		MS to continue to follow up on possibilities of signing bi-lateral agreements with other countries who could take up the sampling obligations in SPRFMO, and then report cv's.			
<b>E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		No derogations listed, so we assume none have been requested		No	
Are the deviations justified?		RCM LDF 2012 did not make any relevant recommendations.		Yes	
Were the relevant derogations listed?		RCM LDF 2012 did not make any relevant recommendations.		Yes	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		RCM LDF 2012 did not make any relevant recommendations.		Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?		RCM LDF 2012 did not make any relevant recommendations.		Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?					
<b>E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>					
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		Yes		Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes		Yes	
<b>F Transversal variables</b>		III.F.1 is provided in 2 parts (sheets), fleet segments should be described (instead of "none" either "all segments" or "no sampling applied")		Mostly	
<b>F1 Capacity</b>		III.F.1 is provided in 2 parts (sheets), fleet segments should be described (instead of "none" either "all segments" or "no sampling applied")		Mostly	
<b>F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		No comments		Yes	
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments		Yes	
Are the deviations explained?		No comments		Yes	
Are the deviations justified?		No comments		Yes	
<b>F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		No comments		Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		No comments		Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No comments		Yes	
<b>F2 Effort</b>		No comments		Yes	
<b>F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		No comments		Yes	
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments		Yes	
Are the deviations explained?		No comments		Yes	
Are the deviations justified?		No comments		Yes	
<b>F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		No comments		Yes	
Is respective data quality information given?		No comments		Yes	
Are the deviations explained?		No comments		Yes	
Are the deviations justified?		No comments		Yes	
<b>F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		No relevant recommendations		Yes	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		No comments		Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?		No comments		Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		No comments		Yes	
<b>F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		No comments		Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		No comments		Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No comments		Yes	
<b>F3 Landings</b>		No comments		Yes	
<b>F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		No comments		Yes	
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments		Yes	
Are the deviations explained?		No comments		Yes	
Are the deviations justified?		No comments		Yes	
<b>F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		No comments		Yes	
Is respective data quality information given?		No comments		Yes	
Are the deviations explained?		No comments		Yes	
Are the deviations justified?		No comments		Yes	
<b>F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		No relevant recommendations		Yes	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		No comments		Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?		No comments		Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		No comments		Yes	
<b>F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		No comments		Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		No comments		Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No comments		Yes	
<b>G Research surveys at sea</b>		No comments		Yes	
<b>G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		Number of fish hauls in the BIAS is mentioned in text but not in the table.		Mostly	
Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		No comments		Yes	
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments		Yes	
Are the deviations explained?		No comments		Yes	
Are the deviations justified?		No comments		Yes	
Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?		No comments		Yes	
<b>G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		No comments		Yes	
Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?		NA		NA	
Are the deviations explained?		NA		NA	
Are the deviations justified?		NA		NA	
<b>G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		No recommendations relevant to surveys		Yes	
Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?		NA		NA	
Are the responsive actions described?		NA		NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA		NA	
<b>G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		No comments		Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		No comments		Yes	

Member State:	Lithuania	Judgement levels		
AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level	
Version of the AR reviewed	5 June 2014	No	<10%	
Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2012?	Partly	10-50%	
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%	
		Yes	>90%	
		NA	not applicable	
EWG COMMENTS		EWG judgement	EWG	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	No action needed	
<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>			
	Even if freshwater aquaculture is not mandatory, filling in table IV.A.1 is mandatory and has not been done. No cells shall be removed from the table	No	MS should fill the table according to the guidelines	
	Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1? guidelines?	NA	No actions needed	
	NA	NA	No actions needed	
<b>A1</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA	No actions needed	
	NA	NA	No actions needed	
	NA	NA	No actions needed	
<b>A2</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	NA	No actions needed	
	NA	NA	No actions needed	
	NA	NA	No actions needed	
<b>A3</b>	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 actions needed	
	NA	NA	No actions needed	
	NA	NA	No actions needed	
<b>A4</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	No actions needed	
	NA	NA	No actions needed	
<b>B</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No actions needed	
	Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
<b>B1</b>	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 actions needed	
	Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
	Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
<b>B2</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No actions needed	
	NA	NA	No actions needed	
	NA	NA	No actions needed	
<b>B3</b>	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 actions needed	
	NA	Yes	No actions needed	
	NA	NA	No actions needed	
	NA	NA	No actions needed	
<b>B4</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No actions needed	
	Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
<b>V</b>	<b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>			
<b>1</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are the relevant derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	
	NA	No derogations apply	Yes	
<b>2</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No shortfalls identified	Yes	
	NA	NA	No action needed	
<b>VI</b>	<b>Module for management and use of the data</b>			
<b>1</b>	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? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	STECF (DG MARE) data calls missing	Mostly	
	NA	No comments	NA	
	NA	No description, same text as last year provided.	No	
	NA	No comments	Yes	
	NA	No comments	Yes	
	NA	No comments	Yes	
<b>2</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	
	NA	No comments	Yes	
<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?	Only 4 recommendations from 2012 STECF-EWG 12-01 and STECF-EWG 12-20 are listed. In total 10 recommendations from 2012 and 2013 are assumed relevant for Baltic countries by the pre-screener.	Partly	
	NA	Yes for the recommendations listed	Partly	
	NA	NA	No action needed	
<b>VIII</b>	<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>			
<b>IX</b>	<b>Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>			
<b>X</b>	<b>References</b>			
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No comments	Yes	
<b>XI</b>	<b>Annexes</b>			
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	only ref to WGBFAS report 2009 (description of survey standard trawl)	Yes	
	annexes not in the same report file		Mostly	
			AR2014: MS to put annexes in the report according to the guidelines.	

Member State:

Malta

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	27 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	March 2013	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

Overall compliance

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

I General framework

Are derogations listed?

No comments	Yes	Action needed?
		No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Is there a national DCF website available?  
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?  
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?  
If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?

No comments	No	MS is request to implement a DCF database and should provide the intended timeframe
No comments	NA	see previous comment
No formal meeting takes place as only one institute are involved.	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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?

No comments		MS should list all the DCF meetings in the table II.B.1 even MS has not participated and/or the meetings are not relevant for the MS
For relevant meetings which was carried out non-participation was explained by "administrative issues".	Partly	
	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	No	MS should list all the recommendations relevant for the country and for the reference year
No comments	NA	see previous comment
No comments	NA	No action needed

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?

No significant changes.	Yes	No action needed
Yes (only Med&BS relevant)	Yes	No actions needed

B Economic variables

Is information under III.B.1-4 for each supra-region given?

SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

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

Only 2012 numbers should be provided. Achieved sample number is higher than Frame Population	Mostly	Table should be corrected and resubmitted
--	--------	---

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

Only one year should be listed as reference year in col C	Yes	No actions needed
---	-----	-------------------

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

Only 2012 numbers should be provided. Some CV's are missing. For cases of census with less than 70% response rate, CV should be provided	Mostly	Table should be corrected and resubmitted
--	--------	---

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	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

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	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

B4 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 actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

C Biological metier related variables

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

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
-----	-----	-------------------

Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

MS should strictly follow the metier naming convention as agreed at Regional level. The Metier LVL6 reported in the table do not correspond to the RCMed&BS agreement (e.g. OTB\_DEMSP\_>=40\_0\_0 LLS\_DEMF\_0\_0\_0 OTB\_DEMSP\_>=40\_0\_0 etc). In the text it is reported that there is a bilateral agreement between Malta and Cyprus. Following this agreement (see also Cyprus AR) Malta should collect the data for OTB\_MDD\_>=40\_0\_0 but no data on OTB MDD are reported and no trips have been carried out. MS should also mention this bilateral agreement in the AR. In all the tables of the AR 2013, MS should report only the sampling year. RCM Med&BS recommendation "the planned minimum number of fish to be measured for metier related variables will not be required" mentioned in the text it's a request for the future NP 2014-2016

	Partly	Yes, MS should complete the table
MS should report only the sampling year	Mostly	Yes, MS should report only the sampling year
CV is not reported and there is a mismatch between the number of specimens sampled between table III.C5 and III.C6	Partly	Yes, MS should complete the table
Only half of the planned trips have been achieved and there is a mismatch between the number of specimens sampled between table III.C5 and III.C6. No discards data have been collected	Partly	Yes, MS should complete the table
In this section the CV should be reported for each species	Partly	Yes, MS should provide all missing CVs
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	Yes, MS should provide missing information
No comments	NA	

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

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

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

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

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

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

No	No	Yes, MS should provide all missing CVs
----	----	--

Were CV targets met?

NA	NA	Yes, MS should provide all missing CVs
----	----	--

Are the deviations explained?

NA	NA	Yes, MS should clarify why CVs are missing.
----	----	---

Are the deviations justified?

NA	NA	No action needed
----	----	------------------

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	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

C4 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 action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

D Recreational fisheries

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

Yes	Yes	No action needed
-----	-----	------------------

Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Member State:

Malta

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	27 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	March 2013	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

Overall compliance

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Mentioned in other section of AR. With regards to shark recreational fishery, MS stated that there is no recreational fishery for sharks but no additional informations are provided. MS should provide any references concerning the absence of recreational fishery for sharks (e.g. papers, pilot studies, survey, laws forbidden this fishery etc)	Mostly	AR2014: MS to information on shark recreational fishery should be included in the report
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Recreational fishery data for tuna are collected through a census approach	Yes	No action needed
	Were data quality targets provided?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
D3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	listed in other section of AR	Yes	No action needed
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
D4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
E	Biological stock-related variables	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?			
Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea				
E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Were CV estimates provided?	No	Mostly	No action needed
	Were CV targets met?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
E3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	NA	NA	No action needed
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
E4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
F	Transversal variables	Malta provided all results for 3 reference years: 2011-2013. The reporting period is 2013 so it would be preferable in the future if MS provides the result only for the reporting period.	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
F1	Capacity	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F2	Effort	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	CV is missing	Yes	Provide CV for survey conducted
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F3	Landings	According to the AR all landings data is collected on census basis. However sample survey is mentioned in the NP for vessels <10 m and no results reported in the AR	Mostly	MS should report the results of the Small scale fishery sampling survey separately
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	CV is missing for 2013 reference year	Mostly	No action needed
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
G	Research surveys at sea			
G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
G3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			



Member State:

Malta

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	27 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	March 2013	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

Overall compliance

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No action needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
<b>G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	MS described some issues on age readings which is related to stock biological variables	Yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed

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?	Table should refer only to the reference year for which data is collected	Yes	No actions needed
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	No	MS should update the table as soon as they have the final data
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	MS should complete the table with the relevant indicators according to the guidelines	No	Table should be completed and resubmitted as soon as the final data is available
<b>A1</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
<b>A2</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No	No	Text should be updated when the relevant table is filled
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No actions needed
<b>A3</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No actions needed
<b>A4</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed

B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table should refer only to the reference year for which data is collected	No	Table should be updated and resubmitted as soon as the data is available
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table should refer only to the reference year for which data is collected. Data quality indicators are missing. Achieved sample rate should be provided	No	Table should be updated and resubmitted as soon as the data is available
<b>B1</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	No	Text should be updated when data is available
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No actions needed
<b>B2</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No	No	Text should be updated when data is available
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
<b>B3</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	Yes	No actions needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	NA	No actions needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No actions needed
<b>B4</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No actions needed

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?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the relevant derogations listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<b>2</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed

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 comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?		Mostly	MS is requested to implement a DCF database and should provide the intended timeframe
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Mostly	MS is requested to implement a DCF database and should provide the intended timeframe
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed

VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations

	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	MS lists only older recommendations	Yes	AR2014: MS to only list the actual recommendations or explicitly state that there are no relevant recommendations
	Are the responsive actions described?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	Yes	No action needed

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations

	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
--	--	-------------	-----	------------------

IX Comments, suggestions and reflections

	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
--	---	-------------	-----	------------------

X References

	Is there a complete list of references?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
--	---	-------------	-----	------------------

XI Annexes

	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
--	---	-------------	-----	------------------

Member State:

The Netherlands

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

I General framework

Are derogations listed?

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

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 a national DCF website available?  
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?  
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?  
If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Maybe DCF material available if logged in. Other wise not.	Mostly	Should be clarified by MS
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No, but very few meetings were not attended (4 out of 34)	Mostly	No action needed

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?

No, All STECF/ICES recommendations are listed in sec VII. Only reference to the relevant recommendation in sec VII are given in this section.	Mostly	MS should in future AR follow guidelines and separate recommendations in correct section.
Yes in section VII	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No significant changes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

B Economic variables

Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?  
SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic

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

Yes	Yes	No action needed
According to NP, segments, smaller than 10 vessels needs to be clustered for confidentiality assurance, however segments with high number (from 12 to 60) of vessels were clustered without clear explanation in the text of AR.	Partly	MS needs to clarify the clustering scheme, since there are fleet segments that have sufficient number of vessels clustered together. In the future MS should use a clustering scheme according to guidelines, separating segments which have sufficient number of vessels
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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?

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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 action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

B4 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 action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

SUPRA-REGION Other regions

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

NA	NA	No action needed
----	----	------------------

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

NA	NA	No action needed
----	----	------------------

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

NA	NA	No action needed
----	----	------------------

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	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

C Biological metier related variables

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

Yes	Yes	No action needed
-----	-----	------------------

Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Yes	Mostly	Yes, MS should use the official Metier LVL6 codes
-----	--------	---

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

Yes	Yes	No action needed
-----	-----	------------------

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

Yes	Mostly	Yes, MS should correct the name of turbot ( <i>Scophthalmus maximus</i> ) according to commission decision 2010/93/EU
-----	--------	---

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	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Member State:		The Netherlands	Judgement levels		
AR year	Version of the AR reviewed	Version of the NP proposal	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			30 May 2014	No	<10%
			31 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
			NA	NA	No action needed
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Are the deviations justified? Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes Yes Yes	Mostly Partly Yes Yes	Yes, MS should provide missing CVs No action needed No action needed No action needed
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 Yes, in section VIIb Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
C4	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	No action needed No action needed
<b>Region North Atlantic</b>					
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?	OTM_SPF_32-69_0_0: expected trips at sea should be zero (the entered value '36' is an error, cf. Table III.C.4) Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
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?	only few cells with 'N/A' due to low no. of samples only in a few cases the target was met data quality is considered to be good (AR text) NA	Mostly Partly Partly NA	Yes, MS should provide CV estimates for blue whiting as >10000 measurements can not be accepted as 'too few samples' No action needed No action needed No action needed
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 Yes, in section VIIb Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
C4	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	No action needed No action needed
<b>Region Other regions</b>					
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 (region for CEECA areas should be 'Other regions') Yes (region for CEECA areas should be 'Other regions') Yes (region for CEECA areas should be 'Other regions') Yes (region for CEECA areas should be 'Other regions') 4 trips sampled out of 12 planned trips. no length samples included in Table III.C.6, whereas Table III.C.5 lists them Yes Yes	Mostly Mostly Mostly Mostly Partly Yes Yes	Yes, MS should use correct the name of region according to commission decision 2010/93/EU Yes, MS should use correct the name of region according to commission decision 2010/93/EU Yes, MS should use correct the name of region according to commission decision 2010/93/EU Yes, MS should use correct the name of region according to commission decision 2010/93/EU Yes, MS should provide missing length samples in Table III.C.6 No action needed No action needed
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 MS states that the data quality is not determined and has not been evaluated yet. No	No NA NA No	Yes, MS should provide CVs No action needed No action needed No action needed
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 Yes, in section VIIb Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
C4	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	No action needed No action needed
D	Recreational fisheries	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	NL only has recreational fisheries in one region	Yes	No action needed
<b>Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic</b>					
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?	No comments No derogations apply No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
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?	Descriptive targets such as area and species coverage, precision of length data Not specified in text NA NA	Yes NA NA NA	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
D3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogations apply	Yes	No action needed

Member State:		The Netherlands	Judgement levels	
AR year	2013		Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014		No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011		Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer		Mostly	50-90%
	Overall compliance		Yes	>90%
			NA	not applicable
<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>			<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG</b>
	WGRFS recommendations referred to		Yes	No action needed
	No comments		Yes	No action needed
	No comments		Yes	No action needed
D4	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	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?			
E	<b>Biological stock-related variables</b>			
	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?		Yes	No action needed
<b>Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic</b>				
E1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		columns E, G and L are hidden	Yes, MS should unhide columns before submission of next year's report
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		most stocks oversampled, a few stocks undersampled	Mostly
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No action needed
E2	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?		Yes, for some stocks	Partly
	Were CV targets met?		in about one third of the cases	Partly
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No action needed
E3	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		No	Yes
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		in section VIIb	Yes
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No action needed
E4	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	Yes
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No action needed
<b>Region North Atlantic</b>				
E1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		columns E, G and L are hidden	Yes, MS should unhide columns before submission of next year's report
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		some stocks are undersampled	Partly
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No action needed
E2	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?		for few stocks, some CVs provided where zero individuals were sampled	Mostly
	Were CV targets met?		in 3 out of 9 cases	Partly
	Are the deviations explained?		Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No action needed
E3	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		No	Yes
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		in section VIIb	Yes
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No action needed
E4	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	Yes
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No action needed
<b>Region Other regions</b>				
E1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		no achievements included, while Table III.C.5 lists length samples	No
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Not clear, as AR text mentions achievements that are not included in Table III.E.3	No
	Are the deviations explained?		No	No
	Are the deviations justified?		No	No
E2	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Were CV estimates provided?		No	No
	Were CV targets met?		No	No
	Are the deviations explained?		No	No
	Are the deviations justified?		No	No
E3	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		No	Yes
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		in section VIIb	Yes
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No action needed
E4	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	Partly
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No comments	NA
F	<b>Transversal variables</b>			
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		NP template used instead of template for AR.	No
F1	<b>Capacity</b>			
F11	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		This is only expressed in the text.	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?		No comments	Yes

Member State:

The Netherlands

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
No comments	Yes	No action needed

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls  
 Are the deviations justified?  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Ni shortfalls identified	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

This is only expressed in the text.	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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

This is only expressed in the text.	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Ni shortfalls identified	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

This is only expressed in the text.	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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

This is only expressed in the text.	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  
 Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Ni shortfalls identified	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
Achievement < 90% in two surveys	Mostly	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?  
 Are the responsive actions described ?  
 Are the responsive actions acceptable?

No reference to recommendations made in Survey Planning group.	Partly	AR2014: MS to list relevant recommendations from survey planning groups (available at <a href="http://community.ices.dk/admin/Recommendations/_layouts/15/start.aspx#/SitePages/Home.aspx">http://community.ices.dk/admin/Recommendations/_layouts/15/start.aspx#/SitePages/Home.aspx</a> )
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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, but MS should follow the guidelines and not erase Table lines	Yes	No action needed
--	-----	------------------

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

Yes	Yes	No action needed
-----	-----	------------------

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

For some variables the cv is missing and no explanation is provided	Mostly	MS has to provide all the cv's or explanation on why some cv's are missing
---	--------	--

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?

Low achieved sample rate for the oyster and the farm-eels sectors	Mostly	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

For most important sector mussels yes, for oysters also but stated as not reliable due to low number of respondents, for land based-eel no information given due to estimation of figures from previous years and expert knowledge.	Mostly	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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?

No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

A4 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 action needed
Explanation of actions is not sufficient	Mostly	Actions have to be further explained

Member State:

The Netherlands

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	31 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
EWG Answer	Mostly	Yes	50-90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

**B Collection of data concerning the processing industry**

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

Yes, but the reference year is 2011. The segment 50-249 is not correctly named	Yes	MS should clarify why the reference year is 2011
Yes, but the reference year is 2011. The segment 50-249 is not correctly named	Yes	MS should clarify why the reference year is 2011

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?

Yes	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

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

Yes	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
N.A.	N.A.	No action needed

Is respective data quality information given?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

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

NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

**B4** Actions to avoid shortfalls

NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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?

Indicators 1-4 is not listed in table	Mostly	Yes. MS to update table including indicators 1-4
No derogations	NA	No action needed

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No shortfalls identified	NA	No action needed
No shortfalls identified	NA	No action needed

**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?

Yes (minor typo: latin name for plaice is Pleuronectes platessa)	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
AR text not updated (refers to 2012)	Partly	MS must resubmit the section referring to the correct year(s)
No deviations	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

MS claims to have identified conflict between control regulation and DCF which prevent MS to submit VMS data.	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	NA

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

**VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations**

MS should summarise the follow-up given to STECF recommendations in a text table comprising on the left side the recommendations and on the right side the responsive actions. Section is separated in VIIa and VII b which is not in line with the guidelines	Mostly	AR2014: MS to update table and put the recommendation only in one chapter and follow the setup described in the guidelines.
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

**IX Comments, suggestions and reflections**

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?

Explanations to the report. Comments that need for follow-up have been passed on to Commission by adding them to the STECF-EWG14-07 comments	Yes	No action needed
--	-----	------------------

**X References**

Is there a complete list of references?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

**XI Annexes**

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Member State:

Poland

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

Overall compliance

		Judgement levels	
		2013	Compliance class
		31 May 2014	No
		22 October 2011	Partly
		EWG Answer	Mostly
		Yes	Yes
		Yes	NA
		Yes	Compliance level
		Yes	<10%
		Yes	10-50%
		Yes	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		Yes	not applicable

I General framework

II National data collection organisation

A National correspondent and participating institutes

Are derogations listed?

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

Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?  
Is there a national DCF website available?  
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?  
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?  
If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
Yes (under reconstruction)	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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?

Yes (although wrongly no stock coordinators in WGBFAS are indicated)	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

B Economic variables

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

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

no comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	NA	No action needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

no comments	yes	No action needed
no comments	NA	No action needed
no comments	NA	No action needed

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 comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

no comments	NA	No action needed
no comments	NA	No action needed

SUPRA-REGION Other regions

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?

no comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

no comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	NA	No action needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

no comments	yes	No action needed
no comments	NA	No action needed
no comments	NA	No action needed

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 comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

no comments	NA	No action needed
no comments	NA	No action needed

C Biological metier related variables

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

Yes	Yes	No action needed
-----	-----	------------------

Region Baltic 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	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Required CVS are given in % rather than numbers. CV not calculated for unsorted catches	Mostly	In future AR the MS should report CVs in numbers
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Overall, the no. of trips of the fleets in the sampling year has decreased to 82% compared to the reference years. The no. of sampled trips was approx. 75% of the planned trips. In SD 22-24, the metiers LLS_DEF_0_0_0 and OTM_SPF_16-31_0_0 were not sampled	Mostly	No action needed
---	--------	------------------

Are the deviations explained?

Yes, due to decrease in fishing activity relative to reference years or early closure of fisheries in most cases.	Yes	No action needed
---	-----	------------------

Member State:

Poland

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

Overall compliance

2013		Judgement levels	
Compliance class	Compliance level		
31 May 2014	No		<10%
22 October 2011	Partly		10-50%
EWG Answer	Mostly		50-90%
	Yes		>90%
	NA		not applicable

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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

not for unsorted catches	Mostly	MS to provide CVs for unsorted catches. In future, Required Cv should be given as a number and not as a %
landings: in 4 of 20 cases for landings were not met, discards: no CV targets were achieved. Overall 57% were not met	Partly	No action needed
Yes, but turbot not mentioned	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
Yes, but recommendations for NA should not be included under the Baltic region	Yes	for future AR the relevant recommendations should be listed under the correct region in the text
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic

- 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?

Yes. Fishing ground is actually ICES I-II, not only IIb. Number of trips during sampling year (column N) not known	Mostly	Number of sampling trips in the year should be listed and correct ICES fishing ground should be in table
Yes. Sampling frame (geographical location) is Eastern Arctic (ICES Sub-areas I and II), not Eastern Greenland (would be Div. XIVb). No. of trips during sampling year not known	Yes	No action needed
Yes. Fishing ground is actually ICES I-II, not only IIb.	Yes	Fishing ground to be corrected
Yes	Yes	Fishing ground to be corrected
Yes	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
No	No	CVs to be provided
NA	NA	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
In section I	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Region Other regions

- 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?

Number of trips during sampling year (column N) not provided	Mostly	Number of trips to be provided
Yes. No. of trips during sampling year not known	Mostly	Number of trips to be provided
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
CECAF: MS refers to multilateral agreement, SPRFMO: no PL fisheries in 2013.	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
Yes (RCM LDF)	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

D Recreational fisheries

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Region Baltic Sea

- 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**

No comments	Yes	No action needed
Derogations apply for salmon and eel	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed



Member State:

Poland

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

Overall compliance

		Judgement levels	
		2013	Compliance class
		31 May 2014	No
		22 October 2011	Partly
		EWG Answer	Mostly
		Yes	Yes
		Yes	NA
		Yes	Compliance level
		Yes	<10%
		Yes	10-50%
		Yes	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		Yes	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement	EWG
Yes	Yes
Information on data quality provided, no specific targets	No action needed
NA	No action needed
NA	No action needed
NA	No action needed

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

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

In section I	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

E Biological stock-related variables

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

Yes	Yes	No action needed
-----	-----	------------------

Region Baltic Sea

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Yes	Yes	for future AR the planned CVs must be given in numbers and not in %
Sea trout, western Baltic cod undersampled and herring in SD 25-32 undersampled	Mostly	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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	Yes	No action needed
30 of 43 cases were not met	Partly	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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	NA	No action needed
Yes	Yes	for future AR the relevant recommendations should be listed under the correct region in the text
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

Yes (typo: AR text refers to 2012 instead of 2013)	Yes	in future, MS should ensure that the correct year is stated in the text
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic

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	for future AR the planned CVs must be given in numbers and not in %
Yes (cod in ICES Sub-areas I-II), derogation for Greenland halibut sampling	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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	Yes	No action needed
only for length@age	Partly	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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 section I	Yes	No action needed
Recommendation re bilateral agreements is missing	Partly	relevant recommendations should be listed and action added
Yes for one recommendation. Accepted	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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 action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Region Other regions

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	for future AR the planned CVs must be given in numbers and not in %
CECAF: MS refers to multilateral agreement, SPRFMO: no PL fisheries in 2013.	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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	NA	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

E4 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 action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

F Transversal variables

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

Exemption from obligation to provide quality indicators applies to EU legislation. MS should provide indicators for data collected under national legislation	Yes	Yes. MS should implement amendment in future AR
---	-----	---

F1 Capacity

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Member State:

Poland

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

Overall compliance

		Judgement levels	
		2013	Compliance class
31 May 2014		No	Compliance level
22 October 2011		Partly	<10%
EWG Answer		Mostly	10-50%
Yes		Yes	50-90%
Yes		NA	>90%
			not applicable

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls  
Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?  
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No deviations	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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?

No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls  
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No shortfalls	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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?

No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls  
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?  
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

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?

Max. days eligible not filled in	Yes	AR2014: MS to fill in max. days eligible
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Maps are in Annex	Yes	AR2014: MS to put maps in text and not in Annex

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?  
Are the responsive actions described ?  
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

No relevant recommendations apply	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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 comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

The segment of "Land based farms - Combined - salmon" is not provided	Mostly	No action needed Explanations are needed to allow EWG to understand why this segment is not in the table anymore
no comments	No	No action needed
no comments	NA	No action needed

A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

no comments	Yes	Ms should provide missing information
no comments	No	Ms should provide missing information
no comments	No	Ms should provide missing information

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?

no comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Na	No action needed
no comments	NA	No action needed

A4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

no comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed

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	Yes	No action needed
Unpaid labour is missing; MS should not delete cells	Yes	No action needed

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Member State: Poland		Judgement levels	
AR year Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
	31 May 2014	No	<10%
	22 October 2011	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance	Yes	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable
		<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>
			<b>EWG</b>
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	no comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	no comments	No
	Are the deviations justified?	no comments	No
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	no comments	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	no comments	NA
	Are the deviations justified?	no comments	NA
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	One meeting is mentioned in 2011	Yes
	Are the responsive actions described ?	no comments	No
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	NA
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	no comments	Yes
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments	Yes
V	<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?	No comments	Yes
	Are the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation identified	Yes
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No shortfalls identified	Yes
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA
VI	<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?	STECF (DG MARE) data call on fish processing industry (EWG 13-15) missing. Not clear for which species the length and age data have been transmitted to ICES NWWG (PL has derogation for Greenland halibut sampling). WKMSB and WKMSPDF2 were 2012. RCM NS&EA missing.	Mostly
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	NA
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	System apparently mature	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Not clear, as AR text is not providing details on national databases etc.	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes (only minor)	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes
VII	<b>Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>		
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No relevant recommendations in 2013	Yes
	Are the responsive actions described?	It's not clear what kind of action the MS is planning for the recommendation for 2011	Mostly
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Responsive actions not concrete	Mostly
VIII	<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes
IX	<b>Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comments	Yes
X	<b>References</b>		
	Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes
XI	<b>Annexes</b>		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes

**Member State:**

**Portugal**

**Judgement levels**

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2011?	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

**Overall compliance**

**EWG COMMENTS**

**EWG judgement**

**EWG Action needed?**

	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
<b>I General framework</b>	Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes No action needed
<b>II National data collection organisation</b>			
<b>A National correspondent and participating institutes</b>	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Is there a national DCF website available?	Yes, but the address is not provided clearly in the AR	Yes MS should provide direct link in AR in the future
	Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?	No comments	Yes No action needed
<b>B Regional and International coordination</b>			
<b>B1 Attendance of international meetings</b>	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No comments	Yes No action needed
<b>B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations</b>	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	The reason given for not uploading data is not valid. Therefore data should be uploaded.	No. MS should upload data according to request from RCM NS&EA
<b>III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector</b>			
<b>A General description of the fishing sector</b>	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	No comments	Yes No action needed
<b>B Economic variables</b>	Is information under III.B.1-4 for each supra-region given?	Mediterranean has not been mentioned	Mostly MS should explain why Mediterranean is missing
<b>SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic</b>	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	100% planned sample rate should be displayed as census.	Yes MS has to write Census instead of survey sampling
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	Yes no action needed
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises	Partly MS should provide variables upon the last version of the guidelines
<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Number of dredgers <10m differs grossly from NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;	Mostly MS should provide more detailed assumptions how MS calculates capital value and capital costs
	Are the deviations explained?	The missing Mediterranean fleet is not explained but fleet differences are mentioned	Mostly MS has to provide information to explain the deviations from NP proposal
	Are the deviations justified?	Deviation for Mediterranean fleet is not justified	Mostly MS has to provide information to justify the deviations from NP proposal
<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is respective data quality information given?	no comments	Yes no action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	no comments	yes no action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	no comments	yes no action needed
<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no comments	Yes no action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	no comments	NA no action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	NA no action needed
<b>B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	no comments	Yes no action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Missing variables are not mentioned	Mostly MS should take the necessary actions to avoid these shortfalls in the future
<b>SUPRA-REGION Other regions</b>	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	100% planned sample rate should be displayed as census.	Yes MS has to write Census instead of survey sampling
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	Yes no action needed
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Numerous variables missing, e.g. salaries, debt/asset ratio, investment, number of fishing enterprises	Partly MS should provide variables upon the last version of the guidelines
<b>B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	vessel number in 'Other reg. HOK2440' does not correspond with NP/ description of methods and assumptions made for estimation of capital value and capital costs not provided;	Mostly MS should provide more detailed assumptions how MS calculates capital value and capital costs
	Are the deviations explained?	Number of vessels deviations are explained but not the missing variables	Mostly MS has to provide information to explain the deviations from NP proposal
	Are the deviations justified?	Deviations for missing variables are not justified	Mostly MS has to provide information to justify the deviations from NP proposal
<b>B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is respective data quality information given?	no comments	Yes no action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	no comments	yes no action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	no comments	yes no action needed
<b>B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no comments	NA no action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	no comments	NA no action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	NA no action needed
<b>B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	no comments	Yes no action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Missing variables are not mentioned	Mostly MS should take the necessary actions to avoid these shortfalls in the future
<b>C Biological metier related variables</b>	Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	Yes	Yes No action needed
<b>Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic</b>			
<b>C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			

Member State:

Portugal

		Judgement levels	
		Compliance class	Compliance level
AR year	2013	No	<10%
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	Partly	10-50%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2011?	Mostly	50-90%
	EWG Answer	Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	NA	not applicable

		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Just a minor issue: In the table C3 there are metiers from different regions (OTB_DEF_>=120_0_0 and OTB_MDD_130-219_0_0 = PT1) (OTM_DEF_100-119_0_0 OTM_DEF_100-129_0_0= PT2) with the same sampling frame code. Tables C3 and C4 for the region Eastern arctic are not coherent: in the C3 are mentioned two metier that thereafter are not reported (or if reported are merged with North Atlantic??) in Table C4. If the metiers have been put together (merged?) MS should check the design of the two tables, reporting the agreed naming convention for the fishery Region and be sure that the planned sampling numbers (trips), and also column N "Total No. of trips during the Sampling year" from the table C3 should match exactly with those of the table C4. In the AR 2013 text the mentioned metiers are correctly reported in separate sections	Yes	MS should clearly explain the difficulties of having one vessel cross into different regions in the same trip, and should highlight the various times where this occurs. MS should also explain how the "total number of trips during the sampling year" is calculated for III.C.3 and III.C.4 to make evaluation easier.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	see previous comments	Yes	MS should clearly explain the difficulties of having one vessel cross into different regions in the same trip, and should highlight the various times where this occurs. MS should also explain how the "total number of trips during the sampling year" is calculated for III.C.3 and III.C.4 to make evaluation easier.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	for OTM_DEF_100-119_0_0 have no trips have been achieved as no fishery took place, and the same is true for Sebastes mentella (III.C.5) there is a deviation from the planned sampling due to no fishing activity.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Cv has been provided for the sampled species	Yes	No action needed
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Were CV targets met?	No deviations	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	There are no derogations for module IIIC	NA	No action needed
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No relevant recommendations made in 2012	NA	No action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes for 2011 recommendations	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	No action needed
C4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No action needed

Region North Atlantic

C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	For 4 metier, FYC_CAT_0_0_0, OTB_CRU_>=55_0_0, OTM_DEF_100-129_0_0 and OTM_DEF_100-129_0_0, and for some species (mentioned in the text and in the table of the AR) is reported undersampling in respect to the planned one	Mostly	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Were CV estimates provided?	for all the species, in the landing fraction, CV has been met	Mostly	No action needed
	Were CV targets met?	The few deviations were found for the discard fraction	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?		Yes	No action needed
C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No derogations requested	NA	No action needed
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	Partly, as only one of the three relevant recommendations were listed.	Partly	MS should ensure that all relevant recommendations aimed at MS should be listed in future reports.
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Partly	MS should ensure that all relevant recommendations aimed at MS should be listed in future reports.
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Partly	Partly	MS should ensure that all relevant recommendations aimed at MS should be listed in future reports.
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Partly	MS should ensure that all relevant recommendations aimed at MS should be listed in future reports.
C4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	No action needed

Region Other regions

C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes. MS should please respect the naming convention for LPF metiers	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Name of the Region should be reported as "Other Regions", IOTC, ICCAT are already specified under the column "RFMO" Yes. MS should please respect the naming convention for LPF metiers	Yes	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	There is under sampling on shore for LLD_LPF_0_0_0 in IOTC. No sampling have been carried out in CECAF area at sea for PS_SPF_16_0_0, LHP_LPF_0_0_0, LLD_DWF_0_0_0.	Mostly	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	The deviations are not explained for CECAF area	Partly	MS to explain why they did not achieve any at sea sampling in three CECAF metiers.
	Are the deviations justified?	The deviations are not explained for CECAF area	Partly	MS to explain why they did not achieve any at sea sampling in three CECAF metiers.
C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			

Member State:

Portugal

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2011?	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

Overall compliance

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	No action needed
Were CV targets met?	Partly	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?		
No derogations requested	NA	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

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

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

D Recreational fisheries

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

Region North Atlantic

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

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

Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Were CV targets met?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

Are the responsive actions described ?

Are the responsive actions acceptable?

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Region North Atlantic

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 ?

Information is given for North Atlantic, ICCAT, IOTC and CEECAF all together	Mostly	AR2014: MS to follow Guidelines: 'Insert here region header, according to Appendix II of Commission Decision 2010/93/EU. For each region, sections III.D.1-4 should be given.'
--	--------	--

No information provided for sharks and eel. For sea bass MS should better clarify the situation	Partly	Yes, MS to clarify the situation on sea bass, and add text on eel and sharks
MS should clarify if there are derogations. It is now unclear if the derogation asked for in 2009-2010 is still in place.	No	Yes, MS to mention derogations if any. If no derogations apply, update text on sampling in 2013.
No deviations related to 2013 mentioned, text refers 2014/2015	Partly	Yes, MS to explicitly mention 2013 sampling and deviations if any.
No comments		

No information on data quality	Partly	Yes, MS to explicitly mention 2013 and if no sampling took place, mention that nothing can be said about data quality
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

No derogations apply	Yes	No action needed
Only old recommendation listed	Yes	AR2014: MS to follow guidelines: 'List the appropriate recommendations from the Liaison Meeting (LM) relevant to the AR year related to the recreational fisheries and give a brief description of the responsive actions taken'
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Although it was an old recommendation, but the description of the responsive action is not concrete	NA	No action needed

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

Yes		
-----	--	--

Yes	Yes	No action needed
for the species <i>Sebastes mentella</i> no sampling has been carried out, as no fishery occurred, and there is also undersampling for cod in the n of individuals for weight at length	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
New staff requiring training for G morhua, and no fishery for <i>S. mentella</i> .	Yes	No action needed

CV has been estimated for the species sampled and related variables	Mostly	MS to explain why they do not read the cod otoliths they collect.
No	No	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

no derogations in the Region	NA	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Mostly	Mostly	MS should read Cod, as they say in the Annual Report that this is the most important species in this region - MS to clarify.

Yes	Yes	No action needed
The table is completely filled in. The "Number of fish sampled" for stock based variables where not achieved for most off stocks. For some species (hake, anglers) length at age have not been presented due to lack in the consensus on the methodology to read otoliths	Partly	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Yes	Yes	No action needed
CV targets were met for 56% of the stocks	Mostly	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Member State:

Portugal

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2011?	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

Overall compliance

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
E4	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No action needed
E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	MS should increase efforts to secure biological sampling, especially for the Azores, even if this requires that the MS tracks landings to the mainland and samples ashore.
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	MS should increase efforts to secure biological sampling, especially for the Azores, even if this requires that the MS tracks landings to the mainland and samples ashore.
	Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	MS should increase efforts to secure biological sampling, especially for the Azores, even if this requires that the MS tracks landings to the mainland and samples ashore.
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 No Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
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 for these Regions No relevant recommendation from RCM LDF No relevant recommendation from RCM LDF No relevant recommendation from RCM LDF	NA NA NA NA
E4	Actions to avoid shortfalls  Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	As stated by MS: "Shortfalls are due to problems inherent in large pelagic fisheries: long fishing trips, vessel's conditions and sampling intensities depend on fishing pattern. No additional measures to be proposed." The EWG agrees that there are no actions to take as these issues will not change, as they are the features of the fishery. NA	No No action needed No action needed
F	Transversal variables  Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Fleet segments <10m missing in effort and landings variable groups	Partly MS should collect missing data
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?	No comments No comments No deviations listed	Yes NA NA
	F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No shortfalls listed	NA NA
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?	Fleet segments <10m missing in effort variable group No comments There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.	Partly Yes Partly
	F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments No deviations listed	Yes NA NA
	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?	No relevant recommendations No comments No comments	NA NA NA
	F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments MS should assure that missing data are being collected	Yes Partly
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?	No. Fleet segments <10m missing in landings variable groups No No. There is no valid justification for not collecting the missing variables.	Partly No Partly
	F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments No comments	Yes NA NA
	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?	No relevant recommendations No comments No comments	NA NA NA
	F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments MS should assure that missing data are being collected	Yes Partly
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?	Complete: yes, following guidelines: no  Design: yes, achievements: no due to technical problems during MEGS No comments No comments	Yes  Mostly Yes Yes

**Member State:**

**Portugal**

**Judgement levels**

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2011?	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

**Overall compliance**

**EWG COMMENTS**

**EWG judgement**

**EWG**

G2	<p><b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b></p> <p>Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?</p> <p>Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?</p> <p>Are the deviations explained?</p> <p>Are the deviations justified?</p>	Map numbers differ between text and table	Yes	AR2014: MS to align map numbering in text and tables
		Unclear to which extent the limited Portuguese data will influence the international indices. Bias on the estimates presented to the relevant working groups	Mostly	Yes. MS to consider risk of using this vessel in future
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
G3	<p><b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b></p> <p>Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?</p> <p>Are the responsive actions described ?</p> <p>Are the responsive actions acceptable?</p>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No recommendations listed, but text explains how follow-up took place	Yes	AR2014: MS to list relevant recommendations from survey planning groups (available at <a href="http://community.ices.dk/admin/Recommendations/_layouts/15/start.aspx#/SitePages/Home.aspx">http://community.ices.dk/admin/Recommendations/_layouts/15/start.aspx#/SitePages/Home.aspx</a> )
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
G4	<p><b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b></p> <p>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?</p> <p>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?</p>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Positive that MS investigates possibilities for a new vessel, although this was also mentioned last year so it is unclear if there is any progress.	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
IV A	<p><b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b></p> <p><b>A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b></p> <p>Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?</p> <p>Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?</p> <p>Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?</p>	Table IVA1 is not correctly filled: "sea bass and bream" are mentioned on 8 different lines (with wrong name in column "species")...	Partly	MS has to follow the most recent guidelines
		no comments	Yes	no action needed
		no comments	Yes	no action needed
A1	<p>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</p> <p>Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</p> <p>Are the deviations explained?</p> <p>Are the deviations justified?</p>	Table IVA1 is not consistent with the NP proposal/ Tables are filled with 2012 reference year, and the text refers to 2011	Partly	MS has to follow the most recent guidelines and to fill correctly the table IVA1. MS should clarify which is the reference year
		Deviations are not explained	No	MS has to explain deviations from the NP proposal
		Deviations are not justified	No	MS has to justify deviations from the NP proposal
A2	<p>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</p> <p>Is respective data quality information given?</p> <p>Are the deviations explained?</p> <p>Are the deviations justified?</p>	Additional information needed if census has too low response rate.	Yes	MS has to explain the low response rate
		Deviations are not explained	No	MS should explain deviations
		no comments	NA	MS has to justify deviations from the NP proposal
A3	<p>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</p> <p>Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?</p> <p>Are the responsive actions described ?</p> <p>Are the responsive actions acceptable?</p>	no comments	NA	no action needed
		no comments	NA	no action needed
		no comments	NA	no action needed
A4	<p><b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b></p> <p>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?</p> <p>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?</p>	Low response rates are not mentioned in the shortfalls	Mostly	MS has to take some measures to avoid this low response rate
		no comments	NA	no action needed
		MS does not mention the segmentation according the guidelines	Mostly	MS should follow the most recent guidelines
B	<p><b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b></p> <p>Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?</p> <p>Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?</p>	There is an inconsistency between the table and the text in AR about the collection of depreciation capital costs	Yes	MS should clarify the inconsistency between the table and the text in AR about the collection of depreciation capital costs
		Tables are filled with 2011 reference year, and the text refers to 2012/ missing data for depreciation of capital, unpaid labour and female FTE/the name of segments does not correspond to the guidelines	Mostly	MS should provide further information about the missing variables of depreciation of capital, unpaid labour and female FTE
		Some deviations are not explained	Mostly	MS should provide further information about deviations
B1	<p>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</p> <p>Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</p> <p>Are the deviations explained?</p> <p>Are the deviations justified?</p>	Some deviations are not justified	Mostly	MS should provide further information about deviations
		no comments	Yes	no action needed
		no comments	Yes	no action needed
B2	<p>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</p> <p>Is respective data quality information given?</p> <p>Are the deviations explained?</p> <p>Are the deviations justified?</p>	no comments	Yes	no action needed
		no comments	Yes	no action needed
		no comments	Yes	no action needed
B3	<p>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</p> <p>Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?</p> <p>Are the responsive actions described ?</p> <p>Are the responsive actions acceptable?</p>	no comments	Yes	no action needed
		no comments	NA	no action needed
		no comments	NA	no action needed
B4	<p><b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b></p> <p>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?</p> <p>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?</p>	No information provided	Mostly	Some measures or procedures for the missing variable should be undertaken.
		No information provided	Mostly	Some measures or procedures for the missing variable should be undertaken.
		no comments	Yes	no action needed
V	<p><b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b></p> <p>1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</p> <p>Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?</p> <p>Are the relevant derogations listed?</p>	No comments	Yes	AR2014: MS to check information in column 'time interval for position reports'
		MS should clarify if there are derogations. It is now unclear if the derogation asked for in 2009-2010 is still in place.	Mostly	AR2014: MS should clarify if there are derogations. It is now unclear if the derogation asked for in 2009-2010 is still in place. Clarify if derogation applies to calculations or to data collection.
		no comments	Yes	No action needed
VI	<p><b>Module for management and use of the data</b></p> <p>1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</p> <p>Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?</p> <p>Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</p>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Aquaculture call missing; not clear why data for fleet economics and aquaculture are not submitted	Mostly	MS should implement amendments in next AR
		No comments	NA	No action needed



Member State:

Portugal

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2011?	Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	<b>EWG Answer</b> <b>Mostly</b>	NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

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

Statements are too general, no real progress can be observed from the text so far	Mostly	MS should be more specific on achievements and on remaining problems
---	--------	--

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

Due to budget constraints MS was not able to carry out all the work related with a Central Data Base for DCF	Partly	MS should fulfill the obligations according to NP
No comments	Yes	No action needed

Are the deviations justified?

No. No deviations foreseen in that context.	No	MS should fulfill the obligations according to NP
---	----	---

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

Not sufficient. Budgetary reasons cannot be accepted.	Partly	MS should provide budget and perform the necessary work
---	--------	---

VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

IX Comments, suggestions and reflections

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

X References

Is there a complete list of references?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

XI Annexes

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Member State: **Romania**

AR year Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	2013		Judgement levels	
			Compliance class	Compliance level
	31 May 2014		No	<10%
	March 2010?		Partly	10-50%
		EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		<b>Partly</b>	Yes	>90%
Overall compliance			NA	not applicable

**I General framework**

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
Even if in the text it is reported that MS has requested some derogations (e.g. sampling <i>Trachurus trachurus</i> for metier related variables or for species of the recreational fishery), no derogations are listed	No	MS should list all the requested derogations and mention if have been accepted or not

**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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	All the information related to national database are reported under Module VI, for the future MS should report information also under this section
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

**B Regional and international coordination**  
**B1 Attendance of international meetings**  
Is Table II.B.1 complete?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
		However, MS should try to participate to all the planned meetings in order to harmonize and to standardize the collection of data between countries in the Region
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

Does not follow the guidelines. Recommendations from all sections are included here. Some are not relevant for the MS. Not in list-form. No indication by various letter types.	No	MS should follow the guidelines and report only the recommendations from the LM relevant for the country and for the reference year (2013)
Not always.	Mostly	Once identified correctly the recommendations, MS should report the responsive actions
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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

**III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector**  
**A General description of the fishing sector**

The description of the fishery is comprehensiv. No description on the the impact of the impementation of NP.	Yes	No action needed
Yes (only Med & BS relevant)	Yes	No actions needed

**B Economic variables**  
Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given?  
**SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea**

Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Correct and complete the table and resend it
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Correct the table and resend it
Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines? Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Several numbers do not correspond with entries in latest NP	No actions needed
	No	No actions needed
	No	No actions needed

**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?

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
No relevant recommendations	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

**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	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

**C Biological metier related variables**  
Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?  
**Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea**

Yes (only Med&BS relevant)	Yes	no action needed
----------------------------	-----	------------------

**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?

NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
It seems that there has been no commercial sampling at all for pelagic trawls and gillnets. Instead, it seems that samples were taken on research surveys or by experimental sampling, but reported as at-sea sampling or port sampling. Not clear why only unsorted catches were sampled (not divided by landings and discards, see Table III.C.5).	No	MS should re-submit tables and AR text for the whole section III.C taking EWG comments into account.
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed

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	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed

**C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**  
Were the relevant derogations listed?  
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?

No	No	
MS should report only the recommendations relevant for the reference year	Mostly	MS to delete old recommendations (before 2012)

Member State:		Romania	Judgement levels	
AR year Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal		2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
		31 May 2014	No	<10%
		March 2010?	Partly	10-50%
		EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
	Overall compliance	Partly	Yes	>90%
			NA	not applicable
		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	no action needed
C4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	NA	no action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	NA	no action needed
D	Recreational fisheries			
	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea			
D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	MS mentioned a derogation for tuna and eel but no evidence that it has been accepted is reported by MS	Mostly	AR2014: MS to clearly indicate whether the derogation mentioned was accepted
	Are the deviations explained?			Yes. MS should request derogation for sampling recreational shark fisheries based on relevant justification.
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Were data quality targets provided?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Were data quality targets met?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
D3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	MS mentioned a derogation for tuna and eel but no evidence that it has been accepted is reported by MS	Mostly	No additional action needed (action already mentioned in III.D1)
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	MS should report only the recommendations relevant for the reference year	Yes	AR2014: MS to report only on recommendations for reference year
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
D4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
E	Biological stock-related variables			
	Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	Yes (only Med&BS relevant)	Yes	No action needed
	Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea			
E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Not clear if data source "landings" is correct, see comments on III.C	Mostly	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Only for <i>Psetta maxima</i> , a lower number than the planned ones has been achieved	Mostly	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No	No	MS should clarify correct sources of data (see comments on III.C)
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes, but not clear if these are relevant (see comments on III.C)	NA	MS should clarify correct sources of data (see comments on III.C)
	Were CV targets met?	No	No	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	MS should explain the deviation from the planned CV	No	MS should explain the deviation from the planned CV
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
E3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	NA	No action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	MS should report only the recommendations relevant for the reference year.	Mostly	MS should delete old and non-relevant recommendations
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
E4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	No	MS should clarify how commercial sampling has been done in 2013 and will be done in future
F	Transversal variables			
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Some of the effort variables are applicable only for specific fishing techniques. The reference year for transversal data collection reported as 2012 meaning, that MS was still collecting data for 2012 when it was already published on the EU Fleet Register web-site. Generally in case of administrative data sources (logbooks, Fleet Register, sales notes) the reference year should be the same as the AR/NP year. However the data presentation is the following year of data collection.	Yes	Consider the difference in effort data collection obligations for different fishing techniques submitting the report next year.
F1	Capacity			
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F2	Effort			
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed

Member State:		Romania		Judgement levels	
AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level		
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%		
Version of the NP proposal	March 2010?	Partly	10-50%		
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%		
Overall compliance	Partly	Yes	>90%		
		NA	not applicable		
		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		No comments	NA	No action needed	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No comments	NA	No action needed	
<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?			
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained?			
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are the deviations justified?			
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
	<b>F12</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?			
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the deviations explained?			
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are the deviations justified?			
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
	<b>F13</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			
		No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed	
		Are the responsive actions described ?			
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
	<b>F14</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?			
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
<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?			
		Number of days at sea and the planned target include both Romania and Bulgaria	Yes	AR2014: MS to only include number of days at sea for the MS	
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
		No comments	Mostly	Yes. MS to revise agreement with Bulgaria	
		Are the deviations explained?			
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the deviations justified?			
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?			
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	<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.)?			
		Bulgaria did not fulfill its part of the coordinated survey.			
			Mostly	No additional action needed (see III.G.1 on agreement with Bulgaria)	
		Are the deviations explained?			
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the deviations justified?			
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
	<b>G3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
		Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?			
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the responsive actions described ?			
		No comments	Yes	No additional action needed (see III.G.1 on agreement with Bulgaria)	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
	<b>G4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?			
		No comments	Yes	No additional action needed (see III.G.1 on agreement with Bulgaria)	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
<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?			
		Table is not according to the guidelines. All the lines should be kept and comment yes/no made for all the cells			
			Mostly	Table should be replaced according to the guidelines and resubmitted	
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
		Achieved sample rate is incorrect. Should be no. Sample/Frame Population no.			
			Mostly	Table should be corrected and resubmitted	
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
		For census less than 70% response rate, CV must be provided			
			Mostly	Table should be completed with missing CV and resubmitted	
	<b>A1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the deviations justified?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
	<b>A2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
		Is respective data quality information given?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the deviations justified?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
	<b>A3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			
		NA	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the responsive actions described ?			
		NA	NA	No actions needed	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
		NA	NA	No actions needed	
	<b>A4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
<b>B</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>				
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
		All cells should be filled in (Variable name), in order to prevent misunderstanding. CV should be 0 when achieved sample rate is 100%.			
			Mostly	MS Should explain why CV is not zero when achieved sample rate is 100%. Table should be completed and corrected and resubmitted.	
	<b>B1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the deviations justified?			
		NA	NA	No actions needed	
	<b>B2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>			
		Is respective data quality information given?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the deviations explained?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the deviations justified?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
	<b>B3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?			
		NA	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are the responsive actions described ?			
		NA	NA	No actions needed	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?			
		NA	NA	No actions needed	
	<b>B4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
		Yes	Yes	No actions needed	
<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?			
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		Are the relevant derogations listed?			
		No derogations apply	NA	No action needed	

Member State:	Romania		Judgement levels	
	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No Partly Mostly Yes NA	<10% 10-50% 50-90% >90% not applicable	
Version of the NP proposal	March 2010?			
Overall compliance	EWG Answer <b>Partly</b>			
	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG	
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes NA No action needed No action needed	
<b>VI 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? Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No comments No comments No comments No comments no deviations are reported No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes NA No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed	
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments No comments	Yes NA No action needed No action needed	
<b>VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations</b>	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Also recommendations not relevant for AR are listed. Some recommendations are listed in various formats (not always following guidelines), which makes it difficult to overview. For most relevant recommendations: yes. No comments	Yes Yes Yes AR2014: MS to list only directly relevant recommendations in table format No action needed No action needed	
<b>VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes No action needed	
<b>IX Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	Comments passed on to Commission by STECF EWG 14-07	Yes No action needed	
<b>X References</b>	Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes No action needed	
<b>XI Annexes</b>	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	79 annexes are presented. Half extensive background material and half results of the data collection. Results should not be included in AR	Yes AR2014: MS only to present most relevant information in annexes	

Member State:

Slovenia

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	NA	not applicable

I General framework

Are derogations listed?

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

Action needed?

Yes. No derogation was expected by MS.	NA	No action needed
--	----	------------------

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 a national DCF website available?  
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?

No comment	Yes	No action needed
A website is given	Yes	No action needed
No comment	Yes	No action needed
Minutes sent to the Commission	Partly	MS should report the main contents and outputs of the national coordination meeting
No comment	Yes	No action needed

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?

Only a subset of meetings are listed	Mostly	MS should list all the DCF meetings in the table II.B.1 even MS has not participated and/or the meetings are not relevant for the MS
No comment	No	MS should clarify the non-attendance to some planned meetings

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?

No comment	No	MS should list all the recommendations relevant for the country and for the reference year
No comment	NA	No action needed
No comment	NA	No action needed

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?

Only brief listing of vessels by category	Partly	MS should clarify if during the reference year changes occurred in the fishing sector and if yes, whether this had implication on the implementation of NP
No comment	Yes	No action needed

B Economic variables  
SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

Is information under III.B.1-4 for each supra-region given?  
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?

No comment	Yes	No action needed
No comment	Yes	No action needed
No comment	Yes	No action needed

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. Clustering scheme in NP has not been updated for reference year 2008	Yes	No action needed
No comment	NA	No action needed
No comment	NA	No action needed

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 action needed
No comment	NA	No action needed
No comment	NA	No action needed

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 comment	Yes	No action needed
No comment	NA	No action needed
No comment	NA	No action needed

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
No comment	NA	No action needed

C Biological metier related variables

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

MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
---------------------------------------	-----	------------------

Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Table complete. But only year 2013 was to be provided. All metiers are undersampled comparing to NP objectives.	Mostly	MS should only list the current years' achievements in the tables ie 2013 - not 2011 and 2012
---	--------	---

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

Table complete. But only year 2013 was to be provided.	Mostly	MS should only list the current years' achievements in the tables ie 2013 - not 2011 and 2012
--	--------	---

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

Table complete. But only year 2013 was to be provided.	Mostly	MS should only list the current years' achievements in the tables ie 2013 - not 2011 and 2012
--	--------	---

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

Information provided only for anchovy and sardine. Is concurrent sampling really implemented?	Mostly	MS should only list the current years' achievements in the tables ie 2013 - not 2011 and 2012. MS to explain whether concurrent sampling took place or not as number of fish measured is the same in tables IIIC5 and IIIC6
---	--------	---

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Table complete. But only year 2013 was to be provided. Achievement rates are respectively 33% and 27% for the two species planned for sampling in the NP. No information provided for other species, whereas Slovenia is implementing the concurrent sampling method.	Partly	None of the metier or planned length sampling was achieved. Slovenia states that pelagic trawling stopped in 2012. MS to confirm that there was no pelagic trawling in 2013
---	--------	---

Only for PTM\_SPF. Nothing for other metiers undersampled. Mixture in the AR text between metiers variables and transversal variables? Why in the AR text Slovenia wrote to have only two metiers to sample when in the NP and AR technical tables 5 are listed? Transversal variables should not be reported under section C. NB text on section IIIC2 is missing/been deleted from the text

Only for PTM_SPF. Nothing for other metiers undersampled. Mixture in the AR text between metiers variables and transversal variables? Why in the AR text Slovenia wrote to have only two metiers to sample when in the NP and AR technical tables 5 are listed? Transversal variables should not be reported under section C. NB text on section IIIC2 is missing/been deleted from the text	No	None of the metier or planned length sampling was achieved. Slovenia states that pelagic trawling stopped in 2012. MS to confirm that there was also no pelagic trawling in 2013. MS to note that TRANSVERSAL variables and text should not be included in Section C. The heading for Section IIIC2 must be highlighted within the text
--	----	---

Are the deviations explained?

Member State:

Slovenia

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
	Overall compliance	NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS EWG judgement EWG

No	No	None of the metier or planned length sampling was achieved. Slovenia states that pelagic trawling ended in 2012. MS to confirm that there was no pelagic trawling in 2013
----	----	---

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the deviations justified?

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 Precision target CV given as a % - this should be given as a number	Yes	No action needed other than, in future, the CV must be in numbers
---	-----	---

Discard CV ok but landings CV only given to 1 decimal point	Mostly	MS to resubmit table with adjustments
---	--------	---------------------------------------

No	No	Section IIIC2 is missing and should be re-inserted into the AR
NA	NA	No action needed

No derogations listed	NA	No action needed
-----------------------	----	------------------

Text of the report a little bit confusing. Slovenia not involved in LPF fisheries.	Partly	Only 1 listed for incorrect year (2009). MS should list the recommendations in a proper format.
--	--------	---

actions not described	No	MS to describe actions planned
NA	NA	No action needed

No deviation found by MS. Difficulties expected for carrying out sampling in the future but no explanation how this will be dealt with.	No	MS to present actions planned in order to avoid shortfalls
---	----	--

NA	NA	No action needed
----	----	------------------

MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
---------------------------------------	-----	------------------

MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
---------------------------------------	-----	------------------

MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
---------------------------------------	-----	------------------

MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
---------------------------------------	-----	------------------

MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
---------------------------------------	-----	------------------

MS is operating only in Region MED&BS	Yes	No action needed
---------------------------------------	-----	------------------

The NP states Slovenia will collect catch and effort data on recreational fishing through the return of filled-in daily and weekly licenses or in the case of annual licenses, through the annexed tables. A pilot study is planned for coastal fisheries.	Mostly	MS should ensure compliance with provisions of daily / weekly licenses by increasing inspections at sea and MS should carry out planned pilot study for coastal recreational fisheries.
--	--------	---

No derogations apply for recreational fisheries in Slovenia.	NA	No action needed
--	----	------------------

Yes: for daily and weekly licenses poor levels of cooperation; for pilot study poor financial situation.	Yes	No action needed
--	-----	------------------

More effort needed to improve data collection.	Mostly	MS to ensure more enforcement of relevant national legislation
--	--------	--

Exact statistics' from the two major classes of recreational fishers (daily/weekly and annual license holders)	Yes	No action needed
--	-----	------------------

No, no returned daily/weekly licenses obtained in 2013	Mostly	MS to ensure return of daily/weekly license data in future.
--	--------	---

No comment	Yes	No action needed
Poor levels of compliance are understandable; more effort needed to improve data collection.	Mostly	MS to ensure more enforcement of relevant national legislation

The MS stated that no derogations apply for recreational fisheries in Slovenia.	NA	No action needed
---	----	------------------

Some recommendations listed.	Yes	No action needed
------------------------------	-----	------------------

Recommendations listed not addressed to MS.	Yes	No action needed
---	-----	------------------

No comment	NA	No action needed
------------	----	------------------

Planned sampling scheme for coastal and recreational fishers holding daily/weekly licenses mentioned but planned actions are postponed 'to the more appropriate time in the future' due to financial constraints	Partly	MS to provide more details on planned sampling schemes.
--	--------	---

No clear when the 'more appropriate time in the future' will be. No reference is made by MS to improving enforcement levels of returned daily/weekly license catch and effort details.	Partly	MS to clarify when planned sampling schemes / pilot study for coastal recreational fisheries will be implemented.
--	--------	---

Information for 2011, 2012 and 2013 appear in table	Mostly	MS should only list the current years' achievements in the tables ie 2013 - not 2011 and 2012
---	--------	---

Partly. Achievement rates in numbers of fish sampled are always under 50%.	Partly	No action needed
--	--------	------------------

Text in AR states that pelagic trawling ended in 2012 - but no mention if it started again in 2013	Mostly	MS to confirm that pelagic trawling did not occur in 2013 (as only 2012 is mentioned in the text)
--	--------	---

Mostly	Mostly	MS to confirm that pelagic trawling did not occur in 2013 (as only 2012 is mentioned in the text)
--------	--------	---

Yes	Yes	No action needed
-----	-----	------------------

no	no	No action needed
----	----	------------------

Less availability of samples due to the stoppage of the pelagic trawlers at the end of 2012. Difficulties to get access to fish for other metiers.	Partly	MS to confirm that information actually refers to 2013 as only 2012 is mentioned. Reference to JRC/precision-level website not relevant
--	--------	---

Partly	Partly	MS to confirm that information actually refers to 2013 as only 2012 is mentioned. Reference to JRC/precision-level website not relevant
--------	--------	---

Partly	Partly	MS to confirm that information actually refers to 2013 as only 2012 is mentioned. Reference to JRC/precision-level website not relevant
--------	--------	---

Partly	Partly	MS to confirm that information actually refers to 2013 as only 2012 is mentioned. Reference to JRC/precision-level website not relevant
--------	--------	---

Partly	Partly	MS to confirm that information actually refers to 2013 as only 2012 is mentioned. Reference to JRC/precision-level website not relevant
--------	--------	---

No derogation was expected by MS	Yes	No action needed
----------------------------------	-----	------------------

No derogation was expected by MS	Yes	No action needed
----------------------------------	-----	------------------

No derogation was expected by MS	Yes	No action needed
----------------------------------	-----	------------------

No derogation was expected by MS	Yes	No action needed
----------------------------------	-----	------------------

No derogation was expected by MS	Yes	No action needed
----------------------------------	-----	------------------

No derogation was expected by MS	Yes	No action needed
----------------------------------	-----	------------------

Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

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 Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Are the deviations explained?

Are the deviations justified?

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?

Member State:		Slovenia		Judgement levels	
AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level		
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%		
Version of the NP proposal	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%		
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%		
	Overall compliance	Yes	>90%		
		NA	not applicable		
		EWG COMMENTS		EWG judgement	
		EWG			
		Only 2013 or 2012 recommendations must be listed, no former ones.		Yes	
		No		No action needed	
		NA		No action needed	
		NA		No action needed	
E4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Loss of the main metier providing biological samples. Improvement of sampling of other metiers, such as purse seiners.		Yes	
		Yes		No action needed	
		Yes		No action needed	
		Yes		No action needed	
F	Transversal variables	Guidelines would request information for unclustered segments. The reference year for transversal data collection reported as 2012. Generally in case of administrative data sources (logbooks, Fleet Register, sales notes) the reference year should be the same as the AR/NP year. While the data presentation is in the following year of data collection.		Yes	
				No action needed	
F1	Capacity	The reference year for capacity data collection reported as 2012 meaning, that MS was still collecting data for 2012 when it was already published on the EU Fleet Register web-site. However in the text MS refers to the fleet on the 1st of January.		Yes	
		No comment		NA	
		No comment		NA	
		No comment		NA	
F11	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	
F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comment		NA	
		No comment		NA	
		No comment		NA	
F2	Effort	No comment		Yes	
		No comment		NA	
		No comment		NA	
F11	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	
F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	
F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No relevant recommendations		NA	
		No comment		NA	
		No comment		NA	
F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comment		NA	
		No comment		NA	
		No comment		NA	
F3	Landings	It is not clear what is the reference year for data collection as in the report vessels registered in the Fleet Register on the 1st of January 2013 mentioned, while in the ST reference year is 2012		Yes	
		No comment		NA	
		No comment		NA	
F11	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	
F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is respective data quality information given?		Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	
F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No relevant recommendations		NA	
		No comment		NA	
		No comment		NA	
F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comment		NA	
		No comment		NA	
		No comment		NA	
G	Research surveys at sea	"% achievement target ----- A/P %" is not calculated correctly.		Mostly	
		No comment		Yes	
		MEDITS temperature data not available due to 'technical reasons' but no details given in this paragraph, but listed by MS as shortfall		Yes	
		No comment		NA	
		The sub-sectioning of the section is messy.		Yes	
G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?		Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?		Yes	
G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?		Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?		NA	
		Are the deviations justified?		NA	
G3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No recommendations		NA	
		"We are following the conclusions of the yearly regional MEDIAS coordination meeting."		NA	
		No comment		NA	
G4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Yes, MS describes action to avoid problems with MEDITS temperature data.		Yes	
		No comment		Yes	
				MS to ensure MEDITS temperature data is collected in future years and passed on to end users in correct format.	



Member State:

Slovenia

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

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, but MS has to fill blank cells with "no" expression	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed
A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed

B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes, but Clustering scheme in NP was not updated for reference year 2009	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is respective data quality information given?	No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed

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?	Information on "Effective time lag for availability" missing for indicators 1-4. "	Mostly	MS to fill in missing cells in Table V.1
	Are the relevant derogations listed?	No. Sampling of Size at maturation of exploited fish species (4) is not done (NP and AP) but no derogation applies	Mostly	MS to clarify why data for indicator 4 is not collected or to give details on the relevant derogation if any.

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	No	MS to clarify why data for indicator 4 is not collected and to provide details on actions to avoid shortfalls in future (unless derogation is granted).
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comment	NA	No action needed

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?	Some details provided but not very precise and several data calls missing (SGMOS, Aquaculture and processing, AER, PGMED, GFCM Task1 and assessment WG....). Not all experts groups or projects as ADRIAMED are reported in the table.	Mostly	MS should report separately in the table, both the name of each data call or end user requests (i.e. GFCM WG on demersal species; Data call for Med&BS DCF etc etc) and the name of the species and the fleet segment
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comment	NA	No action needed
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NP text seems to be not updated since 2010. So it is not possible to know the exact objectives planned for 2013.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Impossible to evaluate	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	No comment	NA	No action needed

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Integration in the national DB of ERS logbooks are mentioned	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comment	Yes	No action needed

VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations

	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comment	Yes	No action needed

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations

	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
--	--	------------	-----	------------------

IX Comments, suggestions and reflections

	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
--	--	------------	-----	------------------

X References

	Is there a complete list of references?	Alternative listing format	Yes	No action needed
--	---	----------------------------	-----	------------------

XI Annexes

	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
--	---	------------	-----	------------------

Member State:

Slovenia

		Judgement levels	
AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

Member State:

Spain

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	30 October 2012	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

Action needed?

I General framework

Are derogations listed?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

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 a national DCF website available?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?  
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?  
If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?

No. The site is only partly in e.g. English. No part of the site seems to be reserved for the DCF. A general search on the site for "DCF" didn't get any hits.	Partly	MS should provide clarification on the website and on the information related to the DCF that are stored in
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

B Economic variables

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

Yes	Yes	No action needed
-----	-----	------------------

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

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?

Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III B 2	Yes	No action needed
Column H should be deleted	Yes	No action needed
Número de empresas/unidades pesqueras missing	Mostly	Update table with the missing variable and resubmit

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	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

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 actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

Comments not relevant	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

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?

Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III B 2	Yes	No action needed
Column H should be deleted	Yes	No action needed
Number of enterprises/fishing units missing	Mostly	Update table with the missing variable and resubmit

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	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

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	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

Comments not relevant	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

SUPRA-REGION Other regions

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?

Yes; asterisk for cluster should be put as last sign, corresponding with III B 2	Yes	No action needed
Column H should be deleted	Yes	No action needed
Number of enterprises/fishing units missing	Mostly	Update table with the missing variable and resubmit

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	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Yes	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

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	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

Comments not relevant	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

Member State:

Spain

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

Overall compliance

		Judgement levels	
		Compliance class	Compliance level
2013		No	<10%
30 May 2014		Partly	10-50%
30 October 2012		Mostly	50-90%
EWG Answer		Yes	>90%
Mostly		NA	not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG  
Action needed?

I General framework

C Biological metier related variables

Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic  
Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?

According to table III.A.1 MS is operating in Regions NS&EA, NA including NAFO, MED&BS and Other/CECAF-ICCAT-IOTC-IATTC+WCPFC	Yes	no action needed
---	-----	------------------

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  
Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Table properly filled and complete.	Yes	no action needed
-------------------------------------	-----	------------------

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

Table properly filled. Some inconsistencies between III.C.3 and III.C.4 : L2 does not appear in III.C.4 for NS&EA, so numbers of trips are not consistent between the two tables.	Mostly	MS to resubmit table with L2 sampling frame
---	--------	---

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

Table properly filled and consistent with AR guidelines. 2 target species planned in 2013 (cod and redfish). Good achievement rate for cod, but very poor for redfish.	Yes	no action needed
--	-----	------------------

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

Table complete and consistent with table III.C.5, as target species mentioned in III.C.5 and main commercial species caught as by catch are reported.	Yes	no action needed
---	-----	------------------

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

No deviation except Sebastes undersampling. Objectives by metiers and by sampling frames fully achieved. Table 6 shows also that observers onboard try to implement concurrent sampling on main species fished.	Yes	no action needed
---	-----	------------------

Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

MS states that oversampling (of cod) as no effect on provisional costs, as main costs are to support observers embarked for long trips applying sampling protocols every day. Undersampling of redfish due to allocation of fishing effort between NS&EA and NA, explaining also that sampling frame L2 was not really applied in NS&EA region in 2013. Discarding patterns are of very low level in these fisheries.	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

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 for cod and redfish. Calculated from unsorted catches.	Yes	no action needed
For cod only.	Mostly	no action needed
Yes. Not enough redfish measured.	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

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 derogation listed in section I.	NA	no action needed
No recommendation addressed by RCM NS&EA 2012 to MS.	Yes	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

MS just give statement on shortfalls	No	MS to describe actions
NA	NA	MS to describe actions

Region North Atlantic

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal  
Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

Table properly filled and complete.	Yes	no action needed
-------------------------------------	-----	------------------

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

Table properly filled. Consistency between III.C.3 and III.C.4 (only one trip more planned and achieved in III.C.4). Sampling frames are sometimes split in two lines with different sampling strategies.	Yes	MS to check inconsistencies between tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 and resubmit tables. In future % achieved numbers to be provided in percentage
---	-----	---

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

Table consistent with AR guidelines. It is difficult to understand why in NAFO fishing grounds column was not used to avoid strange names of some species (for example Gadus morhua SA1 or 2J,3KL) .	Mostly	In future MS to provide planned precision target in numbers and not percentage and species name without reference to the fishing ground
--	--------	---

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Table complete and consistent with table III.C.5 and III.C.3.	Yes	no action needed
Good achievement rates in NAFO in terms of trips samples and biological sampling in length. Two stocks were never sampled (Pandalus 3M and Sebastes 3LN). In ICES areas, target planned by metiers mostly achieved but poor achievement rates for some metiers as OTB_MPD (at market), LHM_DWS and netting (these last ones were sometimes sampled as domains). Same comments in terms of sampling frames. for length samplings, all the stocks were oversampled in 2013 except Nephrops VII (achievement 16%).	Mostly	no action needed

Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

Explanations on deviations are provided in the AR text metier by metier. Main reasons are : decreasing of some metiers, decreasing of quotas for some SPF, changes in fishing patterns (particularly meshsize for netters and trawlers), closure of fishing areas, penalties on Mackerel quota, etc. Oversampling cases are also explained : mostly redeployment from some metiers to others. Sampling domains can also produce results different than those planned for metiers involved. Concerning stocks, oversampling is justified to obtain good pictures of length distributions. Small samples of landings can generate in the same time big samples of discards. Mixed catches can also oblige to implement higher sampling levels. Reason for Nephrops VII undersampling is the change in processing of the catch on board: individuals are now frozen headless. Tests for buying "entire" samples in 2011 shown that it was too expensive to be implemented every year.	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?  
Were CV targets met?

Yes for landings and discards.	Yes	no action needed
Good results in NAFO. In ICES areas for around 60% of stocks for landings, less than 15% for discards.	Mostly	no action needed

Member State: **Spain**

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

		Judgement levels	
		Compliance class	Compliance level
Overall compliance	2013	No	<10%
	30 May 2014	Partly	10-50%
	30 October 2012	Mostly	50-90%
	EWG Answer	Yes	>90%
	Mostly	NA	not applicable

I General framework

EWG COMMENTS EWG judgement EWG Action needed?

Variability of sizes distributions between samples, more opportunistic sampling strategies for species which are not the main target species of the metiers sampled.	Yes	no action needed
Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	no action needed

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

One derogation for length sampling for rays.	Yes	no action needed
One recommendation addressed by RCM NA 2012 to MS. Some others could be also listed.	Mostly	MS to list relevant recommendations from previous LM
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

For NAFO same as for Region NS&EA. For other areas, improvement of the planned NP objectives, but some changes in fisheries cannot always be anticipated. Also to improve access to fish for biological sampling in some harbours.	Mostly	MS to provide actions to avoid shortfalls on board.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	MS to provide actions to avoid shortfalls on board.

Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Table properly filled and detailed by GSAs. With footnotes explaining some changes in 2013 for some metiers and/or sampling frames. ICCAT fisheries should be under "Other Regions".	Mostly	MS to resubmit table with ICCAT fisheries under "Other Regions"
--	--------	---

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

Table properly filled. Sampling rames are sometimes split in two lines with different sampling strategies. Inconsistencies between total numbers of trips achieved in 2013 between III.C.3 (912) and III.C.4 (934).	Partly	MS to resubmit table with correct total number os trips.
No discards reported but explained in the text.	Yes	no action needed

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

Table properly filled. Information provided shows that concurrent sampling is fully implemented by MS but only of the retained part of the catch. No discards reported.	Yes	no action needed
---	-----	------------------

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Target planned by metiers mostly achieved. Some metiers undersampled (OTB_DWS GSA05 and LLS_DEF GSA06), some not sampled at all (PS_SPF GSA07. Concerning stocks, planned objectives in general achieved, sometimes with oversampled. But some deviations for 3 demersal species in GSA05 and for anchovy in GSA07.	Mostly	no action needed
---	--------	------------------

Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

Explanations on deviations are provided in the AR text metier by metier and by GSA. Main reasons are : decreasing of some metiers, shorter fishing seasons, change in fishing patterns due to decreasing CPEUs (mainly for anchovy), difficulties to have access on board or to the fish... Concerning stocks, oversampling is justified by the high variability of the catches between trips and GSAs. Oversampling allows to obtain good pictures of length distributions. Undersampling cases observed in 2013 due to decreasing landings of concerned stocks (mainly anchovy) and small sizes of samples for some species when operating at sea. MS demonstrates in its AR that discarding patterns are low in GSAs exploited by MS.	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?

Yes, when numbers of fish measured were consistent Only for retained catches. CVs are provided by stock (by GSA).	Yes	no action needed
---	-----	------------------

Were CV targets met?

For around 50% of the stocks only for landings. Often big differences observed between GSAs for the same species. Could be a consequence of planned objectives at national level and not at GSA.	Mostly	no action needed
--	--------	------------------

Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

Reasons given by MS are seasonality of catches for some metiers or some stocks and their low volumes of landings or availability for sampling. Well detailed by types of species.	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

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

One derogation for metier PS_SPF GSA05.	Yes	no action needed
One recommendation addressed by RCM MED&BS 2012 listed.	Mostly	MS to list relevant recommendations from previous LM
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Shortfalls are considered as usual difficulties met in any monitoring programme. No specific action proposed.	Yes	MS to report specific action to increase sampling intensity
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	MS to report specific action to increase sampling intensity

Region Other regions

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?

ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under "Other Regions".	Mostly	MS to resubmit tables with correct region naming.
Table consistent with III.C.3. ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under "Other Regions".	Mostly	MS to resubmit tables with correct region naming.

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

ICCAT and CECAF RFMO have to be under "Other Regions". Required annual precision targets to be presented as a number and not percentage.	Mostly	MS to resubmit tables with correct region naming.
Concurrent sampling appears well implemented by MS.	Yes	no action needed

Member State:

Spain

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	30 October 2012	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance	Mostly	Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

I General framework

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG  
Action needed?

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

IN CECAF most of the fisheries in third countries waters were closed in 2013 to Spanish vessels. Only OTB_DEF off Mauritania and PS_SPF in Canary islands waters could operate normally with good achievement rates. Length sampling for these two fisheries were also well achieved for all stocks planned. In other RFMOs, generally good achievement rates in numbers of trips, except in ICCAT area for 2 LHP fleets targeting BFT, 1 LLD targeting BFT, LHP_LPF_0_0_0 (MSP) and PS_LPF in IOTC waters not sampled at all. Concerning stocks, good achievement rates are obtained for well sampled metiers. But results difficult to evaluate for species without objectives planned in the NP.	Mostly	no action needed
---	--------	------------------

Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

Deviations are clearly identified by MS in its AR, metier by metier. Main reasons were: CECAF fisheries closures, piracy in IOTC, difficulties for implementing sampling at sea, difficulties for sampling when landings are frozen, changes in fishing patterns and operational difficulties in ICCAT for sampling at sea. MS must also comply with fisheries regulation and obligations implemented by third countries where Spanish vessels operate and land their catches. Deviations for samplings in length are directly linked to have access to fish and the possibility to sample catches correctly or not. MS provide detailed explanations stock by stock for each RFMOs. Difficult to follow the explanations since ICCAT is under two different supra-sections Other Regions and Med.	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?  
Were CV targets met?

Yes for landings or unsorted catches when samples sizes permitted to calculate CVs. Discards are low in these LDF fisheries so no CVs were provided.	Yes	no action needed
For around 20% of documented stocks.	Partly	no action needed

Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?

High disparity between samples collected from metiers targeting different stages of species exploited and so wide size range of catches. In general not enough samples also to achieve good CVs.	Yes	no action needed
Yes.	Yes	no action needed

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?

No derogation listed in section I and regardin metiers variables in Other regions.	NA	no action needed
--	----	------------------

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

No relevant recommendation from RCM_LDF 2012 addressed to MS.	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

Shortfalls are considered as usual difficulties met in any monitoring programme of LDF fisheries. MS states an observation, but no specific action proposed.	Partly	MS to suggest an action to avoid the shortfalls.
Partly	Partly	MS to suggest an action to avoid the shortfalls.

D Recreational fisheries

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Region North Atlantic

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?

It is unclear why seabass is only sampled in the Basque country and not in the other Atlantic areas	Mostly	Yes, MS to clarify why sea bass is only sampled in the Basque country and not in the other Atlantic areas
No derogations apply	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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?

Information on data quality provided	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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?

No derogations apply	Yes	No action needed
No relevant recommendations apply	Yes	No action needed
MS sent data to ICES WGEEL and is ready to apply recommendations from WGEEL and WGRFS.	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

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?

Due to low eel catches in the Balears, eel is only sampled in Valencia region.	Mostly	MS might consider to ask for derogation for this species in the Balears
No derogations apply	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

Information on data quality provided	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

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 ?

No derogations apply	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed

Member State: **Spain**

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

		Judgement levels	
		Compliance class	Compliance level
Overall compliance	2013	No	<10%
	30 May 2014	Partly	10-50%
	30 October 2012	Mostly	50-90%
	EWG Answer	Yes	>90%
	Mostly	NA	not applicable

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

I General framework

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?

No shortfalls listed by MS, but lack of eel sampling in the Balears should have been listed as a shortfall.	Mostly	Yes, MS to list lack of eel sampling in Balears as a shortfall
Lack of eel sampling in the Balears should have been listed as a shortfall.	No	Yes, MS to explain how to solve the eel sampling issue in the Balears

E Biological stock-related variables

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

According to table III.A.1 MS is operating in Regions NS&EA, NA including NAFO, MED&BS and Other/CECAF-ICCAT-IOTC-IATTC+WCPFC	Yes	MS to not that ICCAT is in "Other Regions" and CECAF is not a region
---	-----	--

Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic

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 complete.	Mostly	required precision CVs should be presented as a number and not as a percentage. Achievement note presented as percentage.
Parameters were to be updated for two stocks (cod and redfish). Cod oversampled and redfish undersampled. See comments III.C.5.	Mostly	no action needed
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. But observers at sea cannot choose fishing areas for sampling issues. See comments in section III.C.1 NS&EA.	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Yes	Mostly	MS to provide explanations why three CVs are not provided
Cod target precision achieved for ALK and weight@length only, not for sex ratio and maturity@length. Not relevant for redfish.	Partly	MS should consider a bilateral with another MS for aging redfish.
Variability in samples, definition precision targets for sex ratio and maturity, redfish otoliths not yet read.	Yes	no action needed
Mostly	Mostly	MS should consider a bilateral with another MS for aging redfish.

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	no action needed
One recommendations of RCM NS&EA 2012 listed by MS.	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
yes	Yes	no action needed

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

Better collaboration with the Industry on durations of trips. Improvement of training of observers for better application of protocols on board.	Mostly	MS should continue to improve relations with the fishing industry. Meanwhile, MS should put in place a training program for observers.
Mostly	Mostly	MS to provide methods they will employ to improve training

Region North Atlantic

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?

Table properly complete. Planned precision target presented in percentage and % achieved in number.	Yes	In future MS to provide planned precision target in numbers and not percentage and % achieved in percentage.
Achievement rates are reached with oversampling. In ICES areas, general oversampling of all the stocks except for 3 parameters poorly sampled.	Yes	No action needed
All deviations are explained in AR, stock by stock and for every parameter. Main reasons are the following : fishing areas depending of the choice of vessels skippers (not those of observers on board), imperfect coverage of all the length sizes distribution 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. But for some stocks, low landings and too high prices could give in final undersampling. Shorter fishing seasons than expected also.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?  
Were CV targets met?

Yes when samples size allows to calculate consistent CVs.	Yes	No action needed
In NAFO more than 50% of CVs met for parameters updated. In ICES areas precision targets achieved for less than 50% of parameters updated. Mostly. Cvs met in general for ALKs and weight@length.	Mostly	No action needed
Variability with fish sizes in samples, difficulties for planning efficient sampling plans for these industrial fisheries. Except for sex ratio@length , comments most of the stocks given in AR.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

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?

Two derogations listed in section 1	Yes	No action needed
3 recommendations of RCM NA 2012 and one from RCM NS&EA 2012 listed by MS.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

MS remains focused on providing high-quality data to stock assessment working groups. Further steps will be : improve relevant coverage of length distributions of the catches, better age reading for difficult species, improve processing and reading of pieces collected, improve COST tool etc.	Yes	No action needed
Yes	Yes	No action needed

Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Member State: **Spain**

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

		Judgement levels	
		Compliance class	Compliance level
Overall compliance	2013	No	<10%
	30 May 2014	Partly	10-50%
	30 October 2012	Mostly	50-90%
	EWG Answer	Yes	>90%
	Mostly	NA	not applicable

I General framework

EWG COMMENTS EWG judgement EWG Action needed?

Table properly filled but not consistent with III.E.2. Task sharing on LPF is correctly documented. All fishing grounds merged as required an appendix 7.	Mostly	Required CVs should be numbers and not percentage. The ICCAT data should be listed in "Other Regions". MS to amend table. The achievement rate should be given in percentage and no numbers
Yes. MS explained under and over sampling	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
Mostly	Mostly	MS to suggest plan to achieve sampling of <i>Trachurus mediterraneus</i>
Yes when samples size allows to calculate consistent CVs.	Mostly	Required CVs should be numbers and not percentage. MS to provide CVs for hake
Yes for more than 50% of the parameters updated. Cvs met in general for ALKs and weight@length.	Mostly	no action needed
Explanations is given for deviations concerning 4 major species.	Yes	no action needed
Yes	Yes	no action needed
No derogation listed in section 1	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
NA	NA	no action needed
To increase numbers of samples and fish sampled for stocks and parameters for which CVs were note achieved.	Yes	MS to increase numbers of samples and fish sampled for stocks and parameters for which CVs were note achieved.
Yes	Yes	no action needed

Region Other regions

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS to explain why CVs provided without sampling achievements for 2013. In future, MS to report Required precision target (CV) in number and not percentage.
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	no action needed
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	no action needed
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	no action needed

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	no action needed
Were CV targets met?	Partly	no action needed
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	no action needed
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	no action needed

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

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

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Partly	MS to suggest an action to avoid the shortfalls.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Partly	MS to suggest an action to avoid the shortfalls.

F Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	MS should submit the updated version of the template as requested and present in the AR Guidelines 2013
--	----	---

F1 Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	MS have to submit the right Excel template.
Are the deviations explained?	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	NA	No action needed

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	No action needed
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	No action needed

F2 Effort

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	No	Considering, that the census data collection scheme been applied MS is encouraged to use right template
Are the deviations explained?	No	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	NA	No action needed

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

No comments	NA	No action needed
-------------	----	------------------



**Member State:**

**Spain**

**AR year**  
**Version of the AR reviewed**  
**Version of the NP proposal**

		Judgement levels	
		Compliance class	Compliance level
<b>2013</b>		No	<10%
30 May 2014		Partly	10-50%
30 October 2012		Mostly	50-90%
<b>EWG Answer</b>		Yes	>90%
<b>Overall compliance</b>		NA	not applicable

**Overall compliance**

**Mostly**

**I General framework**

- 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?

EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
There are some effort variables missing and there is no actions to avoid this shortfalls planned.	No	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
Spain provided description of data collection in the section. Seems there is no deviations.	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No quality indicators provided as there template submitted is wrong	No	No action needed
No comments	Partly	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No relevant recommendations	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	NA	No action needed

**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
  - Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups 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?

Map numbers are not incorporated in table	Yes	AR2014: MS to add map number references in table III_G_1, check planning group acronyms
Mackerel egg survey achievements are relatively low due to bad weather	Mostly	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No deviations listed	Yes	No action needed
NA	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

**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?

No. Table is not filled according to the guidelines. No cells should be deleted from the table.	No	Fill the table according to the guidelines
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
For census with less than 70% response rate, CV should be provided. For some variables, response rate is 100% but CV is not zero.	Mostly	Table should be updated and corrected and resubmitted
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
No relevant comments made	Yes	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
NA	NA	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed
Yes	Yes	No actions needed

**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?

Yes	Yes	No action needed
Achieved sample rate bigger than response rate in case of census. Some variables are not collected under SBS but they are presented as SBS.	Mostly	MS should explain why Achieved sample rate is bigger than the response rate in case of census. Table should be corrected and resubmitted
Missing methodology for the calculation of employment by gender and Imputed value of unpaid labour. It's not clear if all variables were provided in case of no availability by SBS, as they are explicated in table IV.B.2. MS should explain how they obtain the No of enterprises by size category in case of random sampling.	Partly	Text should be updated with the missing information. MS should clarify about the availability of variables not collected under SBS
Partly	Partly	Text should be updated with the missing information. MS should clarify about the availability of variables not collected under SBS

Member State: **Spain**

AR year Version of the AR reviewed Version of the NP proposal	Judgement levels		
	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
30 May 2014	No		<10%
30 October 2012	Partly		10-50%
<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly		50-90%
<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>	NA	>90%
			not applicable

**I General framework**

**EWG COMMENTS EWG judgement EWG Action needed?**

<b>B2</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal <i>Are the deviations justified?</i> <i>Is respective data quality information given?</i> <i>Are the deviations explained?</i>	Partly	Partly	Text should be updated with the missing information. MS should clarify about the availability of variables not collected under SBS
<b>B3</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations <i>Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?</i> <i>Are the responsive actions described ?</i> <i>Are the responsive actions acceptable?</i>	Partly	Partly	Information should be provided about variables provided and not under SBS
<b>B4</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls <i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?</i> <i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?</i>	Yes	Yes	Information should be provided about variables provided and not under SBS

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

<b>1</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal <i>Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?</i> <i>Are the relevant derogations listed?</i>	No comments No derogations apply	Yes Yes	No action needed No action needed
<b>2</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls <i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?</i> <i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?</i>	No shortfalls identified NA	Yes NA	No action needed No action needed

**VI Module for management and use of the data**

<b>1</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal <i>Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?</i> <i>Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</i> <i>Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?</i> <i>Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?</i> <i>Are the deviations explained?</i> <i>Are the deviations justified?</i>	A very long list provided by MS. But only for biological data. SGMOS data call missing, as AER, Aquaculture and Processing industry ones. What also about research projects such as MAREA in MED ? No comments No comments No detailed objectives provided in NP 2013. Only basic IT developments for maintaining performances of the national data bases are mentioned in AR 2013. No comments No comments	Mostly NA Mostly Yes NA NA	MS should complete the list with all the end users requests specifying the data and No action needed MS should better clarify and detail the use and management of data No action needed No action needed No action needed
<b>2</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls <i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?</i> <i>Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?</i>	No shortfall identified by MS. No comments	NA NA	No action needed No action needed

**VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations**

<i>Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<i>Are the responsive actions described?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
<i>Are the responsive actions acceptable?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed

**VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations**

<i>Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
---	-------------	-----	------------------

**IX Comments, suggestions and reflections**

<i>Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?</i>	Comments forwarded to Commission by STECF EWG 14-07	Yes	No action needed
---	---	-----	------------------

**X References**

<i>Is there a complete list of references?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
--	-------------	-----	------------------

**XI Annexes**

<i>Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?</i>	No comments	Yes	No action needed
--	-------------	-----	------------------

Member State:		Sweden		
		Judgement levels		
AR year		2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed		27 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal		26 March 2013	Partly	10-50%
EWG Answer		Yes	Mostly	50-90%
Overall compliance		Yes	Yes	>90%
			NA	not applicable
		EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG Action needed?
I General framework		Are derogations listed?	No comments	Yes No action needed
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 a national DCF website available? Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)? Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings? If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?	No comments No comments No comments Yes (minutes in Annex 1). No comments	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
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?	No comments No comments	Yes Yes No action needed No action needed
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?	No comments No comments No comments	Yes Yes Yes No action needed No action needed No action needed
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?	Very nicely	Yes No action needed
B Economic variables		Is information under III.B1-4 for each supra-region given? <b>SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic</b>  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?	no comment  For one segment Supra region is listed instead of segment information, accuracy indicators must be provided in percentage. Clustered segments must be marked with asterisk.  For one segment Supra region is listed instead of reference year. Some segment is too big to be clustered. CV has not been provided for some segments with response rate less than 70%	Yes Yes Mostly Yes Mostly No action needed MS has to provide tables upon the last version of the guidelines No action needed Provide information about missing CVs
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?	no comment no comment no comment	Yes NA NA No action needed No action needed No action needed
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 no comment no comment	Yes NA NA No action needed No action needed No action needed
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 comment no comment no comment	Yes NA NA No action needed No action needed No action needed
B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comment no comment	Yes NA No action needed No action needed
C Biological metier related variables		Is information on III.C.1-4 given for each region?	Yes	Yes no action needed
Region Baltic 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?  Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes Yes Yes Yes  Several derogations apply (GNS/FPO on FWS/SPF). Severe undersampling of OTB_DEF_>=105_1_110, PTM_SPF_32-104_0_0 and FPN_CAT_0_0 in SD 22-24; PTM_SPF_16-31_0_0 in SD 25-29,32; OTB_SPF_16-104_0_0 in SD 30-31. Some metier coding not consistent across tables Yes NA	Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes Yes Yes No action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed metier naming not consistent between IIC tables, nor between tables and text. MS to clarify no action needed no action needed
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 Yes NA NA	Yes Yes NA NA No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
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?	in section I and Table III.C.3 Yes Yes NA	Yes Yes Yes Yes No action needed No action needed No action needed No action needed
C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes NA	Yes Yes No action needed No action needed
Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic				
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 Yes Yes Yes  Several derogations apply (mainly in ICES areas IV and VIId). Severe oversampling of PS_SPF_16-31_0_0, severe undersampling of OTB_CRU_32-69_0_0 and OTB_MCD_90-119_0_0 IllaN. Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes Yes  Mostly Yes Yes No action needed the total number of trips reported no action needed no action needed no action needed no action needed
C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met? Are the deviations explained?	Yes Yes NA	Yes Yes NA No action needed No action needed No action needed

Member State:		Sweden		Judgement levels	
AR year	Version of the AR reviewed	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level	
	Version of the NP proposal	27 May 2014	No	<10%	
		26 March 2013	Partly	10-50%	
		EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%	
		Overall compliance	Yes	>90%	
			NA	not applicable	
EWG COMMENTS		EWG judgement	EWG		
C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		NA	No action needed		
Are the deviations justified?					
Were the relevant derogations listed?		in section I and Table III.C.3	Yes	metier LHP_FIF referred to derogation in text as LHM_FIF. No action needed	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	NA	no action needed	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	NA	no action needed	
C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls			MS should continue to improve response rates with the fishing industry, if possible		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	Yes	no action needed	
D Recreational fisheries					
Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
Region Baltic Sea					
D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
Are obtained derogations mentioned?		No comments	NA	No action needed	
Are the deviations explained?		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
Are the deviations justified?		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
Were data quality targets provided?		Information on data quality provided, no specific targets. Cod: control checks on length and weight measurements	Yes	No action needed	
Were data quality targets met?		NA	NA	No action needed	
Are the deviations explained?		NA	NA	No action needed	
Are the deviations justified?		NA	NA	No action needed	
D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations					
Were the relevant derogations listed?		No derogations requested	Yes	No action needed	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		No relevant LM recommendations apply	Yes	No action needed	
Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	NA	No action needed	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	NA	No action needed	
D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls					
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic					
D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Cod recreational fisheries in the Kattegat from four boats is relatively new, sampling was not planned in NP, but conducted as pilot survey.	Yes	No action needed	
Are obtained derogations mentioned?		No derogations requested	NA	No action needed	
Are the deviations explained?		NA	NA	No action needed	
Are the deviations justified?		NA	NA	No action needed	
D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
Were data quality targets provided?		Information on data quality provided, no specific targets.	Yes	No action needed	
Were data quality targets met?		NA	NA	No action needed	
Are the deviations explained?		NA	NA	No action needed	
Are the deviations justified?		NA	NA	No action needed	
D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations					
Were the relevant derogations listed?		No derogations requested	Yes	No action needed	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		No relevant LM recommendations apply	Yes	No action needed	
Are the responsive actions described ?		NA	NA	No action needed	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		NA	NA	No action needed	
D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls					
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		No shortfalls listed	Yes	No action needed	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		NA	NA	No action needed	
E Biological stock-related variables					
Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?		Yes	Yes	No action needed	
Region Baltic Sea					
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes. Comments in Swedish in column U.	Yes	in future MS should remove comments	
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		Overall, slight undersampling. Severe undersampling for herring in SD 22-24, salmon in SD 30-31 and salmon weight@length in rivers. Severe oversampling for cod market+sea sampling.	Mostly	no action needed	
Are the deviations explained?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
Are the deviations justified?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
Were CV estimates provided?		10 from 59 not provided	Mostly	MS to provide missing CVs	
Were CV targets met?		in about half of the cases	Mostly	no action needed	
Are the deviations explained?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
Are the deviations justified?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations					
Were the relevant derogations listed?		in section I	Yes	no action needed	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		from RCM Baltic 2011, there are no more recent recommendations	Yes	no action needed	
Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls					
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic					
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		In general, oversampling of biological parameters from surveys. Undersampling (65%/57%) of <i>Nephrops</i> .	Mostly	no action needed	
Are the deviations explained?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
Are the deviations justified?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal					
Were CV estimates provided?		a few missing	Mostly	MS to provide missing CVs	
Were CV targets met?		in 21 of 53 cases	Partly	no action needed	
Are the deviations explained?		in general, but not in detail	Yes	no action needed	
Are the deviations justified?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations					
Were the relevant derogations listed?		in section I	Yes	no action needed	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		Yes, from RCM NS&EA 2012	Yes	no action needed	
Are the responsive actions described ?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	
E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls					
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		Yes	Yes	no action needed	

Member State:		Sweden		Judgement levels	
AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level		
Version of the AR reviewed	27 May 2014	No	<10%		
Version of the NP proposal	26 March 2013	Partly	10-50%		
EWG Answer	Mostly	Yes	50-90%		
Overall compliance	Yes	Yes	>90%		
		NA	not applicable		
EWG COMMENTS		EWG judgement	EWG		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		Yes	no action needed		
Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		Yes	MS should amend one wrong entry in "variable group" column		
<b>F1 Capacity</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes		
	Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA		
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA		
<b>F13</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No Shortfalls	NA		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA		
<b>F2 Effort</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes		
	Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA		
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA		
<b>F12</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes		
	Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA		
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA		
<b>F13</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	NA		
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA		
<b>F14</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No Shortfalls	NA		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA		
<b>F3 Landings</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes		
	Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA		
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA		
<b>F12</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes		
	Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	NA		
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA		
<b>F13</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	NA		
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	NA		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA		
<b>F14</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No Shortfalls	NA		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	NA		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA		
<b>G Research surveys at sea</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes		
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes		
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes		
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No comments	Yes		
<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.)?	No comments	Yes		
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes		
	Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes		
<b>G3</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
	Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?	No, but text explains how follow-up took place	Yes		
	Are the responsive actions described?	No comments	Yes		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes		
<b>G4</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No comments	Yes		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No comments	Yes		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes		
<b>IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture				
	Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	no comments	Yes		
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	Yes		
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	Yes		
<b>A1</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Minor changes which improve the AR	Yes		
	Are the deviations explained?	no comments	NA		
	Are the deviations justified?	no comments	NA		
<b>A2</b>	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Is respective data quality information given?	no comments	Yes		
	Are the deviations explained?	no comments	NA		
	Are the deviations justified?	no comments	NA		
<b>A3</b>	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	MS gives recommendations on meeting	Yes		
	Are the responsive actions described?	no comments	NA		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	NA		
<b>A4</b>	Actions to avoid shortfalls	no comments	Yes		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	no comments	NA		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments	NA		
<b>B Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	Yes		
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	Na		
<b>B1</b>	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	no comments	Yes		

Member State:		Sweden		Judgement levels	
Overall compliance	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level	
	Version of the AR reviewed	27 May 2014	No	<10%	
	Version of the NP proposal	26 March 2013	Partly	10-50%	
	EWG Answer	Yes	Mostly	50-90%	
		Yes	Yes	>90%	
		NA	NA	not applicable	
		<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG</b>	
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	no comments	Yes	No action needed	
		no comments	Yes	No action needed	
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 comments	Yes	No action needed	
		no comments	NA	No action needed	
		no comments	NA	No action needed	
		no comments	NA	No action needed	
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments	Yes	No action needed	
		no comments	NA	No action needed	
		no comments	NA	No action needed	
		no comments	NA	No action needed	
<b>V 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 "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		No derogations apply	Yes	No action needed	
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No shortfalls listed	Yes	No action needed	
		NA	NA	No action needed	
<b>VI Module for management and use of the data</b>					
1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal Is Table V1.1 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?	Yes, very complete list	Yes	No action needed	
		No comments	NA	No action needed	
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal? Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		database development slower than anticipated	Yes	No action needed	
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
VII	Follow-up of STECF recommendations Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
VIII	List of acronyms and abbreviations Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
		No comments	Yes	No action needed	
<b>IX Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>					
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	Comments passed on to Commission by adding them to	Yes	No action needed	
<b>X References</b>					
	Is there a complete list of references?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	
<b>XI Annexes</b>					
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	No comments	Yes	No action needed	

Member State: **UK**

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

		Judgement levels	
		2013	
Overall compliance		Compliance class	Compliance level
	31 May 2014	No	<10%
	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
	Mostly	NA	not applicable

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

I General framework

Are derogations listed?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

Is there a national DCF website available?  
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?  
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?  
If yes, is the list filled in according to the guidelines?

Information on website is provided in section VI	Mostly	No action needed, for next AR is suggested to provide it in IIA section.
No comments	NA	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

Relevant recommendations provided in the separate relevant sections	Mostly	No action needed, for next AR is suggested to provide it in IIB section.
No comments	Yes	No action needed
No comments	Yes	No action needed

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?

No comments	Yes	No action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

B Economic variables

Is information under III.B.1-4 for each supra-region given?  
**SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic**

no comments	Yes	no action needed
-------------	-----	------------------

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

Clustered segments are not marked with asterisk as it is required in guidelines.	Mostly	MS has to put some asterisk on clustered segments and to resubmit the table
--	--------	---

Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  
Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

For some segments, as Polyvalent active and passive gears 10-12 m, pure seiners 18-24 m and etc. target population and planned sample numbers are 0. If these segments do not have vessels in fleet register they should not be included into AR, if they are, then it must be in target population.	Mostly	MS needs to delete segments that have no vessels
no comments	Yes	No action needed

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Number of clustered segments differ from NP and it is not explained in AR section regarding deviations from NP proposal.	Mostly	Deviations from the NP has to be explained in the AR
No comments	No	Deviations from the NP has to be explained in the AR

Are the deviations justified?

No comments	No	Deviations from the NP has to be explained in the AR
-------------	----	--

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?

MS gives some explanations on the CV's calculation but it is not sufficient.	Partly	MS has to enhance the quality of the data
--	--------	---

Are the deviations explained?

For some segments as dredges 18-24, dredges 24-40, Drif and/or net fixed 12-18/24-40, the sample is higher than in NP proposal without any explanation in the AR. MS samples inactive vessels and it is a deviation from the NP proposal.	Partly	More detail is asked to the MS to highlight the deviations
---	--------	--

Are the deviations justified?

No comments	No	More detail is asked to the MS to highlight the deviations
-------------	----	--

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?

Recommendations listed are not from LM meetings. But MS mentions recommendations from other meetings as PGECON	Yes	No action needed
no comments	NA	No action needed
no comments	NA	No action needed

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

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

no comments	Yes	No action needed
no comments	Yes	No action needed

C Biological metier related variables

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

According to table III.A.1 MS is operating in Regions NA and NS&EA.	Yes	No action needed
---	-----	------------------

Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

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

Table complete and detailed by fishing grounds. Table difficult to analyse because metiers are split by countries (Scotland, England, etc). 6 metiers not planned in the NP were added in the AR table.	Mostly	For the next AR, MS should consider reporting by regions, not split by countries within the UK.
---	--------	---

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

Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4 not comparable. Several metiers, target assemblages and regions included in the same sampling frames (codes). Some inconsistencies in numbers of trips achieved with Table III.C.3 (see for example sampling frame E2).	Mostly	For the next AR, MS should consider reporting by regions, not split by countries within the UK. MS should improve comparability of Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4.
--	--------	--

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

Table modified by MS and difficult to check. Results by provinces and partners are irrelevant. Many species not planned in the NP added in the table and which should be enough to list in table III.C.6, especially when no CVs are provided.	Partly	MS to submit final clean table in accordance with the AR Guidelines & Templates.
--	--------	--

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

Table modified by MS. Concurrent sampling is correctly implemented.	Partly	MS to submit final clean table in accordance with the AR Guidelines & Templates.
---	--------	--

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Objectives planned for sampling trips and species are mostly achieved. Metier DRB_MOL abd OTB_DEF_100-119 in UKE severely undersampled. Often better achievement rates for strategy at sea than at the market or specific stock ones. Sampling frames E2 and E5 partly achieved for some fleets. Most of the species planned appear as oversampled. Rays in NS and mackerel in I,II not sampled at all.	Mostly	No action needed
---	--------	------------------

Member State:		UK		Judgement levels	
AR year	Version of the AR reviewed	Version of the NP proposal	Overall compliance	Compliance class	Compliance level
	2013	31 May 2014		No	<10%
		October 2012?		Partly	10-50%
		EWG Answer	Mostly	Mostly	50-90%
			Mostly	Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>			<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG</b>	
		New sampling programmes were established on the basis of probability-based sampling rather than using a quota sampling system based on targeted numbers of metier-based samples.			
		Deviations in on-shore sampling and length sampling by species well explained.	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Yes	Yes	Yes	No action needed
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Were CV targets met?	No	No	No action needed
		Best results achieved are listed in the AR. But MS considers that the DCF precision targets are currently unachievable for many stocks at the Member State level, despite substantial and costly sampling programmes.	Yes	Yes	No action needed
<b>C3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	No	No	No action needed
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	MS to shift STECF recommendations to section VII.
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Partly	Partly	MS to provide concrete plans for actions for each shortfall.
		No comment	NA	NA	No action needed
<b>Region North Atlantic</b>					
<b>C1</b>	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Mostly	For the next AR, MS should consider reporting by regions, not split by countries within the UK.
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Mostly	For the next AR, MS should consider reporting by regions, not split by countries within the UK. MS should improve comparability of Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4.
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Partly	MS to submit final clean table in accordance with the AR Guidelines & Templates.
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Partly	MS to submit final clean table in accordance with the AR Guidelines & Templates.
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Mostly	No action needed
<b>C2</b>	<b>Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Were CV estimates provided? Were CV targets met?	No comment	Yes	No action needed
		Best results achieved are listed in the AR. But MS considers that the DCF precision targets are currently unachievable for many stocks at the Member State level, despite substantial and costly sampling programmes.	Yes	Yes	No action needed
<b>C3</b>	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>	Are the deviations explained? Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	MS to shift STECF recommendations to section VII.
<b>C4</b>	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed? Are the responsive actions described? Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described? Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Partly	Partly	MS to provide concrete plans for actions for each shortfall.
		No comment	NA	NA	No action needed
<b>D Recreational fisheries</b>					
		Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?	Yes	Yes	No action needed
		No comment	NA	NA	No action needed

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

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



Member State:

UK

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

**EWG COMMENTS**

**EWG judgement**

**EWG**

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	DCF regulation mentions cod, eel and sharks as the recreative targeted species to be sampled in the NS&EA region. Reporting for the region is provided by provinces and for a mixture of species concerning both NS&EA and NA. So AR is difficult to evaluate : England is processing 2012 data collected by a Sea angling survey, when Scotland banned recreational fishing for eel and sharks but was collecting some data on cod. States of way appear really different in England and Scotland, without national coordination. 2013 NP objectives were not clearer. To be noted results of a study provided in annex 2 of the AR on inland salmon and eel recreational fisheries.	Mostly	AR2014: MS to report by species instead of by country
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Derogations for eel and sharks mentioned only for Scotland. Derogations in Annex III (2) unclear, it only contains a list of species without any further explanation. Derogation in III.D.4 is also not completely clear, but it is assumed that this derogation relates to text in III.D (first paragraph)	Mostly	AR2014: MS to list derogations (if any) in III.D.1, following guidelines: 'If the MS obtained derogation for the collection of landings data on recreational fisheries, then it should explicitly be mentioned in this section.'
Are the deviations explained?	The deviations are in the report but are not well structured	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No information on data quality	Partly	Yes, MS to provide information on data quality based on the final report
Were data quality targets provided?	NA	NA	No action needed
Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No (listed in III.D.4)	Yes	No action needed
Were the relevant derogations listed?	No recommendation addressed to MS.	Yes	No action needed
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls	Yes	Yes	AR2014: MS to move derogations to a different paragraph
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	In England only the charter boats survey should be carried out in the beginning of 2013 to achieve data collection for a full year.	Yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			

**Region North Atlantic**

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	DCF regulation mentions sea bass, salmon, eel and sharks as the recreative targeted species to be sampled in the NA region. Reporting for the region is provided by provinces and for a mixture of species concerning both NS&EA and NA. So AR is difficult to evaluate: only salmon seems to be monitored on a regular basis. England is processing 2012 data collected by a Sea angling survey, when Scotland banned recreational fishing for eel and sharks and did not collect data on sea bass in 2013. Data collection in Northern Ireland but was just beginning in 2013. States of way appear really different in the different provinces, without national coordination. 2013 NP objectives were also not clearer. To be noted results of a study provided in annex 2 of the AR on inland salmon and eel recreational fisheries.	Mostly	AR2014: MS to report by species instead of by country
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Derogations for eel and sharks mentioned only for Scotland. Derogations in Annex III (2) unclear, it only contains a list of species without any further explanation. Derogation in III.D.4 is also not completely clear, but it is assumed that this derogation relates to text in III.D (first paragraph)	Mostly	AR2014: MS to list derogations (if any) in III.D.1, following guidelines: 'If the MS obtained derogation for the collection of landings data on recreational fisheries, then it should explicitly be mentioned in this section.'
Are the deviations explained?	The deviations are in the report but are not well structured	Yes	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Information on data quality provided for England and Scotland (not for Northern Ireland), no specific targets.	Mostly	AR2014: MS to provide information for all provinces explicitly
Were data quality targets provided?	NA	NA	No action needed
Were data quality targets met?	NA	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations explained?	NA	NA	No action needed
Are the deviations justified?	NA	NA	No action needed
D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	No (listed in III.D.4)	Yes	No action needed
Were the relevant derogations listed?	No recommendation addressed to MS	Yes	No action needed
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	NA	No action needed
Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls	The derogations should be under III.D.1	Yes	AR2014: MS to move derogations to a different paragraph
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	In England only the chartered boats survey should be carried out in the beginning of 2013 to achieve data collection for a full year. But not real improvement of data collection on recreational fisheries can be expected before next DCMAP.	Yes	No action needed
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			

**E Biological stock-related variables**

Is information on III.E.1-4 given for each respective region?	According to table III.A.1 MS is operating in Regions NS&EA and NA	Yes	No action needed
---	--	-----	------------------

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table modified by MS (e.g. added columns) and difficult to check. Two species not planned in the NP added in the table.	Mostly	MS to submit final clean table in accordance with the AR Guidelines & Templates.
--	---	--------	--

Member State:		UK	Judgement levels		
AR year	Version of the AR reviewed	Version of the NP proposal	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			31 May 2014	No	<10%
			October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
			EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%
			Overall compliance	Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
				Mostly	

  

	EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
	Achievements rates can be considered as mostly achieved in terms of numbers of fish sampled. Most of the stocks appear as well or oversampled for the parameters planned. But undersampling is registered for scallops (not sample at all) and some valuable species such as sea bass (OK for length@age), John Dory, brill. Weakness also of samples for sex ratio and maturity @age for megrim and anglerfish. Some planned numbers very low (less than 10 fish), doubtful that parameters can be estimated from so few individuals.	Mostly	No action needed
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Sampling achievement is mostly totally dependent on the catches of the species on the surveys and the staff time available between tows to process multiple species.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	No action needed
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	No action needed
	Were CV targets met?	Mostly	No action needed
	Explanations provided for two stocks, anglerfish and megrim, with too small samples collected during IBTS. But MS considers that the DCF precision targets are currently unachievable for many stocks at the Member State level, despite substantial and costly sampling programmes.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
E3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	Yes	No action needed
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	One from RCM NS&EA 2012 on bilateral agreements.	Yes
	Are the responsive actions described ?	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	No action needed
E4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	More task sharing between MS for to achieving precision targets at regional level. Only existing case up to now in NA UK fishing areas : sole in VIIId.	Yes
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No action needed
	Yes	Yes	No action needed
Region North Atlantic			
E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Mostly	MS to submit final clean table in accordance with the AR Guidelines & Templates.
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table modified by MS and difficult to check. 14 stocks not planned in the NP added in the table.	
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Achievements rates can be considered as mostly achieved in terms of numbers of fish sampled. More than 50% of the stocks were well or over-sampled for the parameters planned. But undersampling is registered for species assessed by ICES WGNEW, Selaciens and Gadoids in Southern fishing grounds, but also for some parameters of important stocks estimated from surveys data in the Northern areas.	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Sampling achievement is mostly totally dependent on the catches of the species on the surveys and the staff time available between tows to process multiple species.	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No action needed
E2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	Yes	No action needed
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	No action needed
	Were CV targets met?	Partly	No action needed
	The majority of stock-based variables are obtained from sampling at sea on research vessels in order to obtain data representative of the population. Sampling achievement is therefore totally dependent on the catches of the species on the surveys and the staff time available between tows to process multiple species. Under-sampling by more than 10% can be explained by low catches or logistical constraints of working with many species. Over-sampling by more than 50% compared to the set targets can occur especially where the targets are modest but catches are sufficiently large to allow the sampling rate to be expanded at no additional expense (as the survey staff costs are fixed). More information provided for two stocks : Gadus morhua from Rockall Vlb and Nephrops FU 13.	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	No action needed
E3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	NA	No action needed
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No derogation listed.	NA
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA wrote by MS. But recommendation by RCM NA 2012 on bilateral agreements is relevant, as for RCM NS&EA in North sea.	No
	Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	MS to add missing recommendation
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	No action needed
E4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	More task sharing between MS for to achieving precision targets at regional level. Only existing case up to now in NA UK fishing areas : sole in VIIa.	Yes
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No action needed
	Yes	Yes	No action needed
F	Transversal variables	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No comments	Yes
F1	Capacity	Yes	No action needed
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	No comments	Yes
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No deviations	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	No deviations	Yes

Member State:		UK	Judgement levels		
AR year	Version of the AR reviewed	Version of the NP proposal	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
			31 May 2014	No	<10%
			October 2012?	Partly	10-50%
			<b>EWG Answer</b>	Mostly	50-90%
		<b>Overall compliance</b>	<b>Mostly</b>	Yes	>90%
				NA	not applicable
			EWG COMMENTS	EWG judgement	EWG
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F13		Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F2		<b>Effort</b>			
F11		Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No deviations indicated.	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F12		Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No deviations indicated. For future, MS is asked to provide precise information on whether deviations occurred or not	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F13		Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F14		Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
F3		<b>Landings</b>			
F11		Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No deviations indicated. For future, MS is asked to provide precise information on whether deviations occurred or not	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F12		Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No deviations indicated. For future, MS is asked to provide precise information on whether deviations occurred or not	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F13		Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	No comments	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No comments	NA	No action needed
F14		Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
G		<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?	The table is unnecessarily long, as surveys are listed that weren't planned in 2011-2013 and e.g. the mackerel egg survey (1, 2, 3) is split up in three lines although it is one survey.	Yes	AR2014: MS to only take surveys into account that ran during the current DCF (2011-2014?) period. Follow guidelines: 'If a survey had covered more than one type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activity', and consider merging one survey carried out by multiple vessels as one survey. Check acronyms of survey planning groups (eg PHERS does not exist anymore, IBTS should be IBTSWG)
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	No comments	Yes	AR2014: MS to add map numbers in text and in table
G2		<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.)?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations explained?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
		Are the deviations justified?	No comments	Yes	No action needed
G3		<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>			
		Are the relevant recommendations from Survey Planning Groups listed?	No relevant recommendations	Yes	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	NA	No action needed
G4		<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	Only descriptions on the deviations listed, no actions to avoid shortfalls in future	Mostly	Yes, see comment below
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Actions not clearly described	No	Yes, MS to add concrete actions for future to avoid shortfalls. E.g. how will mismatch of logistical requirements of charter vessels for WCBTS Q4 be avoided?
IV		<b>Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry</b>			
A		<b>Collection of data concerning the aquaculture</b>			
		Is AR consistent with Table IV.A.1?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Table IV.A.3 indicates A and B scheme, not reflected here. Also achieved sample and planned sample as well as population data differ in some cases extremely. If new information are available, table shall be updated.	Mostly	MS should explain why achieved sample number is higher than the planned sample number. The table should be updated according to the guidelines and to the explanations provided
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	In most cases achieved sample rate and response rates are missing	Mostly	MS has to provide sample rate and precise if the sample is census or not.
A1		Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Table IV A1: carp cages not sampled and Table IV A2: 12 more segments are sampled compare to NP proposal.	Mostly	MS has to provide detailed explanations on the deviation (added segments) from NP proposal

Member State:	UK		Judgement levels	
	AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2014	No	<10%	
Version of the NP proposal	October 2012?	Partly	10-50%	
Overall compliance	EWG Answer	Mostly	50-90%	
		Yes	>90%	
		NA	not applicable	
		<b>EWG COMMENTS</b>	<b>EWG judgement</b>	<b>EWG</b>
	Are the deviations explained?	Deviations from NP proposal are not explained	Partly	MS has to provide detailed explanations on the deviation (added segments) from NP proposal
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	no comments	No	MS has to provide detailed explanations on the deviation (added segments) from NP proposal
	Are the deviations justified?			
	Is respective data quality information given?	MS provides some explanation but not sufficient	Mostly	MS has to apply the methodology to get all data required (CVs, sample rates, response rate) for the aquaculture sector
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	MS is not explaining the all deviations from the NP proposal	Mostly	MS has to explain by methodology/comments deviations
	Are the deviations explained?	Deviations are not fully justified	Mostly	MS has to justify all the deviations
	Are the deviations justified?			
	Are the responsive actions described ?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	NA	no action needed
A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	no comments	NA	no action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	no comments	yes	no action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	no comments	yes	no action needed
B	Collection of data concerning the processing industry			
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Employment rows are missing	Mostly	No cells shall be removed from the table. The table should be resubmitted.
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	MS states that subsidies, other income, unpaid labour costs and net extraordinary costs are not mandatory.	Mostly	MS should provide explanations for the missing variables
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	MS does not explain these deviations	No	MS should provide explanations for the missing variables
	Are the deviations explained?	Deviations are not justified	No	MS should provide explanations for the missing variables
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	no comments	yes	no action needed
	Is respective data quality information given?	no comments	Yes	no action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	Subsidies, other income, unpaid labour costs and extraordinary costs, net are missing	Yes	no action needed
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	no comments	Yes	no action needed
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no comments	NA	no action needed
	Are the responsive actions described ?	no comments	NA	no action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	NA	no action needed
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	no comments	Yes	no action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Missing variables are not identified as shortfalls	No	MS should take the necessary actions to avoid these shortfalls in the future
V	Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem			
1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No derogations apply	Yes	No action needed
	Are the relevant derogations listed?			
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls	No shortfalls	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	NA	NA	No action needed
	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	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No deviations	Yes	No action needed
	Are the deviations explained?	No comments	NA	No action needed
	Are the deviations justified?			
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?			
VII	Follow-up of STECF recommendations			
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions described?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
VIII	List of acronyms and abbreviations			
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
IX	Comments, suggestions and reflections			
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?	no comments	Yes	No action needed
X	References			
	Is there a complete list of references?	No references listed	No	AR2014: MS to update reference list with references used in the report
XI	Annexes			
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	no comments	Yes	No action needed

**ANNEX 3 – DETAILED DT EVALUATION TABLE BY MS**

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
18	Belgium	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	1, Depreciated Replacement value missing for 2008 for several fleet segments. Energy consumption missing for several fleet segments and years (2008/09). Incomplete/inconsistent data sets for some fleet segments. 2, Recreational catch data not submitted See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	1, Most of the "suspect or missing" data relate to fleet segments with very few members, which easily yield large variations. 2. In Belgium there is no obligation to record the catches from recreational fisheries. Therefore, it is not possible to submit catch data for recreational fisheries. To improve and hopefully solve this problem, Belgium has started a new project (LIVIS) under the EFF where a full inventarisation of the recreational fisheries is done and based on this, recommendations will be done to the government to implement a registration system for the catches from recreational fisheries in Belgium. The project started end 2013 and is finalized begin 2015.	1. Insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery 2. there is a legal obligation to collect data on certain recreational fisheries. According to AR MS has indicated to have collected data on recreational cod fishery. In the 2011 AR MS indicated that data would be available during 2012. Moreover, in the 2011 AR MS stated that "the gradual implementation of a full quantitative study on recreational fisheries is undertaken in 2011, 2012 and 2013"	Unsatisfactory
40	Belgium	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	No information submitted for vessels <10m in length. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	For the requested period, there were no vessel <10m active in the Belgian fisheries.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
85	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions VIIa,b,d (Northern stock)(hke-nrtn) WKSOUTH	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards	BE has length information of Hake but the stock coordinator agreed that the upload of quarterly landings and effort into InterCatch was sufficient.	It is not up to the stock coordinator to decide on changes in data calls. MS should in general comply with data calls unless an agreed derogation is in force.	Satisfactory
86	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: European seabass in Divisions IVbc, VIIa and VII d-h (Irish Sea, English Channel and southern North Sea)(bss-47) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings	BE does not have age and length samples of seabass in recent years	Seabass in not part of stocks of the MS DCF NP and MS has therefor no obligation to submit the data.	Satisfactory
87	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(cod-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The data were uploaded on the day of the deadline (17/04/2014 14h20)	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
88	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIe (Western Channel)(ple-echw) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings	Plaice in VIIe can only be sampled as opportunity arises, therefore we didn't have enough samples to deliver an age or length distribution.	Seems that MS was in position to respond to the Data call but as not perform it properly (for length distribution).	Unsatisfactory
89	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Divisions VIII-k (Southwest of Ireland)(sol-7h-k) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings	The area VIII-k is not an area BE has to sample (cfr ranking of metiers), and BE only has a quatum of about 4 ton of sole in VIIh.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
90	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(sol-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline after EG	In the assessment of sole 7A, the raw age data were combined for the major countries (Belgium, Ireland and UK) without weighting. The combined ALK was applied to the raised length distribution of the national catches to obtain a combined age distribution. Therefore InterCatch cannot be used for the raising and an upload of the Belgian data is irrelevant.	Seems that MS was in position to respond to the Data call but as not perform it properly (time delivery).	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
91	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Subarea IV (North Sea), Division VII d (Eastern Channel) and IIIa West (Skagerrak)(cod-347d) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Because of the expanding demand to deliver data and the delay in the data transmission for the administration, we were not able to upload the data into InterCatch on time. However we uploaded the data (04/04/2014 11h39) within one week after the deadline for submission.	Seems that MS was in position to respond to the Data call but as not perform it properly (time delivery).	unsatisfactory
92	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Common shrimp (Crangon crangon) in sub-area IV and division VII d (csh-47d ) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The data of common shrimp were not requested in the Data call under InterCatch. De Crangon data needed for WGCRAN were delivered directly to the chair of WGCRAN by email.	Derogation granted to MS in its NP. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
93	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Subarea IV (North Sea) and Division IIIa West (Skagerrak)(had-34) WGNSSK	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	Hake is only 0.2% of the total landings in Belgium. Therefore, it can hardly be sampled for as well landings as discards.	Hake was not in the selected stocks of the MS NP. Only data collected at sea could be available if MS applied correctly the concurrent sampling method. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
94	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IV b (Off Horn Reef, FU 33)(nep-33) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Because of the expanding demand to deliver data and the delay in the data transmission for the administration, we were not able to upload the data into InterCatch on time. However we uploaded the data (04/04/2014 11h52) within one week after the deadline for submission.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
95	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IV bc (Botney Gut - Silver Pit, FU 5)(nep-5) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Because of the expanding demand to deliver data and the delay in the data transmission for the administration, we were not able to upload the data into InterCatch on time. However we uploaded the data (04/04/2014 11h52) within one week after the deadline for submission.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
96	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VII d (Eastern Channel)(ple-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Because of the expanding demand to deliver data and the delay in the data transmission for the administration, we were not able to upload the data into InterCatch on time. However we uploaded the data (04/04/2014 12h17) within one week after the deadline for submission.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
97	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice Subarea IV (North Sea)(ple-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Because of the expanding demand to deliver data and the delay in the data transmission for the administration, we were not able to upload the data into InterCatch on time. However we uploaded the data (04/04/2014 12h17) within one week after the deadline for submission.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
98	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Saithe in Subarea IV (North Sea) Division IIIa West (Skagerrak) and Subarea VI (West of Scotland and Rockall)(sai-3a46) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The data were uploaded the day before the deadline (27/03/2014)	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
99	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(sol-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Because of the expanding demand to deliver data and the delay in the data transmission for the administration, we were not able to upload the data into InterCatch on time. However we uploaded the data (04/04/2014 12h27) within one week after the deadline for submission.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
100	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)(sol-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Because of the expanding demand to deliver data and the delay in the data transmission for the administration, we were not able to upload the data into InterCatch on time. However we uploaded the data (04/04/2014 12h27) within one week after the deadline for submission.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
101	Belgium	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting Subarea IV (North Sea) & Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(whg-47d) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The data were uploaded the day before the deadline (27/03/2014)	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
335	Belgium	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (gug-celt)Grey gurnard in Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa-c and e-k (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/gug-celt.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/gug-celt.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Quality of landings data Description: Because the species is largely discarded, landings data do not reflect the actual catches. Comments: The landings values of the MS listed are very low	Quality of landings data : as it was legal to land all species of gurnard under the generic category 'gurnards' until 2010, it is not possible to improve the quality of landings data prior to 2010. Discards:as all species of gurnard are landed under one category, it is practical not feasible for the sea going observer to sample the discards as well.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. Data call deadline should try to match the NP from relevant MS.	satisfactory
349	Belgium	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ple-iris)Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-iris.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-iris.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards sampling intensity Description: The discard data are noisy and the assessment would benefit from increased sampling intensity. Discard information from Northern Irish and Irish Nephrops fleets became available for the first time this year, enabling improved discard estimates for the most recent years (2010–2012). Because no time-series of this information was available to be incorporated in the assessment model, the previous discards computation was used. However, the new discard information was used to quantify the catch advice.	Age distribution of discards and landings was provided on 17/04/2014 14h22	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. Data call deadline should try to match the NP from relevant MS.	satisfactory



Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
353	Belgium	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ple-echw)Plaice in Division VIIe (Western Channel) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-echw.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-echw.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission - Age composition Description: This assessment would benefit from the addition of age composition information from both the French and Belgian fleets who collectively account for 30% of the total landings for this stock.	We only sample area VIIe as opportunity arises, therefore we didn't have enough samples to deliver an age or length distribution that is statistically sound.	Seems that MS was in position to respond to the Data call but as not perform it properly (by combining with French data at least).	unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
2	Bulgaria	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Only few variables (number of enterprises by size category, turnover for 2008-2010, livestock costs (2008), livestock volume and total sales volume for 2008-2010) were disaggregated at the segment level. The turnover and sales volume by specie was not reported by DCF segment for 2011. See: <a href="https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	The information of 2011 is revised. We send you table Aqua_production_2013_revised.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	NA
19	Bulgaria	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Significant amount of missing and inconsistent data for several fleet segments . Energy consumption missing for 2011. National level capacity data (number of vessels, GT, kW) significantly lower than at fleet segment level due to the submission of MS capacity data only on the active fleet. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	It's not possible to report these data because our e-database does not contain information about Energy consumption for 2011 and 2012. For 2013 information for Energy consumption is available. Capacity_tot for 2011 include only the active vessels.	No response to "Significant amount of missing and inconsistent data for several fleet segments". Insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery on energy consumption. MS indicated in 2013 AR that energy consumption data were collected for 2012. MS was alerted to provide inactive vessels in previous years' AR evaluation	Unsatisfactory
55	Bulgaria	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity. The values provided for the variable "purchase of fish and other raw material for production" are very low compared with those for "turnover". Although the national correspondent for Bulgaria has confirmed that all the information provided were correct, the experts continued to find the consistency of the data provided questionable. Values equal to zero: subsidies in 2011. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	The data for the variables "purchase of fish and other raw material for production" and "turnover" will be checked again. The value of subsidies in 2011 is zero, because from all submitted questionnaires the value of this indicator is zero. In table DCF_ProInd_ma_2011 value of Achieved sample rate shall be zero.	No justification for "No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity". Explanation on subsidies acceptable. Evaluation of questionable data should be based on the check as announced by MS	Unsatisfactory
83	Bulgaria	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	No discards data received. Table B landings at length is missing all years except 2008. Landings in tons is missing from 2007-2009. Fishing effort is missing for years before 2008. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Currently no collected data from discard. You could see landings in tons from 2008-2012 by species in table MEDBS_CATCH. There is no data for fishing effort before 2008.	Before the 2008 MS was not involved in the DCF. Instead, discards data should be collected under module III.C of the current DCF, and at least for the metiers identified during RCMMed&BS 2010 (see RCMMed&BS Report Varna, 2010. Table 7. Priorities for sampling effort for discards)	Unsatisfactory
399	Bulgaria	GFCM	Task 1 2 Main resource and activity components variables per Operational Units	Mostly completed (75%)	All available data is submitted.	In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	Satisfactory
412	Bulgaria	GFCM	Task 1 4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycatch	Mostly completed (75%)	All available data is submitted.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call	Satisfactory
422	Bulgaria	GFCM	Task 1 5 Provisional biological parameters	No data provided	Currently, we have not collected biological data from landings.	Under Module III.C and III.E of the current DCF, MS is collecting the request data. Moreover, if the requested data (for GFCM task 1.5 those corresponds to mean length, max and min length...) are not available from commercial catches, MS could use surveys data.	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	Pre-screening comments	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
400	Croatia	GFCM	Task 1 2 Main resource and activity components variables per Operational Units	Mostly completed (75%)	Data for referent years 2011 and 2012 will be provided by 31 May 2014.	Following the dead line of the Task 1, data for 2011 should have already been transmitted by the country in May 2013. 2012 data should be transmitted in may 2014. GFCM should confirm if the data have been received	Croatia joined the EU on the first of July 2013, also starting the implementation of the DCF in that period. In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call.	Satisfactory
405	Croatia	GFCM	Task 1 3 Economic component variables	Partially completed (50%)	Data for referent years 2011 and 2012 will be provided by 31 May 2014.	Following the dead line of the Task 1, data for 2011 should have already been transmitted by the country in May 2013. 2012 data should have be transmitted in may 2014. GFCM should confirm if the data have been received	Croatia joined the EU on the first of July 2013, also starting the implementation of the DCF in that period. In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call.	Satisfactory
413	Croatia	GFCM	Task 1 4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycatch	Scarcely completed (25%)	Data for referent years 2011 and 2012 will be provided by 31 May 2014.	Following the dead line of the Task 1, data for 2011 should have already been transmitted by the country in May 2013. 2012 data should be transmitted in may 2014. GFCM should confirm if the data have been received	Croatia joined the EU on the first of July 2013, also starting the implementation of the DCF in that period.	Satisfactory
423	Croatia	GFCM	Task 1 5 Provisional biological parameters	No data provided	Data for referent year 2013 will be provided in 2015.	For Task 1, 2013 data should be sent in 2015. 2011 data were to be transmitted in May 2013. GFCM should confirm if the 2011 data have been received in 2013	Croatia joined the EU on the first of July 2013, also starting the implementation of the DCF in that period.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
3	Cyprus	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Cyprus provided all economic variables at the national level. However, due to a low number of firms only turnover and sales volume by specie have been provided by segments. Some information is provided by group of species instead of by specie (3 alpha code). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	For the Turnover Aqua Template the information provided is by species -Regarding DCF-Aqua Template indeed only Turnover and sales volumes have been provided by species due to the low number of firms in Cyprus. However if it is required upon request we could revise the data with further breakdown in relation to the other variables. -Another issue that needs to be addressed is the units that relate to the hatcheries. we strongly recommend that in the Turnover Aqua Template the hatcheries production is reported in number of fry instead of weight.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
20	Cyprus	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Substantial amount of data not submitted at all levels. Capacity data not submitted for any of the years requested. Effort data not submitted for any of the years requested. Employment data not submitted for any of the years requested. Income and Expenditure data not submitted for any of the years requested. Capital & Investment not submitted for any of the years requested. Recreational catch data not submitted for any of the years requested. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	We acknowledge that data should be send within the deadline. However, the data were not ready to be uploaded within the deadline but on a later stage. Thus, on June 2013 we have sent email whether we could upload the data even with a delay. Despite the fact that permission was given, there was not this possibility through the system. Relevant email was sent by us suggesting if it was possible to send the data by email but we have not received any reply to our question. (Relevant emails attached). As for the Recreational catch data, is not relevant for Cyprus because derogation was granted to Cyprus by STECF for eel and BFT fishery is prohibited for recreational fishery.	Insufficient explanation for failure of fleet data delivery in time. Evaluation of e-mail dialogue between MS and end user is beyond scope of EWG. Recreational catch: MS provided reasonable explanation	Unsatisfactory
56	Cyprus	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: "imputed value of unpaid labour" (all years); "extraordinary costs, net" (all years); subsidies (2009) See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	These variables were collected through the questionnaire method and their values were zero	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
76	Cyprus	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	Late submission in respect of first deadline (3/06/2013) . No catch at age (Table A) and effort data (Table D). No MEDITS TE file.TC file included only data from 2013. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Data regarding landings and discards were submitted in early September 2013. There was further delay for the preparation of catch at age data due to other commitments, but at the time they were prepared the uploading system was already closed. Concerning the Medits TE file, Cyprus submitted the file on the 29th of November 2013, and an updated version of the file on the 6 of December, by email (at mare-datacollection.framework@ec.europa.eu). In the email it was requested that the uploading system, which closed early afternoon on the 29th of November, would re-open for uploading TE file and other files already uploaded with some corrections (the relevant emails are attached). However, the uploading system did not open again and for this TE file and TC including data from all the years were not uploaded, even with some delay. Considering that in other data calls JRC accepts the uploading of files even after the deadline, we would be greatfull if the system remains open at least during the whole day of the last submission date.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
406	Cyprus	GFCM	Task 1.3 Economic component variables	Mostly completed (75%)	The data requested (working hours, fixed costs) but not sent by Cyprus are the ones not requested to be collected under DCF.	In general, the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call. The failure of 25% is because the requested data are the ones not requested to be collected under DCF.	Satisfactory
414	Cyprus	GFCM	Task 1.4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycatch	Partially completed (50%)	In relation to the above issues on Data Transmission 2013 for Cyprus, we inform you that the partial or non data submission of some of the required data was due to administrative issues. These issues have been addressed and the information will be sent to the GFCM Secretariat at the earliest possible. It is noted that the information requested will derive from the National Data Collection Programme under the Data Collection	In general, the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. GFCM should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	NA
424	Cyprus	GFCM	Task 1.5 Provisional biological parameters	No data provided		GFCM should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	NA

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
21	Denmark	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Effort and landings data provided for 2012 but no corresponding capacity data (national and fleet segment levels). Capacity data not reported for 2013 (national and fleet segment levels). Recreational catch data not submitted See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	The Fleet Economic Data Call asks for processed data for 2012 already in February/March 2013, but we cannot deliver data for a given year before the data has been validated and is ready for processing. It is the same for the 2014 data call, that we cannot deliver 2013 data already in March 2014. We have corresponded with DGMARE about this and proposed to report some preliminary 2013 data in May 2014. See the enclosed e-mail correspondence.	Deadline was evidently missed. Evaluation of bilateral correspondence between MS and DG Mare is beyond scope of EWG.	NA
41	Denmark	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	No effort or catch information for the special conditions BACOMA or T90 in the Baltic. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	See point 4 in the attached letter to DG MARE concerning the SGMOS data call.	Evaluation of bilateral correspondence between MS and DG Mare is beyond scope of EWG.	NA
57	Denmark	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: subsidies (all years); "turnover attributed to fish processing" for enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity (2011). As explained by the national expert, although reported as zero, the "turnover attributed to fish processing" is not equal to zero (and indeed it could not be, as the value provided for "number of enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity" is not zero) but it cannot be shown for confidentiality reasons. More information is available in Section 4.4. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Statistics Denmark has thoroughly examined data for the processing industry for the years reported to JRC and has concluded that there are no subsidies in the Danish processing industry. This has been explained by the MS several times. Furthermore, it is correct that the numbers of enterprises carrying out fish processing, but not as a main activity, is not zero. However, the numbers cannot be provided for public publication do to Statistics Denmark's (and for that matter EUROSTAT's) rules on confidentiality. MS was instructed to insert the value zero, because the data is collected, but cannot be provided for publication.	OK. MS provided reasonable justifications. MS should not be instructed to fill in wrong numbers and then receive a complaint.	Satisfactory
102	Denmark	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 26 and 28(fle-2628) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	Denmark has never sampled the stock in 26 and 28. Before the stock was defined for the area 22 to 32 - and in the last 10 years around 0.2 % of the landings from 22 to 32 came from 26 and 28. Since 2000 we have in total landed 75 tons from subdivision 26 and 28.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
103	Denmark	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVa (Norwegian Deeps, FU 32)(nep-32) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Data were uploaded before the deadline, but due to an error in InterCatch data were not imported into InterCatch, see mail from Henrik Kjems-Nielsen (ICES) from 4th of April 2013.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	NA
104	Denmark	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVb (Off Horn Reef, FU 33)(nep-33) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Data were uploaded before the deadline, but due to an error in InterCatch data were not imported into InterCatch, see mail from Henrik Kjems-Nielsen (ICES) from 4th of April 2013.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	NA
105	Denmark	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IIIa (Skagerak Kattegat, FU 3,4)(nep-3-4) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Data were uploaded before the deadline, but due to an error in InterCatch data were not imported into InterCatch, see mail from Henrik Kjems-Nielsen (ICES) from 4th of April 2013.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	NA

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
106	Denmark	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVbc (Botney Gut - Silver Pit, FU 5)(nep-5) WGNSSK	Missing data: Landings data Delay: after deadline	Data were uploaded before the deadline, but due to an error in InterCatch data were not imported into InterCatch, see mail from Henrik Kjems-Nielsen (ICES) from 4th of April 2013.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	NA
107	Denmark	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVa (Fladen Ground, FU 7)(nep-7) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Data were uploaded before the deadline, but due to an error in InterCatch data were not imported into InterCatch, see mail from Henrik Kjems-Nielsen (ICES) from 4th of April 2013.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	NA
304	Denmark	ICES	Ecoregion: Widely distributed stocks Stock: (hom-west)Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb, VIa, VIIa-c, e-k, and Subarea VIII (Western stock) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom-west.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom-west.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission - Transmission of discard data Description: Discards are included in the assessment. However, not all countries provide data on discards; consequently, there is no estimate of the total amount of discards in the horse mackerel fisheries.	Denmark is having derogation for discard sampling in the Danish horse-mackerel fishery.	Derogation checked. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
317	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Ecoregion: North Sea Stock: (sol-kask)Sole in Division IIIa and Subdivisions 22–24 (Skagerrak, Kattegat, and the Belts) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sol-kask.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sol-kask.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Sampling of landings is complicated by the low total landings which are dispersed spatially. Comments: The problems of sampling intensity are due to the low landings.	The sole landings in Kattegat and Skagerrak was in 2012 150 t. and 134 t., respectively. This is a very low level of total landings and it is extremely difficult to get a good spatial and temporal coverage with so few landing events. We have increased the sampling program to also include the sole above minimum landing size on the observer trips to try to optimize the numbers of sampling events of sole.	In theory the MS has not responded according to the data call.	Unsatisfactory
318	Denmark	ICES	Ecoregion: North Sea Stock: (spr-kask)Sprat in Division IIIa (Skagerrak – Kattegat) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/spr-kask_201303102249.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/spr-kask_201303102249.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Even though the sampling intensity conforms to the DCF regulation, it does not provide a good enough representation of the fishery catches for use in an analytical assessment. Sampling intensity of commercial catches should be increased.	To increase sampling event and the quality of the sprat samples we have initiated a self-sampling program for sprat. This have given better data (we have now positions by haul) and increased the number of samples. Denmark still has samples from the control to ensure that the samples collected by the industry is not different from the samples taken by the control agency.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to responde according to the data call.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
372	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (cod-2532)Cod in Subdivisions 25–32 (Eastern Baltic Sea) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-2532_201304112231.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-2532_201304112231.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Ageing inconsistencies Description: Ageing problems are a concern for the quality of the assessment.	Denmark has started a quality program for East Baltic cod where we are reading the same otolith across many countries. Denmark will in WebGr highlight the age rings read and try to focus on the differences between countries. If the discrepancy between MS are within the first rings the true age can be verified by reading day rings. If the discrepancy are in the older age ring structure it is more difficult to set a true age. However, the work is ongoing.	Attempts of DK to reach consistency in age determination of eastern Baltic cod are acknowledged and should be continued.	Satisfactory
373	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (fle-2232)Flounder in Subdivisions 22–32 (Baltic Sea) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/fle-2232_201304122320.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/fle-2232_201304122320.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve discards sampling Description: The uncertainty of the discard estimates is of concern. Discarding practices are controlled by factors such as market price and cod catches. Given the high variability in the discard ratios, estimating discards is very uncertain without an extensive sampling programme	Denmark has very extensive discard sampling program in the Baltic Sea and data has been delivered on an annually basis. The discard sampling program is for the same métier as for the Baltic cod where the data is used in the assessment. The challenge with the flounder discard data is not within the sampling program but due to the fact that data cannot be raised in InterCatch if no landings are applied. Therefore if a country has discard for a given species but no landings (and this is the case for some flounder stocks in the Baltic) then the data cannot be raised in InterCatch.	Discard sampling by DK is not the problem, but raising procedures at ICES.	Satisfactory



Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
4	Estonia	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Some information was provided in the previous data calls, but not in 2013. Most of the aquaculture sector is represented by fresh water aquaculture. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Although the data were collected, Estonia did not submit aquaculture data in 2013 due to disagreement between the coordinating institution and institution engaged in economic data collection. The latter was not satisfied with the conditions of the new contract. In terms of production Estonia produces a small amount of freshwater aquaculture (rainbow trout predominantly). Eel and salmon are reared mainly for restocking by some fish farms and these data can not be presented in accordance with the requirement of confidentiality.	Acceptable, as no mandatory data collection except for eel and salmon is affected. And for those issues of confidentiality arises.	Satisfactory
22	Estonia	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	No economic data provided for 2011 (national and fleet segment levels), apart from landings income. Significant amount of missing data at fleet segment level. Employment data not submitted for 2011. Energy consumption data not submitted for 2011. Fishing enterprises not submitted for 2012. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Although the data were collected, Estonia did not submit economic data for 2011 due to disagreement between the coordinating institution and institution engaged in economic data collection. The latter was not satisfied with the conditions of the new contract. Today, the situation has been resolved and missing data was provided this year.	Insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
42	Estonia	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	Table A, catch: discards provided for flounder only (landings of cod over three times greater than flounder in 2012). Table A, catch: dome mesh sizes are inconsistent with the data call. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Discarding is not allowed in Estonian waters except discarding of live fish. The flounder was discarded mainly from pots where flounder survival is very high. The total reported discard of flounder was 2.34 tons. Cod is taken by trawls where survival is low. Estonian fishermen are obliged to record the mesh size in coastal fisheries by following ranges: up to 48, 48-72, 73-120 and over 120. Therefore, we do not have sufficient information in accordance with the mesh size ranges of the data call. During the same fishing trip the fishermen collect catch from different mesh sizes and it is impossible to record the weight of the catch at sea. The weight of the catch is recorded at port but then the catch from different mesh sizes is already mixed. The mesh-size ranges that we used are based on best knowledge from the ranges that are used for specific species in Estonian waters. We are exploring the possible options for being able to record the catch by mesh size before the catch gets mixed. It would be interesting to know how other MS-s deal with this problem. We don't have this issue with trawlers. The cod Inter-catch database is updated currently in 2014. Age and size data are added for 2008, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013; data from Estonian ships, SD 24, 25, 26.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
58	Estonia	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: "extraordinary costs, net" (all years). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	The data is collected from financial statements. In the absence of extraordinary costs and extraordinary income the value is equal to zero.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
108	Estonia	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 24 and 25(fle-2425) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards	Discarding is not allowed in the Estonian waters. There have been no biological flounder analysis from SD 24 and 25.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
109	Estonia	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 26 and 28(fle-2628) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Discards data Age or length data for discards	In Estonia (SD28) discard is not allowed; bycatch can be up to 10 % of the total weight of the catch. From SD 26 there have been no biological analysis and measurements of flounder. Estonian flounder catch in SD 26 is small.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
110	Estonia	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder demersal in Subdivisions 27 and 29-32(fle-2732) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Discards data Age or length data for discards	In Estonia (SD28, 29, 32) discard is not allowed; bycatch can be up to 10 % of the total weight of the catch.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
387	Estonia	NAFO	Biological information (Sex, Length, Age)	Missing data for: 3O Redfish, 3LNO Yellowtail Flounder, SA 2+3 Rough head grenadier	<p>3O RED: The fishing effort was very low in 2012 (only one fishing trip targeting finfish) and the observer concentrated on GHF and COD samples, so only 245 specimens of RED were sampled. The data was presented in Estonian Research Report for 2012. See: <a href="http://archive.nafo.int/open/sc/2013/scs13-15.pdf">http://archive.nafo.int/open/sc/2013/scs13-15.pdf</a></p> <p>3LNO YEL: This species is not in Estonian DCF.</p> <p>SA2+3 RHG: This species is not in Estonian DCF.</p> <p>All sampling programs were revised in 2013 and adjustments made so that in 2013 there were 3O RED, 3N YEL and SA2+3 RHG also sampled.</p>	In NAFO Div. 3O, Estonia only employed minor fishing effort on finfish in the 3LMNO areas and had redfish landings of 181t (of 6400t in total, cf. NAFO SC report 2013). Nevertheless, NAFO SC should be asked if redfish biological data from Estonia are relevant for the assessment.	Unsatisfactory
317	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	<p>Ecoregion: North Sea</p> <p>Stock: (sol-kask)Sole in Division IIIa and Subdivisions 22–24 (Skagerrak, Kattegat, and the Belts)</p> <p>Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sol-kask.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sol-kask.pdf</a></p>	<p>Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity</p> <p>Description: Sampling of landings is complicated by the low total landings which are dispersed spatially.</p> <p>Comments: The problems of sampling intensity are due to the low landings.</p>	Estonia has no such quota in the area.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
372	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	<p>Ecoregion: Baltic Sea</p> <p>Stock: (cod-2532)Cod in Subdivisions 25–32 (Eastern Baltic Sea)</p> <p>Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-2532_201304112231.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-2532_201304112231.pdf</a></p>	<p>Type of issue: Data quality - Ageing inconsistencies</p> <p>Description: Ageing problems are a concern for the quality of the assessment.</p>	In Estonian waters the cod is caught only as bycatch because of low abundance currently. In 2013, the age reading of the cod otoliths was started from SD 24, 25, and 26, which were collected from Estonian ships from 2008 to 2013. The relative importance of confused otoliths is relatively high. Therefore ageing methods need to improve. However, true age of natural fish is unknown and mistakes of age reading cannot be directly estimated. Indirect methods are affected by many factors. Therefore the problems in age reading cannot be solved conclusively.	In general, MSs should always be involved in age reading comparisons (otolith exchanges and workshops) to ensure international consistency in age determination.	Satisfactory
373	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	<p>Ecoregion: Baltic Sea</p> <p>Stock: (fle-2232)Flounder in Subdivisions 22–32 (Baltic Sea)</p> <p>Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/fle-2232_2013041122320.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/fle-2232_2013041122320.pdf</a></p>	<p>Type of issue: Data quality - Improve discards sampling</p> <p>Description: The uncertainty of the discard estimates is of concern. Discarding practices are controlled by factors such as market price and cod catches. Given the high variability in the discard ratios, estimating discards is very uncertain without an extensive sampling programme</p>	In Estonian waters discard is not allowed; bycatch can be up to 10 % of the weight of the catch.	MS response is justified (discards are not allowed according to MS legislation)	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
5	Finland	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	No major deviations from the data call. The only minor deviation is missing Net investment by segment for 2008. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	When the data for 2008 was originally calculated according to the DCR, there was no obligation for segmentation by fishing technique and species. Thus the net investments were estimated for the total population only.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
23	Finland	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Capacity data for 2013 not submitted. Some minor missing data at the fleet segment level. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	In the Fleet data call, in the fleet segment AREA27 PG, VL1012, the capacity was under-reported by 2 vessels. The total number of vessels is actually 53 and not 51. The corrected data is presented in this Workbook in the sheets CAPACITY_TOT, CAPACITY, and CAPACITY_REGION.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
43	Finland	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	Data submitted in format inconsistent with the definitions of the data call on the grounds of the data confidentiality clause in the DCF. No mesh size information for any gear. For vessels over 10 m in length a specific vessel length category was not defined. Missing quarter information for vessels over 10 m in length. Data for areas 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 aggregated into a single category "24-28". Table C, effort by rectangle: contains no information on rectangles. Table D, Capacity: No data on fishing activity (days) for 2003-2011, (fishing activity (days) for 2003-2012 was requested for the first time in 2013). Table E, landings by rectangle: contains entries for invalid area "24-28" and these entries have no rectangle information. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	For some species, e.g. for cod, the Finnish fishery is carried out by a very limited number of vessels. In many cases there are only one or few vessels operating in some of the given combinations of subdivisions, gear and quarter. According to EC 199/2008, Article 20 (4), Member States may refuse to transmit relevant data "(a) if there is a risk of natural persons and/or entities being identified, in which case the Member State may propose alternative means to meet the needs of end-user which ensure anonymity." To protect anonymity, we were obliged to aggregate the data to higher level than defined in the data call.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
59	Finland	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: subsidies (2010 and 2011). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	According to 2010/93/EU, the subsidies should include only direct payments and exclude indirect subsidies. The processing companies have received investment subsidies in 2010 and 2011. However, to our knowledge the investment subsidies are regarded as indirect subsidies and thus they should not be reported under the subsidies, but rather under the other income.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
112	Finland	ICES	Data call under InterCatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 26 and 28(fle-2628) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards	According to 2010/93/EU and the RCM Baltic, Finland is not required to sample flounder catches for lengths and ages, and therefore it has not been included in the Finnish NP. There were no discards in flounder stock fle-2628 from the Finnish fishery, which information was already reported to the WKBALFLAT within the InterCatch data call.	MS landings in 2010-2012 have only been 0-10 t per year (WGBFAS 2013).	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
113	Finland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder demersal in Subdivisions 27 and 29-32(fle-2732) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	According to 2010/93/EU and the RCM Baltic, Finland is not required to sample flounder catches for lengths and ages, and therefore it has not been included in the Finnish NP. However, the amount of discarded flounder in the stock fle-2732 from the Finnish fisheries (18 kg) has been reported to the WKBALFLAT within the InterCatch data call.	MS landings in 2010-2012 have only been 4-7 t per year (WGBFAS 2013).	Satisfactory
372	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (cod-2532)Cod in Subdivisions 25–32 (Eastern Baltic Sea) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-2532_201304112231.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-2532_201304112231.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Ageing inconsistencies Description: Ageing problems are a concern for the quality of the assessment.	According to 2010/93/EU and the RCM Baltic, Finland is not required to sample cod catches for lengths and ages and therefore cod has not been included in the Finnish NP.	MS has a derogation for Baltic cod sampling.	Satisfactory
373	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (fle-2232)Flounder in Subdivisions 22–32 (Baltic Sea) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/fle-2232_201304122320.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/fle-2232_201304122320.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve discards sampling Description: The uncertainty of the discard estimates is of concern. Discarding practices are controlled by factors such as market price and cod catches. Given the high variability in the discard ratios, estimating discards is very uncertain without an extensive sampling programme	In 2013, the share of Finnish flounder catches were 0.16 % in the stock fle-2628 and 2.14 % in the stock fle-2732. The same year, the share of Finnish cod catches were 0.39 % in the stock cod-2224 and 1.27 % in the stock cod-2532. Therefore, based on the Commission decision 2010/93/EU, Finland is not required to sample neither flounder nor cod catches (landings and discards) and therefore they have not been included in the Finnish NP. There were no discards reported in the flounder stock fle-2628 in the Finnish fisheries and the amount of discarded flounder in the stock fle-2732 (18 kg) has been reported to the WKBALFLAT within the InterCatch data call.	MS has a derogation for flounder sampling.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
6	France	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Most of the economic variables for 2008-2009 (subsidies, other income, all costs items, debt, capital value and raw material) were missing. The full set of economic variables for France is available only for 2010-2011; however the national totals were not estimated, as not all aquaculture segments are fully covered by data collected. The missing segments represented 6-7% of overall turnover. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	It was mentioned in the NP that economic data in aquaculture have been collected from 2010 onwards. Data were provided for all segments except a few ones with a very small number of enterprises where it was not possible to produce reliable indicators.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
24	France	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Capital & Investment data missing for 2008 and 2009. Significant amount of data missing for 2008 and 2009 (e.g. estimated fleet depreciated replacement value) at the national and fleet segment level. Effort and Landings data not submitted for 2012. Most effort data not provided for 2008 and 2009; only energy consumption submitted for 2008. Limited data provided for fleet segments operating in OFR (Other fishing regions) and to a lesser extent Area 37. Capacity data not provided for 2012 and 2013 (national total and fleet segment levels). DCF Capacity data under-reported compared to fleet register. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	There were methodological difficulties to calculate capital variables. France has started implementing the PIM methodology in 2013 in order to provide 2012 data. Quality improvement is still needed and it is foreseen to apply the method retroactively for 2011. Landing and effort data for 2012 could not be provided at the time of the data call. They could be available later in the year, given that the DCF segmentation of the fleet, as mentioned in the NP, could be produced only in October. This is the same as regards capacity data per segments. OFR covers very different regions and fleets, it is very difficult to collect data on small-scale fleets, it is possible only in some of the regions and in general these data are made available later in the year.	Justification for 2012 and 2013 data acceptable (provision of those data not mandatory). Aside from those data, insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
44	France	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	No landings by rectangle data for 2003-2010. Table A, catch: no age information for 2009-2012. Table A catch: No discard data for 2003-2009 or 2012. Table A catch: no split of special condition CPart13 into CPart13a-d for 2009-2011. Table B, nominal effort: no fishing activity data for 2000-2009. Table B, nominal effort: no fishing capacity data for 2000-2011. Table C, effort by rectangle and Table E, landings by rectangle: records with missing rectangle information in years for which data is supplied. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>		No explanation for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
60	France	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Data on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity has been provided for years 2009 and 2010 (requested but not mandatory), but not for 2008 and 2011 (mandatory). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>		No explanation for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
77	France	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	No effort data from GSA 7 and 8 (Table D). No fisheries data from GSA 8 (Tables A,B,C,D). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>		MS should give an answer in relation to the missing data (effort data from GSA 7 and 8 and surveys data for GSA 8).	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
114	France	ICES	Data call under Inter catch for: Anglerfish ( <i>Lophius piscatorius</i> and <i>L. budegassa</i> ) in Division IIIa and Subareas IV and VI(ang-ivvi) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Early 2013, IFREMER has initiated a new procedure in order to better respond to data calls and deliver data to end-users. Part of this procedure was the appointment of a dedicated engineer, the creation of an expert network and the development of writing protocols for each of the calls to ensure quality and repeatability. The number of data calls IFREMER must deal with, associated with the organisation of this new procedure caused some delays but the essential objective was to deliver data in time for the expert working groups. It must be noticed that the new procedure improved in 2014 with all data delivered to all end-users but with still some delays. It is clearly an objective for the future to deliver all data to all end-users in full respect of the deadlines.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
115	France	ICES	Data call under Inter catch for: Cod in Divisions VIIe-k (Celtic Sea cod)(cod-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline.	Satisfactory
116	France	ICES	Data call under Inter catch for: Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(cod-scow) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	France had only 4 tonnes of cod caught in VIa (2% of the total catch in 2012, source cod VIa ICES advice). It is impossible to design a sampling plan to get any commercial information on such a scarce fishery.	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory
117	France	ICES	Data call under Inter catch for: Haddock in Divisions VIIb,c,e-k(had-7b-k) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	This stock was eventually uploaded in InterCatch after some issues had to be resolved  As regards length and age data, these were all provided to the group, as mentioned in the ICES WGCSE 2013 report, section haddock VIIb-k. Section 7.4.8 Landings : " <i>Sampling levels of the landed catch for recent years are considered to be sufficient to support current assessment approaches</i> " Section 7.4.8 Discards : " <i>French discard data exist from 2004 onwards[...]. These proportions were estimated from the available discard and retained catch data provided by France.</i> " On April 30 2013, all files were available for the group and InterCatch	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory
118	France	ICES	Data call under Inter catch for: Haddock in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(had-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory
119	France	ICES	Data call under Inter catch for: Haddock in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(had-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory
120	France	ICES	Data call under Inter catch for: Plaice in Division VIIb,c (West of Ireland)(ple-7b-c) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
121	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Divisions VIIh-k (Southwest of Ireland)(ple-7h-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory
122	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Divisions VIIf,g (Celtic Sea)(ple-celt) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch. France does not sample this stock for age because of the low landings (125 tonnes). This has always been the case, without too much prejudice for the assessment as proves excerpts from ICES WGCSE 2013 report, section Plaice VIIfg. Section 7.10.8 Landings : <i>"Sampling levels of the landed catch for recent years are considered to be sufficient to support current assessment approaches"</i> Section 7.10.8 Discards : <i>"Estimates of discarding are now included in the assessment. [...]. From 2003 onwards, discard sampling for Ireland, Belgium, France and the UK(E&amp;W) has been improved under the Data Collection Regulation. Nevertheless, only discard data from the UK, Ireland and Belgium was available in a suitable format required to raise the data to international level.."</i> Since France provides a length structure of the discards, it is easy for the group to apply any Age Length Key to produce an age structure. It is to be noticed that this is not possible to do in Intercatch, but would be possible in an international database. For the delay, see response cell F7	If the landings are more than 5% of the TAC and if data are not to be sampled, an approved derogation has to be presented. Otherwise data should be sampled and submitted. It is not up to the stock assessor to decide if data should be uploaded to InterCatch or not. In all cases upload to InterCatch has a documentary reason even in cases where the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In such case the deadlines are less crucial but data has to be uploaded within a reasonable time frame.	Unsatisfactory
123	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIe (Western Channel)(ple-echw) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline	This is partly correct France does not sample this stock for age because of the low and scattered landings (225 tonnes in 2012). This has always been the case, although this is a potential source of bias for the assessment as proves excerpts from ICES WGCSE 2013 report, section Plaice VIIe. Section 8.2.7 : <i>"There is a heavy reliance on the age composition data derived from UK(E&amp;W) sample data. Around 30% of the landings for this stock are taken by countries that do not provide age-based data and this situation is improved only slightly once the migration correction data from VIId is added"</i>  France provides a length structure of the discards, it is easy for the group to apply any Age Length Key to produce an age structure. It is to be noticed that this is not possible to do in Intercatch, but would be possible in an international database.  for the delay, see response cell F7	In general MS should apply for derogation if there are a good reason for not sampling according to DCF rules.	NA
124	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(ple-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
125	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIb, c (West of Ireland)(sol-7b-c) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory
126	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Divisions VIIh-k (Southwest of Ireland)(sol-7h-k) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline	As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.  France does not sample this stock for age because of the low landings (85 tonnes). This has always been the case, without too much prejudice for the assessment as proves excerpts from ICES WGCSE 2013 report, section Sole VIIh-k : "Sampling appears to be sufficient to establish landings numbers-at-age."  for the deadline, see response cell F7	It is not up to the stock assessor to decide if data should be uploaded to InterCatch or not. In all cases upload to InterCatch has a documentary reason even in cases where the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In such case the the deadlines are less crucial but data has to uplade within a reasonable time frame.	Unsatisfactory
127	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Divisions VIIf, g (Celtic Sea)(sol-celt) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline	As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.  France does not sample this stock for age because of the very low landings (48 tonnes, 5% of the total). This has always been the case, without prejudice for the assessment as proves excerpts from ICES WGCSE 2013 report, section Sole VIIfg : " <i>The major fleets fishing for VIIfg sole are sampled (approximately 95% of the total landings). Sampling is considered to be at a reasonable level (Table 2.1).</i> "  for the deadline, see response cell F7	It is not up to the stock assessor to decide if data should be uploaded to InterCatch or not. In all cases upload to InterCatch has a documentary reason even in cases where the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In such case the the deadlines are less crucial but data has to uplade within a reasonable time frame.	Unsatisfactory
128	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIe (Western Channel)(sol-echw) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory
129	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(sol-iris) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline	As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.  France does not sample this stock for age because there is no catch (<1 tonne in 2012).  for the deadline, see response cell F7	It is not up to the stock assessor to decide if data should be uploaded to InterCatch or not. In all cases upload to InterCatch has a documentary reason even in cases where the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In such case the the deadlines are less crucial but data has to uplade within a reasonable time frame.	Unsatisfactory



Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
130	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIe-k (whg-7e-k) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline	This stock was eventually uploaded in InterCatch after some issues had to be resolved As regards length and age data, these were all provided to the group, as mentioned in the ICES WGCSE 2013 report, section haddock VIIb-k. Section 7.15.7 Landings : "Sampling levels of the landed catch for recent years are considered to be sufficient to support current assessment approaches." Section 7.15.2 Discards : "Discard data are available from the Irish fishery since 1994 (ICES: SGDBI, 2002), from French sampling in 1991, 1997, and 2005–2012, and for the UK (E&W) fisheries from 2001–2012." On May 3 2013, all files were available for the group and InterCatch:	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory
131	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(whg-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	satisfactory
132	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(whg-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory
133	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Grey gurnard in Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa-c and e-k (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(gug-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory
134	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(pol-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory
135	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Subarea IV (North Sea), Division VIId (Eastern Channel) and IIIa West (Skagerrak)(cod-347d) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory
136	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Subarea IV (North Sea) and Division IIIa West (Skagerrak)(had-34) WGNSSK	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	France catches are 175 tonnes in 2012 (source ICES advice) or 0.5% of the total catches of this stock. No age or length data is provided or needed by the group.  As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.	MS to provide data according to the data call not to the stock coordinator. Data may be requested for documentation. In order to get agreement for not sampling this stock MS should apply for a derogation in the future	unsatisfactory
137	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(ple-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory
138	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice Subarea IV (North Sea)(ple-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
139	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Saithe in Subarea IV (North Sea) Division IIIa West (Skagerrak) and Subarea VI (West of Scotland and Rockall)(sai-3a46) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory
140	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIII (Eastern Channel)(sol-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory
141	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)(sol-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory
142	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting Subarea IV (North Sea) & Division VIII (Eastern Channel)(whg-47d) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory
259	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIg (Celtic Sea, the Smalls, FU 22)(nep-22) WGCSE	Missing data: Landings data Delay: after deadline after EG	Data was reported to WGCSE and stock assessor on April 30 2014  As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.	It is not up to the stock assessor to decide if data should be uploaded to InterCatch or not. In all cases upload to InterCatch has a documentary reason even in cases where the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In such case the the deadlines are less crucial but data has to uploade within a reasonable time frame.	Unsatisfactory
278	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Megrim (Lepidorhombus spp) in Divisions IVa and VIa(meg-4a6a) WGCSE	Missing data: Landings data Discards data Delay: after deadline after EG	France catches in VIa in 2012 is 140 tonnes et 4 tonnes in IVa. This is too small catches to design a specific sampling plan in order to provide robust estimates.  As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.	It is not up to the stock assessor to decide if data should be uploaded to InterCatch or not. In all cases upload to InterCatch has a documentary reason even in cases where the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In such case the the deadlines are less crucial but data has to uploade within a reasonable time frame.	Unsatisfactory
283	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIa,g,j (South East and West of IRL, FU 19)(nep-19) WGCSE	Missing data: Landings data Delay: after deadline after EG	France has caught 11 tonnes of Nephrops in 2012. There is nothing else than the official landings data to provide to the group.  As regards InterCatch, in 2013, France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.	It is not up to the stock assessor to decide if data should be uploaded to InterCatch or not. In all cases upload to InterCatch has a documentary reason even in cases where the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In such case the the deadlines are less crucial but data has to uploade within a reasonable time frame.	Unsatisfactory
284	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in the FU 20 (Labadie, Baltimore and Galley), FU 21 (Jones and Cockburn)(nep-2021) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	idem response detailed cell F7	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call. In general MS should respect the Data call deadline	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
299	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions VIIIa,b,d (Northern stock)(hke-nrtn) WKSOUTH	Missing data: Landings data Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline after EG	It is true that France could not provide the benchmark information in time. This is due to several difficulties related to the earlier part of the time series. It was extremely difficult and time consuming to resolve these issues but eventually it was solved. We believe that the difficulties encountered at the end of 2013 and early 2014 were exceptional and will not repeat.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
300	France	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: European seabass in Divisions IVbc,VIIa and VIId-h (Irish Sea, English Channel and southern North Sea)(bss-47) WGCSE	Missing data: Landings data Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline after EG	France did not upload all the stocks in InterCatch in 2013, only those requested by the stock assessor. This is not a will of not uploading data, as a proof, in 2014 all stocks were uploaded in InterCatch.  Concerning this seabass stock, all data were provided to the group in time for conducting the assessment.	It is not up to the stock assessor to decide if data should be uploaded to InterCatch or not. In all cases upload to InterCatch has a documentary reason even in cases where the stoc coordinator isn't using InterCatch for compiling. In such case the the deadlines are less crucial but data has to uploade within a reasonable time frame.	Satisfactory
303	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Widely distributed stocks Stock: (hom-west)Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb, VIa, VIIa-c, e-k, and Subarea VIII (Western stock) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom-west.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom-west.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission - Transmission of discard data Description: Discards are included in the assessment. However, not all countries provide data on discards; consequently, there is no estimate of the total amount of discards in the horse mackerel fisheries.	the vas majority of the horse mackerel catches is taken by industrial vessels landing in the Netherlands. The sampling of this fishery is covered by a bilateral agreement with the Netherlands.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
323	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ang-78ab)Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b,d Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ang-78ab.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ang-78ab.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards Description: The increase in discarding in recent years has resulted in uncertainties in recent catch values.  Reliable estimates of discards are not available. The increase in discarding may be related to larger year classes recruiting in the fishery. Information from research surveys indicates an increase in smaller fish on the fishing grounds in recent years. Discarding is also known to be partly dependent on market conditions and quota restrictions. Efforts should be made to obtain reliable estimates of total catches in order to improve the assessment.	The stock was benchmarked in 2012 (ICES WKFLAT) and no assessment method was found acceptable. After an extensive analysis of discard data by WKFLAT 2012, discard estimates were considered not to be precise enough to be used in the assessment. WGHMM 2013 recommended improvement in the field of surveys tracking recent good recruitment and ageing validation (see cell below) and did not mention the need for discards. Discard estimates is a sensitive exercise which needs to be guided and validated in a benchmark forum. The effort to obtain reliable estimates of total catches should be stirred by the WG in conjunction with all the main countries participating to the fishery. This could be also a discussion to be held in the RCM NA 2014.	MS is obliged to deliver dat according to the DCF until a derogation is approved.	Unsatisfactory
326	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ang-78ab)Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b,d Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ang-78ab.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ang-78ab.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Improved sampling of length composition and accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment. An ageing exchange study for L. piscatorius took place in 2011 to compare the different approaches that are used (otoliths and illicia).  Improved sampling of length composition and accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment.	France participated to the otolith and illicia exchange. The length distribution of anglerfish is correctly estimated and all information provided to the group. Growth parameter is an issue which could be tackled in the RCM NA 2014 in order to propose a common international approach in 2015	MS is obliged to deliver dat according to the DCF until a derogation is approved.	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
330	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (cod-scow)Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-scow.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-scow.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Discard information is imprecise compared to landings data because of lower sampling coverage. Because catch is now dominated by discards it is very important to maintain the highest possible sampling (observer) coverage of vessels in Division VIa. Comments: Note that discards are available from Scottish and Irish trawlers are used in the assessment.	France reached a coverage of 10% of trips in 2012 (21 trips sampled out of 212 in total, see table III.C.3 or the Annual Report 2013). Although France is catching less than 10% of the total catch, the discard rates could be investigated and the information brought to WGCSE 2015.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
333	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (gug-celt)Grey gurnard in Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa-c and e-k (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/gug-celt.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/gug-celt.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Quality of landings data Description: Because the species is largely discarded, landings data do not reflect the actual catches. Comments: The landings values of the MS listed are very low	In the advice it is also stated : The EVHOE-WIBTS-Q4 survey could be used as an indicator of abundance of grey gurnard in Divisions VIIf,g,h,j. The availability of the time series of abundance from the Spanish, UK, Russian, and Irish surveys should provide indications of trend in the northern and central parts of the ecoregion (Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa and VIIb,c)	The MS is nor obliged to submit the data according to the DCF. Nevertheless, it is good practice to provide additional data if collected and needed.	Satisfactory
338	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (had-7b-k)Haddock in Divisions VIIb-k Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/had-7b-k.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/had-7b-k.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: There is considerable uncertainty around the estimated discard numbers-at-age due to the diverse fishing (and discarding) practices and relatively low numbers of discard samples. Improving discard estimates would require a significant increase in the number of observer trips or other monitoring means.	To be discussed in RCM NA 2014	ok	Satisfactory
341	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (mgw-78)Megrim (Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis) in Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b,d Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/mgw-78.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/mgw-78.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission - Lack of discard data Description: An important contributor to the megrim catches, France, has not provided discard estimates in the last decade.	we take note of this recommandation and will program to provide an estimates of discards for the next assessment	MS has not fulfilled the obligations in the DCF.	Unsatisfactory
348	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (nep-2021)Nephrops in FU 20 (Labadie, Baltimore, and Galley) and FU 21 (Jones and Cockburn) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/Nep-VII-FU%2020%20and%2021.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/Nep-VII-FU%2020%20and%2021.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards sampling intensity Description: Discards of Nephrops are thought to be extensive, but observations are insufficient to provide a reliable time-series. The data from sampling programmes in France and Ireland are patchy, leading to some uncertainty in the estimation of mean weight in the landings and discard rates.	The sampling is done, how to improve the estimates is something to consider and discuss in the next RCM NA. There is no easy answer to this comment.F53	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
352	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ple-echw)Plaice in Division VIIe (Western Channel) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-echw.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-echw.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission - Age composition Description: This assessment would benefit from the addition of age composition information from both the French and Belgian fleets who collectively account for 30% of the total landings for this stock.	We have tried to collect data for ages for plaice VIIe following a former recommendation by the group but never succeeded in doing so, because of the scatter landings of this species in the western channel harbour.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
354	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ple-7h-k)Plaice in Divisions VIIh-k (Southwest of Ireland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-7h-k.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-7h-k.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Age composition of younger individuals Description: The assessment is only based on age 4 and older; ICES does not have information on younger ages.	France caught only 62 tonnes in 2012, no data collection for ages can be put in place for such a low volume of catches.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
357	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ple-7b-c)Plaice in Divisions VIIb,c (West of Ireland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-7b-c.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-7b-c.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. Comments: This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 29 tonnes.		In general, MS should provide an answer to requests concerning deficiencies in DCF data.	NA
361	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (pol-celt)Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/pol-celt.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/pol-celt.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Biological data and landings figures Description: Some length frequency data are available for recent years, but area-specific data on life history parameters are missing and should be collected in surveys and through market sampling. Data on growth and maturity, as well as more information from the fisheries, are needed. Landings figures are incomplete and erratic and further scrutiny of this information is required. More information is needed on: stock identity of pollack within the ICES area; details of the fisheries (more spatial detail in landings data – especially for the earlier years in the time-series, landings by gear, length compositions, discards); life history/biological parameters (surveys and commercial sampling); and recreational fisheries (catch and effort statistics).	France is the coordinator and assessor of this stock and has set up a PhD on this specific issue. The PhD will start in October 2014 and will work on every aspects related to the pollock assessment issues.	In general, it is not sufficient only to established long term solutions when immediate action is required.	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
363	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (sol-7b-c) Sole in Divisions VIIb,c (West of Ireland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sol-7b-c.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sol-7b-c.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. Comments: This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 44 tonnes.	Same comment as for Plaice VIIbc	MS should provide an answer to the request of data and the missing data submission	Satisfactory
366	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (whg-7e-k) Whiting in Divisions VIIe-k Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2012/2012/whg-7e-k.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2012/2012/whg-7e-k.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission - Lack of French lpue Description: The main quality consideration is [...], the lack of update of the French commercial lpue series since 2009 is an additional uncertainty.	There is an issue of representativity of the LPUE series as regards the abundance of the population due to a change of behaviour of the fisheries and an issue of historical consistency. These issues are under investigation and all effort is made to propose an LPUE series in the future.	Despite questionable issues about data quality, data should be provided unless a derogation is approved.	Unsatisfactory
367	France	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (whg-7e-k) Whiting in Divisions VIIe-k Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2012/2012/whg-7e-k.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2012/2012/whg-7e-k.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission - Discards data Description: There is a need for all countries to provide discard estimates of whiting raised to fleet level for inclusion in future assessments after a benchmark procedure. Comments: French landings are 19% of the total landings	Discards estimates are provided to the group ( <i>'Discard data are available from [...] French sampling in 1991, 1997, and 2005-2012'</i> , ICES WGCSE 2013)	ICES WG should confirm if the data have been received and the time of transmission	NA
380	France	ICCAT	Task 2	Missing data for: ALB-AN, ALB-MED, BET-AT and SKJ-AE	TaskII for tropical tuna fisheries has been communicated in time to Iccat secretary and include all ALB, BET and SKJ catches for this fishery.	ICCAT should confirm if the data have been received and the time of transmission	NA
390	France	IOTC	Artisanal and long line fleet	No length frequency for sharks and only partial for nominal catches and effort. No length frequencies of relevant species		It seems that MS should be in position to provide more completed data.	unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
391	France	IOTC	Purse seiners	Partial information on sharks catches and no info on effort and length frequency for sharks	Tropical Purse Seine Tuna fishery does not target sharks and does not land this group of species. The only information available on sharks bycatch and discards are issued from observers programmes which have presently low coverage (around 10%). Statistical studies conducted in 2012 (Amande et al, 2012, ICES Journal of Marine Science) showed that this coverage does not permit to estimate neither total catch nor length structure at the fisheries level with sufficient precision. This is the reason why global estimates of sharks discarded has been presented and discussed in different papers relative to IOTC based on observer programmes but no formal data transmission of estimates has been done to IOTC secretary. However, it is worth underlining that France does submit to IOTC secretariat all detailed information (trip by trip) of observer programme as asked in resolution 11/04 on regional observer programme. Furthermore In order to progress on this subject, we will submit formally in 2014 a synthesis of raw observations on sharks catches and size frequencies made by observers but without any elevation at the fishery's level.	It seems that MS should be in position to provide more completed data.	unsatisfactory
407	France	GFCM	Task 1 3 Economic component variables	Mostly completed (75%)		In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	Satisfactory
415	France	GFCM	Task 1 4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycatch	Scarcely completed (25%)	The main catches were provided for GSA07 and GSA08 as required. 25% must refer the fact that no discards, effort or bycatch were provided.	In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	Satisfactory
425	France	GFCM	Task 1 5 Provisional biological parameters	No data provided	This type of data is not used in any assessment WG. The development of a Task 2 for structuring this biological information is currently ongoing	Requested biological data are collected under the Modules III.C and III.E of the current DCF. MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
7	Germany	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Germany provided full set of data required under DCF. The data covers only marine aquaculture segments. Due to confidentiality reasons, no data have been provided for oyster aquaculture, so the national totals correspond only to mussel production in marine waters. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Germany can only confirm that we have fulfilled our commitments under the DCF concerning the Aquaculture Sector and appreciate that this has been stated by the evaluator.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
25	Germany	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Only capacity data provided for the pelagic fleet over 40 meters (TM VL40XX). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	As in previous years and as indicated in the NP, Germany has collected the data on the pelagic fleet but cannot publish them for confidentiality reasons as all vessels belong to one owner.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
45	Germany	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	No mesh size or discards data for vessels <8m in length. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	No detailed logbook information is available for vessels under 10m in the North Sea and under 8m in the Baltic. According to the legislation, vessel owners only have to fill out monthly landings declarations. Information on mesh sizes used are therefore not available. Germany has no specific sampling program for vessels under 10m or under 8m, respectively. This is in accordance with principles of the DCF, as landings of these vessels are overall very small.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
61	Germany	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity has been provided for one of the two mandatory years (i.e. 2008). However, these data were provided for years 2009 (requested but not mandatory) and 2011 (mandatory). Values equal to zero: "imputed value of unpaid labour" (all years); "extraordinary costs, net" (2008, 2009 and 2011). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As Germany reports, in particular cost data, only for enterprises with <math>\geq 20</math> employees, there is no unpaid labour. Work of owners is paid by profit. Extraordinary costs have not been reported by the enterprises.</li> <li>The delay in receiving the data was described and accepted in the German Annual Report 2010, section IV.B.1: "Germany planned to use the register of EU veterinary approval numbers for fish processors to identify those enterprises. Unfortunately, a complete version of this register was not available before late 2010." When we sent out questionnaires early 2011, the most recent, i.e. 2009 data were requested. The year 2008 is not clearly covered by the DCF, as Decision 2008/949/EC (chapter IV.B.2.2) only refers to sampling in 2009, but not to the reference year: "For enterprises that carry out fish processing but not as a main activity, it is mandatory to collect the following data, in the first year of each programming period...". As mentioned, this has been accepted already and has also been stated in the reply to the Data transmission failures table for 2011.</li> </ul>	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
143	Germany	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(cod-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The deadline was 15 April 2013 (ICES letter ref. L.27/ACB/HKN of 13 March 2013, p. 2 of Data Call annex). We uploaded our data on 27 March 2013, i.e. <u>before</u> the deadline.	Seems the the MS has tried as much as possible to responded according to the data call	satisfactory
144	Germany	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(had-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The deadline was 15 April 2013 (ICES letter ref. L.27/ACB/HKN of 13 March 2013, p. 2 of Data Call annex). We uploaded our data on 27 March 2013, i.e. <u>before</u> the deadline.	Seems the the MS has tried as much as possible to responded according to the data call	satisfactory



Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
145	Germany	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Subarea IV (North Sea) and Division IIIa West (Skagerrak)(had-34) WGNSSK	Missing data: Age or length data for discards	The relevant fisheries were sampled, but no discards for this species occurred, so no data on discards (age/length) could be collected.	As the absence of discard is not documented therefore MS do not responded according the the Data call	unsatisfactory
146	Germany	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division IIIa (Skagerrak - Kattegat)(whg-kask) WGNSSK	Missing data: Discards data Age or length data for discards	The relevant fisheries were sampled, but no discards for this species occurred, so no data on discards (age/length) could be collected.	As the absence of discard is not documented therefore MS do not responded according the the Data call	unsatisfactory
305	Germany	ICES	Ecoregion: Widely distributed stocks Stock: (hom-west)Horse mackerel ( <i>Trachurus trachurus</i> ) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb, VIa, VIIa-c, e-k, and Subarea VIII (Western stock) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom-west.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom-west.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission / Data quality - No biological sampling Description: The landings fraction sampled to estimate biological parameters has been declining in recent years; it is important to keep those levels on target. As in previous years, and despite the data sampling regulations for EU countries, some countries with major catches have not conducted biological sampling programmes. Comments: Few biological samples available from the 2nd and 3rd quarter	Germany conducts a biological sampling programme with regard to horse mackerel. However, horse mackerel is only caught by pelagic freezer trawlers by Germany. The target species in this metier depends highly on the fishing season. In 2012, it was not possible to place an observer on a fishing trip targeting horse mackerel which usally takes place only in the 4th quarter. Germany was, however, able to sample horse mackerel as by-catch in the mackerel fishery in the 1st quarter. Those biological parameters were delivered to ICES.	Seems the the MS has tried as much as possible to responded according to the data call	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
8	Greece	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Most of DCF economic variables (other income, all costs parameters, capital value raw material and employment (by gender and in FTE)) are missing. Only variables, covered by other data collections are provided for 2008-2011. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Due to administrative and financial obstacles, DCF has not been applied in Greece from 2007 (with the exception of 2nd half of 2008) to 2011. Thus, no data were collected for aquaculture. However some data were collected by the DG Fisheries, Directorate of Aquaculture and transmitted to JRC.	No justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
26	Greece	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	No data submitted for the 2013 call for economic data on the EU fishing fleet See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	The 2013 data call for economic variables referred to 2011 economic data information. DCF hadn't implemented in Greece that year. Therefore there are not available data. The 2014 data call for economic variables referred to 2012 data information. This information is available and already supplied.	No justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
62	Greece	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	No data provided for years 2008-2010. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Due to administrative and financial obstacles, DCF has not been applied in Greece from 2007 (with the exception of 2nd half of 2008) to 2011. However, some data on the processing industry were transmitted to JRC by the DG Fisheries, Directorate of Fisheries Extensions.	No justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
78	Greece	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	No fisheries data submitted (Tables A,B,C,D) . Only Medits data was uploaded, for 2013 only for GSA 22 (partial number of tows in Northern Aegean), lack of TE file. No hydroacoustic survey data (Table M, N, O) uploaded. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Data were provided for Medits 2003-2006, 2008 and 2013. During 2013 the Medits survey realized only in GSA 22 in Northern and Central Aegean. However this area covers the 40% of the total number of hauls that should be done in the whole survey.	Greece has not implemented DCF from 2009 to 2012. Data collection in 2012 started in December. MS was not in the position to fulfill the requirements of the different data calls.	NA
381	Greece	ICCAT	Task 2	Missing data for: ALB-MED	The 2013 data call is referred to 2012 data information. During 2012 DCF has been applied in Greece for a very short period (December) due to financial and administrative constraints. At that time there is no albacore fishing in Greece. Therefore no data were collected.	Greece has not implemented DCF from 2009 to 2012. Data collection in 2012 started in December. MS was not in the position to fulfill the requirements of the different data calls.	NA
396	Greece	GFCM	Task 1 1 Fleet and area variables	No data provided	The Task 1.1 statistical matrix for the reference year 2011 was submitted to the GFCM Secretariat on 31-5-2013 (protocol number 4301/ 66127). The submitted data included the best possible information available to the National Services.	Greece has not implemented DCF from 2009 to 2012. Data collection in 2012 started in December. MS was not in the position to fulfill the requirements of the different data calls.	NA
401	Greece	GFCM	Task 1 2 Main resource and activity components variables per Operational Units	No data provided	The Task 1.2 statistical matrix for the reference year 2011 was submitted to the GFCM Secretariat on 31-5-2013 (protocol number 4301/ 66127). The submitted data included the best possible information available to the National Services.	Greece has not implemented DCF from 2009 to 2012. Data collection in 2012 started in December. MS was not in the position to fulfill the requirements of the different data calls.	NA
408	Greece	GFCM	Task 1 3 Economic component variables	No data provided	The 2013 data call for economic variables referred to 2011 economic data information. DCF hadn't implemented in Greece that year. Therefore there are not available data.	Greece has not implemented DCF from 2009 to 2012. Data collection in 2012 started in December. MS was not in the position to fulfill the requirements of the different data calls.	NA

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
416	Greece	GFCM	Task 1.4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycatch	No data provided	The 2013 data call is referred to 2011 data information. During 2011 DCF has been applied in Greece for a very short period (December) due to financial and administrative constraints. Thus, no data were collected.	Greece has not implemented DCF from 2009 to 2012. Data collection in 2012 started in December. MS was not in the position to fulfill the requirements of the different data calls.	NA
426	Greece	GFCM	Task 1.5 Provisional biological parameters	No data provided	The 2013 data call is referred to 2011 data information. During 2011 DCF has been applied in Greece for a very short period (December) due to financial and administrative constraints. Thus, no data were collected.	Greece has not implemented DCF from 2009 to 2012. Data collection in 2012 started in December. MS was not in the position to fulfill the requirements of the different data calls.	NA

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
27	Ireland	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Substantial amount of missing data at the fleet segment level, in particular for small vessel length groups. Data inconsistencies and incomplete time series data for many fleet segments reported. . Landings data for 2012 (national and fleet segment levels) not provided. DCF capacity data for engine power under-reported at fleet segment level (2008-2012). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	The small vessel length groups (under 10m) contain the largest number of vessels in the Irish fleet. Due to the lack of logbook data for these segments IRL conducts a targeted survey of these vessels. Due to the small sampling size (<10%) it is not possible to cover all of the segments within this group. Many of the fleet segments reported consist of a small number of vessels and there is insufficient data to submit. Additionally, fishing vessel's dominant gear may change from year to year so it is possible for the number of vessels within fleet segments to change temporally thus giving incomplete time series data. There are consistent and complete time series data for the most important Irish fleet segments. Due to the timing of the data call in 2013 the transversal data for 2012 (landings and effort) were not available from the national authority. By the time of the 2013 Annual Economic Report (AER) only Effort data were ready and these were submitted at the second AER. Landings data were submitted later in the year.	Justification for 2012 and 2013 data acceptable (provision of those data not mandatory). Aside from those data, insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
46	Ireland	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	No nominal effort, effective effort by rectangle and landings by rectangle information submitted for vessels <10m in length.	This information is not collected within the logbooks and therefore it is not possible to supply information for <10m vessels at the level of detail requested within the data call. Specific information on missing gears or mesh sizes result from information missing within the official logbooks and included for completeness.	Insufficient justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
63	Ireland	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: "extraordinary costs, net" (2008). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Zero indicates that there were no extraordinary cost in 2008.	OK. MS provided reasonable explanation	Satisfactory
147	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Division IIIa and Subareas IV and VI(ang-ivvi) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline after EG	In 2013 ang-ivvi data were provided to ICES stock coordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
148	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Divisions VIIe-k (Celtic Sea cod)(cod-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 cod-7e-k data were provided to ICES stock coordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	As te upload delay was in agreement with the stock coordinator and had no consequence for the assessment it seems to be ok	Satisfactory
149	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(cod-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 cod-iris data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
150	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(cod-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 cod-scow data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch and used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
151	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(had-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 had-iris data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
152	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIb (Rockall)(had-rock) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline	In 2013 had-rock data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
153	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(had-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 had-scow data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch and used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
154	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIa (North Minch, FU 11)(nep-11) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch and used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
155	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIa (South Minch, FU 12)(nep-12) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
156	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIa (Firth of Clyde + Sound of Jura, FU 13)(nep-13) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
157	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIa (Irish Sea East, FU 14)(nep-14) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
158	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIa (Irish Sea West, FU 15)(nep-15) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
159	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIb,c,j,k (Porcupine Bank, FU 16)(nep-16) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline after EG	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
160	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIb (Aran Grounds, FU 17)(nep-17) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
161	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIa,g,j (South East and West of IRL, FU 19)(nep-19) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
162	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in the FU 20 (Labadie, Baltimore and Galley), FU 21 (Jones and Cockburn)(nep-2021) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline after EG	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
163	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIg (Celtic Sea, the Smalls, FU 22)(nep-22) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 Nephrops Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
164	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIb,c (West of Ireland)(ple-7b-c) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Ireland is stock coordinator for this stock; we prioritised uploading intercatch data for stock that are coordinated by other countries. The data were available and the delay did not impact on our ability to assess this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
165	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Divisions VIIf,g (Celtic Sea)(ple-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 ple-celt Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
166	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(ple-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 ple-iris Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
167	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIb, c (West of Ireland)(sol-7b-c) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Ireland is stock coordinator for this stock; we prioritised uploading intercatch data for stock that are coordinated by other countries. The data were available and the delay did not impact on our ability to assess this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
168	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Divisions VII f, g (Celtic Sea)(sol-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 ple-celt Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
169	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VII e (Western Channel)(sol-echw) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Ireland has no fisheries catching sol-echw	This stock was not planned in the MS NP 2013	satisfactory
170	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VII e-k (whg-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 ple-iris Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
171	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VII a (Irish Sea)(whg-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 whg-iris Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
172	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VI a (West of Scotland)(whg-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 whg-scow Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch and used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	MS to provide data according to the data call in order to respect the submission deadline.	satisfactory
173	Ireland	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(pol-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	In 2013 pol-celt Data were provided to ICES stock co-ordinator directly and did not delay the assessment process. Data were subsequently uploaded to intercatch which was not used in data raising in 2013 for this stock.	This stock was not planned in the MS NP 2013	satisfactory
306	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Widely distributed stocks Stock: (hom-west)Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Divisions II a, IV a, V b, VI a, VII a-c, e-k, and Subarea VIII (Western stock) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom-west.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom-west.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission / Data quality - No biological sampling Description: The landings fraction sampled to estimate biological parameters has been declining in recent years; it is important to keep those levels on target. As in previous years, and despite the data sampling regulations for EU countries, some countries with major catches have not conducted biological sampling programmes. Comments: Few biological samples available from the 2nd and 3rd quarter	In 2012, Ireland reported zero catch in quarter 2. In quarter 3 1933t was reported of which 1134t was sampled. In total for 2012, 42665t was sampled from a total catch reported to the working group of 45307t (approximately 94%)	Seems that MS was in position to provide the requested data.	unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
320	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (her-irls)Herring in Divisions VIIa (South of 52°30'N) and VIIg,h,j,k (Celtic Sea and South of Ireland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/her-irls.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/her-irls.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Improved information on discards is required as this appears to have become a feature of this fishery in recent years; however, after the changes in the regulations of weekly quota allocations in 2012, the risk of discarding is reduced.	Improved data submitted at subsequent ICES working group	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to obtain reliable estimation of discards.	satisfactory
324	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ang-78ab)Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b,d Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ang-78ab.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ang-78ab.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards Description: The increase in discarding in recent years has resulted in uncertainties in recent catch values.  Reliable estimates of discards are not available. The increase in discarding may be related to larger year classes recruiting in the fishery. Information from research surveys indicates an increase in smaller fish on the fishing grounds in recent years. Discarding is also known to be partly dependent on market conditions and quota restrictions. Efforts should be made to obtain reliable estimates of total catches in order to improve the assessment.	yes part of the programme	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to obtain reliable estimation of discards.	satisfactory
327	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ang-78ab)Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b,d Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ang-78ab.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ang-78ab.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Improved sampling of length composition and accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment. An ageing exchange study for L. piscatorius took place in 2011 to compare the different approaches that are used (otoliths and illicia).  Improved sampling of length composition and accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment.	Contribute to ICES data initiative in 2014	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
329	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (cod-rock)Cod in Division VIb (Rockall) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-rock.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-rock.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - No biological sampling Description: Available data provide information on landings only. There are doubts on the accuracy of the reported landings as these are reported by vessels operating in both Divisions VIa and VIb. Comments: Landings of this stock are very low (32 tonnes on 2012), which is the reason for the lack of biological sampling	below threshold	Seems that MS was in position to provide the requested data.	unsatisfactory



Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
332	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (cod-scow)Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-scow.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-scow.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Discard information is imprecise compared to landings data because of lower sampling coverage. Because catch is now dominated by discards it is very important to maintain the highest possible sampling (observer) coverage of vessels in Division VIa. Comments: Note that discards are available from Scottish and Irish trawlers are used in the assessment.	sampling programme meets DCF targets ( 11 from 13)	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
336	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (gug-celt)Grey gurnard in Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa-c and e-k (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/gug-celt.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/gug-celt.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Quality of landings data Description: Because the species is largely discarded, landings data do not reflect the actual catches. Comments: The landings values of the MS listed are very low	yes	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
339	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (had-7b-k)Haddock in Divisions VIIb-k Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/had-7b-k.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/had-7b-k.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: There is considerable uncertainty around the estimated discard numbers-at-age due to the diverse fishing (and discarding) practices and relatively low numbers of discard samples. Improving discard estimates would require a significant increase in the number of observer trips or other monitoring means.	Discard sampling has improved in recent years but discard numbers-at-age will necessarily be a source of uncertainty.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
343	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (nep-16)Nephrops on Porcupine Bank (FU 16) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/Nep-VII-FU%2016.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/Nep-VII-FU%2016.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards sampling intensity Description: Discard observer coverage is low and should be increased, to sample the landings and any discards that might be occurring.	Discard sampling has improved in recent years three trips were carried out in 2013 for this stock. Trips to this area are long in duration usually >14days and numbers of sampled trips will be low given the constraints of the national programme. Discard sampling to date has confirmed the assumption that discard rates were negligible.	Seems that MS should be in position to provide the requested data.	unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
346	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (nep-19)Nephrops off the southeastern and southwestern coasts of Ireland (FU 19) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/Nep-VII-FU%2019.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/Nep-VII-FU%2019.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve catch sampling Description: Adequate catch sampling remains difficult for such a heterogeneous area. Comments: The heterogeneous area turns the adequate sampling almost impossible.	Sampling has improved in recent years but the adequate sampling of the individual disparate mud patches is almost impossible. The resulting catch length for this FU are likely to have lower precision than most other areas.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
347	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (nep-2021)Nephrops in FU 20 (Labadie, Baltimore, and Galley) and FU 21 (Jones and Cockburn) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/Nep-VII-FU%2020%20and%2021.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/Nep-VII-FU%2020%20and%2021.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards sampling intensity Description: Discards of Nephrops are thought to be extensive, but observations are insufficient to provide a reliable time-series. The data from sampling programmes in France and Ireland are patchy, leading to some uncertainty in the estimation of mean weight in the landings and discard rates.	Irish participation in this fishery has been increasing in recent years and sampling and monitoring programmes are developing to take this into account. Fishing activities in this FU usually are part of trips which take place in more than one FU making a target sampling programme difficult.	Seems that MS should be in position to provide the requested data.	unsatisfactory
350	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ple-iris)Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-iris.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-iris.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards sampling intensity Description: The discard data are noisy and the assessment would benefit from increased sampling intensity. Discard information from Northern Irish and Irish Nephrops fleets became available for the first time this year, enabling improved discard estimates for the most recent years (2010–2012). Because no time-series of this information was available to be incorporated in the assessment model, the previous discards computation was used. However, the new discard information was used to quantify the catch advice.	Ireland has provided discard data since 1995 for this stock. During WKFLAT 2011, discard data from Ireland was raised and collated to the total international level for the years 2004 – 2010. Length distributions of landed and discarded fish estimates are presented in WGCSE 2013 for Ireland from 2004-2012.	Seems that MS should be in position to provide the requested data.	unsatisfactory
355	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ple-7h-k)Plaice in Divisions VIIIh–k (Southwest of Ireland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-7h-k.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-7h-k.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Age composition of younger individuals Description: The assessment is only based on age 4 and older; ICES does not have information on younger ages.	Discard sampling in recent years has been adequate, there is a problem with the time-series of data. For this reason the WG decided to exclude younger ages from the assessment. This decision will affect the forecast but not the assessment of the state of the stock.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
358	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ple-7b-c)Plaice in Divisions VIIb,c (West of Ireland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-7b-c.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-7b-c.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. Comments: This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 29 tonnes.	Indeed: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 29 tonnes.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
362	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (pol-celt)Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/pol-celt.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/pol-celt.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Biological data and landings figures Description: Some length frequency data are available for recent years, but area-specific data on life history parameters are missing and should be collected in surveys and through market sampling. Data on growth and maturity, as well as more information from the fisheries, are needed. Landings figures are incomplete and erratic and further scrutiny of this information is required. More information is needed on: stock identity of pollack within the ICES area; details of the fisheries (more spatial detail in landings data – especially for the earlier years in the time-series, landings by gear, length compositions, discards); life history/biological parameters (surveys and commercial sampling); and recreational fisheries (catch and effort statistics).	pollack data on surveys ,stock is complex and would require dedicated genetics programme	Seems that MS has responded according to the Data Call	satisfactory
364	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (sol-7b-c)Sole in Divisions VIIb,c (West of Ireland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sol-7b-c.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sol-7b-c.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. Comments: This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 44 tonnes.	Indeed: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 44 tonnes.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
369	Ireland	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (whg-rock)Whiting in Division VIb (Rockall) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/whg-rock.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/whg-rock.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Quality of landings data Description: There are doubts on the accuracy of the reported landings as these are reported by vessels operating in both Divisions VIa and VIb. Comments: Official landings were 9 tonnes in 2011 and 1 tonne in 2012	Confirmed these were the landings	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
370	Ireland	ICES	<p>Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland</p> <p>Stock: (wgh-iris)Whiting in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)</p> <p>Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/wgh-iris.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/wgh-iris.pdf</a></p>	<p>Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity</p> <p>Description: Since 2003 the low landing levels have resulted in poor sampling coverage of the stock and no reliable estimates of catch numbers-at-age.</p> <p>Comments: Landings of this stock are low (~ 50 tonnes on 2012)</p>	adequate coverage in VIIa OTB	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call.	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
9	Italy	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Following Italian NP, Italy submitted all requested information for 2008-2010 in due time of the data call, 2011 data set has been submitted in August. Following JRC data quality checks corrections been done before the STECF EWG 13-10 meeting. The only minor deviation from the data call is missing debt parameter for 2008. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	2008 was the first reference year for the collection of economic data for aquaculture. The variable "debt" was wrongly translated in appendix X of EU Decision 93/2010. In fact it was translated as "total liabilities" and not as debts (in Italian "passivo, alla fine dell'anno fiscale" and not "debiti"). Therefore in the first year the variable "total liabilities" was wrongly collected (and not debts). In the subsequent years STECF clarified this point and Italy started with collecting the variable "debts". However data from balance sheets on debts referred to 2008 have been recovered and this data will be sent in the 2014 data call.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
28	Italy	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Capacity data for 2013 not submitted. Some minor missing data at the fleet segment level. Fishing Enterprise data missing for 2011 and 2012. DCF capacity data for number of vessels and kW under-reported for several years See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	<u>Capacity data for 2013</u> have to be delivered with a time lag of 6 months, according to Italian National Program. In fact, data from the fleet register have to be updated with the information on the prevalent fishing technique as required by Appendix III of the DCF. This is derived through a field survey covering all the vessels. <u>Some minor missing data at the fleet segment level. Fishing Enterprise data missing for 2011 and 2012.</u> There was a clear error in the submission of data as regards to fishing enterprise because these are administrative data available at any time. They do not imply any kind of data collection. In addition, we think that this error did not have a negative impact on the analysis because fleet has been quite stable in the period. <u>DCF capacity data for number of vessels and kW under-reported for several years.</u> Differences between DCF capacity data and the EU Fleet Register are due to the fact that the fleet uploaded is the average fleet over the year and not the fleet at the 1 January of the reference year. This motivation is also reported in the data coverage report (page 57).	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
64	Italy	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity has been provided for one of the two mandatory years (i.e. 2008). However, these data were provided for years 2009 (requested but not mandatory) and 2011 (mandatory). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	EU Decision 93/2010 states that "For enterprises that carry out fish processing but not as a main activity, it is mandatory to collect the following data (data on non main activity enterprises), in the first year of each programming period". Therefore we delivered data for 2009 (first year of the program 2009-2010) and 2011 (first year of the program 2011-2013).	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
79	Italy	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	Part of the fisheries data was submitted late (Table A, B, C) according to the first deadline. Data from Tables (A,B,C) is lacking years 2002-2005 plus additional years (details in Section 4). Effort data (Table D) is entirely lacking 2010 Catch and landings datasets from GSA 11 are incomplete in temporal coverage and present substantial quality problems (details in reports of STECF EWG 13-09 and EWG 13-19). No Medits or hydroacoustic survey data sent according to the second deadline. Lack of Medits data from GSA 17 for period 1994-2002. In GSA 11 for years 2002-2005, 2007-2008 the reported number of species is approximately one third less. Lack of Medits TE file for GSA 10, 17 and 18. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	<u>Part of the fisheries data was submitted late (Table A, B, C) according to the first deadline.</u> On a total of 203 files uploaded, only 4 files, and precisely "CATCH_MEDBS-GSA 17_3.xls", "DISCARDS_MEDBS-GSA 17.xls", "LANDING_MEDBS_GSA 17_2.xls" and "DISCARDS_MEDBS_GSA 17_2.xls", have been successfully uploaded after the deadline. All the other files have been uploaded in time. For the future Italy will try to submit all the requested templates in due time. Data from Tables (A,B,C) is lacking years 2002-2005 plus additional years (details in Section 4). Data missing after 2005 are mainly related to age and discards data because, before 2011, there wasn't the obligation to collect annually these data for the concerned species. The temporal stratification, for discards and age data, was every three years. Concerning the years from 2002-2005, it is worth mentioning that Italy has for the first time implemented the data collection of biological samples in 2002. The sampling protocols and methodology applied at that time for the data collection and elaboration, related to the biological samplings, were different from the standards subsequently adopted, which were fully developed and tested during 2005 and completely applied in 2006. These standards proved to be adequate and in line with the more commonly adopted methods for biological samplings. As a consequence, data from 2002-2005 have been collected, processed and stored in	In general MS following the requirements of the DCF should try to fully comply with the request of the end users. The main problems related to quality of the data in GSA 11 have been checked by MS and MS stated that in the future it will improve the collection of the data in the area. Nevertheless MS should provide the entire data set for GSA11. The end user should also take into account the data availability following the Data presentation chapter of the NP proposal.	Unsatisfactory
383	Italy	ICCAT	Task 2	Missing data for: BFT-MED	We can certify that data on task 2 ICCAT have been sent on the 18th and 29th of July 2013	Not possible to check. MS/End user to clarify.	NA
402	Italy	GFCM	Task 1.2 Main resource and activity components variables per Operational Units	Mostly completed (75%)	GFCM Task 1.2 We checked the submission to the GFCM and we can confirm that the requested data have been correctly uploaded. According to our files all the components of task 1.2 have been submitted	In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	Satisfactory
417	Italy	GFCM	Task 1.4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycatch	Partially completed (50%)	GFCM Task 1.4 We checked the submission to the GFCM and we can confirm that the requested data have been correctly uploaded. According to our files most of the components of task 1.4 have been submitted (catch and effort). The few data missing are linked to some fields (discards and by catch), that due to the structure of the template, are problematic to be uploaded.	In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
427	Italy	GFCM	Task 1.5 Provisional biological parameters	Mostly completed (75%)	<p>GFCM Task 1.5</p> <p>We checked the submission to the GFCM and we confirm that the requested data have been correctly uploaded. Italy has uploaded the information requested for the most important commercial species and for each GSA. Following the structure of the Task 1.5 has been possible to fulfil the 75% of the requested data. The few data missing are linked to some fields (e.g. id_CLPrecisionLevel; id_CLValueType; CPUEOrLPUEValue), that due the structure of the template, is problematic to upload in a correct way.</p>	<p>In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call</p>	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
29	Latvia	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Investment values and depreciation cost for 2008 not provided. DCF capacity data under-reported compared to FR See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	<p><u>Investment values and depreciation cost for 2008 not provided.</u> The questionnaire form for economic data was changed in 2008. The first investment and depreciation costs data were received for 2009. <u>DCF capacity data under-reported compared to FR</u></p> <p>In order to keep the principle of confidentiality for the long distance sea fleet segment &gt;40 m operating in North Atlantic and CECAF areas economic and transversal data for these vessels were not reported. The economic and transversal data for the part of small coastal zone vessels less than 10m excluded from the Fleet economic request. These vessels are fishing only for self consumption and thus belong to the recreational fishery and were not involved in commercial fishing activity.</p>	Lack of 2008 investment data not justified. Under-repored capacity data is sufficiently explained	Unsatisfactory
47	Latvia	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	Table A, catch: discards submitted only for cod. Table B, nominal effort: only 'days at sea' effort data for vessels <10m in length for 2005-2007. Table D, Capacity: no data for vessels <8m in length for 2003-2007. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	<p><b>Table A, catch:</b> Discard data in 2012 were collected under the Latvian National Programme according to the sampling strategy. The discard volume was estimated in cod fishery: GNS_DEF_110-156_0_0 and OTB_DEF_&gt;=105_1_110. No discards in sprat and herring targeted fishery have been recorded during 2012 as well as in previous years.</p> <p><b>Table B, nominal effort; Table D, Capacity:</b> Information on the boat register number was included in the coastal logbooks since 2008. Therefore, detailed data such as number of active vessels aggregated by area ( Table D, Capacity) as well as data on kW*days and Gt*days aggregated by quarter, vessel segments, gear and area ( Table B, nominal effort) for boats less than 10 m can be provided only from 2008 and afterwards.</p>	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
65	Latvia	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: "imputed value of unpaid labour" (2010 and 2011). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	According to the questionnaire of Latvian Central Statistical Bureau the unpaid labour was not reported and therefore the variable "imputed value of unpaid labour" had zero values in 2010 and 2011.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
174	Latvia	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 24 and 25(fle-2425) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	Latvia provided flounder discard length information in Excel spread sheet for SD 24-25 for 2006 to 2012 according to WKBALFLAT data call. The total amount of landings was low (less than 10 tons as bycatch in cod fishery)	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call, since the MS landings of flounder in SD 24-25 in 2012 were only 19 t (WGBFAS 2013).	Satisfactory



Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
175	Latvia	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 26 and 28(fle-2628) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for discards	Latvia provided discard length information in Excel spreadsheet for SD 26, 28 for 2004 to 2012 according to WKBALFLAT data call. No specific discard age samples were available. However due to the factor that a local market is the main limiting factor (not fish size or condition), age length key from landings are applicable to discard length distribution to calculate an age distribution of discards	OK, ICES may check why length data were not available to (or used by) WKBALFLAT. Not clear why age readings have not been conducted on the sampled discards.	Unsatisfactory
372	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (cod-2532)Cod in Subdivisions 25–32 (Eastern Baltic Sea) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-2532_201304112231.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-2532_201304112231.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Ageing inconsistencies Description: Ageing problems are a concern for the quality of the assessment.	Age determination of the Eastern Baltic cod is a long-standing problem. Latvia has regularly participated in age reading workshops and otolith exchanges to improve the situation. Several age reading workshops took place in Latvia. Age reading of cod in Latvia is performed by experienced expert (experience is more than 30 years). For quality assessment every otolith is weighted, annual growth zones are measured. Analyses of otolith edge is performed to improve quality of age reading. The same procedure is applied for all otoliths from commercial and scientific surveys.	Ageing of cod is a general problem in the Baltic, and MS effort to improve cod age determination is acknowledged.	Satisfactory
373	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (fle-2232)Flounder in Subdivisions 22–32 (Baltic Sea) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/fle-2232_201304122320.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/fle-2232_201304122320.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve discards sampling Description: The uncertainty of the discard estimates is of concern. Discarding practices are controlled by factors such as market price and cod catches. Given the high variability in the discard ratios, estimating discards is very uncertain without an extensive sampling programme	Discarded flounder is registered in all fishing trips. However, as it was concluded in WKBALFLAT, a special discard raising system should be developed while InterCatch could not provide enough flexibility (inter year, inter species) to calculate a reliable flounder discard ratio. There is a lack of reliable survival estimate of the discarded flounder since any significant research has been carried out on this issue.	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	Pre-screening comments	EWG1407 comment	STECF EWG - evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
30	Lithuania	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Energy consumption missing for 2008 (national and fleet segment level). Only capacity data submitted for TMVL40XX. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Due to primary data transfer failure between administrating institutions, insignificant part of 2008 data were not provided to STECF, consequently, in 2013 Lithuania was charged with penalty. Afterwards, missing data, including energy consumption was estimated and reported in 2014 data call. The data was unavailable for that period.	2008 fuel issue explained, repetitive penalty would not be reasonable. Missing data for VL40xx due do confidentiality reasons, explanation given in NP (p. 13)	2008 fuel issue sufficiently explained. Data for VL40XX are contained in AER. Thus the respective data must have been submitted in due time. Data delivery apparently compliant with obligations. MS provided data clustered with other segment, in line with NP	Satisfactory
48	Lithuania	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	Table A, catch: no data for 2003-2004. Table A, catch: no (nor zero) discards or age data for 2003-2008. Table B, nominal effort: no data for 2000-2004. Table C, effort by rectangle: no data for 2003-2008. Table D, Capacity: no data for 2003-2008. Table E, landings by rectangle: no data for 2003-2007. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	In 2005 Lithuania started to implement Data Collection programme for this reason there had been missed some data before 2005.	Some of the data should be available, at least from 2005 onwards. Additional view from biologist desirable. The coverage report as referred to under "ISSUE" is of no use in this context.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
66	Lithuania	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity. Values equal to zero: "extraordinary costs, net" (2008 and 2009); "imputed value of unpaid labour" (all years); subsidies (2008 and 2011). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Due to confidentiality reasons data for companies which carry out fish processing not as a main activity were not reported separately. The turnover and corresponding costs of processed fish as well as corresponding employment for those companies which do not perform fish processing as main activity was merged to rest of population (where fish processing is main activity) and was reported un-separately, providing a complete information of Lithuanian fish processing industry with regard to reported response rate. Reported zero values are not missed variables.	OK	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
176	Lithuania	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 24 and 25(fle-2425) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards	Lithuania did not collect data from subdivisions 24-25 for flounder. The reasons are: 1. Observers are not allowed onboard due safety reasons and lack of space. Therefore it is not possible to collect discard data; 2. All catches are landed in Denmark. Therefore, biological data is not available; 3. There was a statement in one of the RCM Baltic reports (2011 or 2012) that cod discard data from subdiv 25 is sufficiently covered by Denmark and Sweden. It's assumed that data for flounder is also covered by concurrent sampling at sea. Otherwise this issue will be clarified during the RCM Baltic 2014.	OK, Lithuanian landings of flounder in SD 24-25 in 2012 were 19 t (WGBFAS 2013). To be checked at RCM Baltic 2014, to which extent other MS's sampling is sufficiently covering this stock.	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call, since the MS landings of flounder in SD 24-25 in 2012 were only 19 t (WGBFAS 2013).	Satisfactory
386	Lithuania	NAFO	Biological information (Sex, Length, Age)	Missing data for: 3M Redfish, 3 LN Redfish	There were no fishery in NAFO area in 2013 at all	OK	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call	Satisfactory
372	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (cod-2532)Cod in Subdivisions 25-32 (Eastern Baltic Sea) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-2532_201304112231.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-2532_201304112231.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Ageing inconsistencies Description: Ageing problems are a concern for the quality of the assessment.	Lithuania is familiar to that problem. Our age reader has been dealing with cod for 13 years and have sufficient skill to provide good reading quality.	OK, however, MS should continue to be involved in age reading comparisons (otolith exchanges and workshops) to ensure international consistency in age determination.	Ageing of cod is a general problem in the Baltic, and MS effort to improve cod age determination is acknowledged.	Satisfactory
373	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (fle-2232)Flounder in Subdivisions 22-32 (Baltic Sea) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/fle-2232_201304122320.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/fle-2232_201304122320.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve discards sampling Description: The uncertainty of the discard estimates is of concern. Discarding practices are controlled by factors such as market price and cod catches. Given the high variability in the discard ratios, estimating discards is very uncertain without an extensive sampling programme	Lithuania is sampling flounder discards routinely at sea during the cod fishery (concurrent sampling). There are no plans to give special attention to flounder issue unless there will be special request from ICES or relevant expert group to do it	OK	Seems that MS has responded according to the data call	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
10	Malta	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	No major deviations from the data call. The only variable missing is live stock volume for 2008-2009 at national total level. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Livestock volume data for both 2008 and 2009 for segment 3.4 (Seabass and Seabream) could not be obtained, as none of the respondents included this information in their replies. Data on segment 6.4 (Other Marine Fish Cages) was provided for both years. Note that the number of aquaculture companies in Malta is relatively low, and aquaculture data is collected via means of a self-reporting questionnaire.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
31	Malta	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Significant amount of missing data at fleet segment level. DCF capacity data (GT) significantly under-reported in 2008-09 compared to FR. Recreational catch data not submitted See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	In 2008 and 2009, due to a vessel registry oversight, a number of recreational vessels (MFC) were listed as part-time fishing vessels (MFB). This in turn contributed to an over reporting of capacity in the FR when compared to DCF capacity data. This error was fixed in 2009, and in fact no such discrepancies have re-occured. With respect to recreational data, as per the annual fleet economic data call, Malta is only required to submit recreational catches, if any, for blue fin tuna and european eel. Malta does not have a recreational fishery targeting eel (and this is explained in Malta's National Programme), while with respect to Blue-fin tuna, recreational catches recorded are usually nil, or as in the case for 2012, when only two individuals were caught, catches are very small. In all cases, any recreational BFT data obtained was submitted.	Insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery for missing data. Explanation of capacity discrepancy appears OK. Lack of Recreational catch data appears reasonably explained.	Unsatisfactory
67	Malta	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity. Values equal to zero: "Other income" (all years); "subsidies" (2010 and 2011); "imputed value of unpaid labour" (2011); "Extraordinary costs, net" (2010). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	The Maltese processing industry is very small and all enterprises that carry out fish processing carry it out as their main activity. Data on the processing industry is collected through a questionnaire sent to the relevant entities. Responses are self-reported and are often not obtained from all entities by the deadline. In view of both the small size of the industry, as well as the self reporting nature of the data collection, the data for a given year for certain variables may either be skewed (due to the low number of responses) or zero.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
80	Malta	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	Late submission of Medits data after both deadlines. No MEDITS TE file See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Data required for the Med and BS data call was submitted on 29/05/2013 in time for the 3/6/2013 deadline. apart from the Medits TD, TT and TA files. This was due to errors in the tables that prevented the data being uploaded. Following correspondence with Mr Giacomo Chato Osio (Data Submission Team, JRC), the problem was tackled and data successfully uploaded on 3/7/2013 and 4/7/2013. The MEDITS TE file was not uploaded due to Malta not having otholith age reading data ready. While the samples required were collected, problems were encountered to subcontract the required work. A tender for this work was issued twice but no successful applicants resulted.	In general, the MS should try, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call. MS should try to improve for the future the work regarding the age reading to ensure the submission of the requested data. The end user however, should also take care of the data availability following the Data presentation chapter in the NP proposal	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
382	Malta	ICCAT	Task 2	Missing data for: ALB-MED	For ICCAT purposes, Malta submits data as per DCF regulations. Following article B.B2.5.5 of Commission Regulation (E.C.) No. 93/2010 Malta does not collect stock-related variables for albacore, since Malta's catch of albacore tuna for 2011-2013 was less than 200 tonnes on average.	In general, MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. In this case Malta need to following the DCF and ICCAT exemption rules.	Unsatisfactory
418	Malta	GFCM	Task 1.4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycatch	Mostly completed (75%)	All data collected by Malta with regard to catch and effort variables for Task 1.4 and available in the logbooks were submitted. Reference is being made to Article 14 (4) of Council Reg. (EC) 1224/2009 which states that "Masters of Community fishing vessels shall also record in their fishing logbook all estimated discards above 50 kg of live-weight equivalent in volume for any species." In most cases, in Malta discards of any species do not exceed 50 kg.	In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
11	Netherlands	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	The Netherlands has a two year data collection lag, i.e. data for 2011 had not been collected by the end of the STECF EWG 13-10 meeting. No data has been provided for 2011. For the rest of the time frame, the following parameters were not submitted: number of enterprises by size category and segment for 2008-2010; number of employees by gender; FTE total and by gender (not obligatory); imputed value of unpaid labour and volume of raw material have been either not provided or provided as zero values. According to the Dutch expert the imputed value of unpaid labour was not estimated. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	As stated in the NP the data from the aquaculture industry is based on financial accounts, which causes a substantial delay. Therefore data on the aquaculture sector was not available before the meeting, but has become available during autumn 2013. Some information such as the employees by gender could not be obtained from the accounts. Value of unpaid labour was not estimated before, but the methodology has been adapted. Volume of raw material is 0 for mussel and oyster sector. For inland fisheries, this could not be obtained from the financial accounts.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
32	Netherlands	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Some missing data at the fleet segment level, in particular for smaller vessel length groups. Reported DCF capacity data lower than FR for all parameters and years. Recreational catch data submitted only for 2010 See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	For a very limited number of segments, response was too low to provide some variables in the older years. For recent years, response is enough to facilitate full coverage of all segments. The capacity of the fleet register has always been higher, because the fleet register also covers some vessels of the inland fleet/aquaculture.	Missing data for smaller vessel groups not sufficiently justified. MS provided reasonable justification for capacity issue. No explanation for failure on recreational catch data	Unsatisfactory
49	Netherlands	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	Catch information available for only 3 species for years 2003-2008; cfr approximately 40 species for years 2009-2012. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	The catch information as delivered in 2003-2008 responded to the data requests as sent out in those days. For The Netherlands, only 3 species were relevant based on the standing criteria at that time. Based on this request, The Netherlands will strive to update the time series to the current request, prior to the 2014 meeting.	Insufficient justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
68	Netherlands	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Late upload (16th of October). The following economic variables were not provided: "male employees" and "female employees" (the variable "total employees" was provided, although the delivery was not mandatory); "Extraordinary costs, net" (provided for 2009 and 2010, not provided for 2008 and 2011). No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity has been provided for 2008, while for 2011, it was provided only the variable "Turnover attributed to fish processing". See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	In the National Programme, derogation is asked for the employment by gender. "Extraordinary costs, net": this variable is available by the Dutch Statistical Office, but because reasons of confidence we were not allowed to collect and use it for the analysis (highest value was more than 50% of the total value of the variable); "enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity": this has not been collected in 2008. Besides the number of enterprises no information about these enterprises was available.	No justification for failure of data delivery with respect to "enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity". For all other issues MS provided reasonable justification. However, the coverage report is not correct with respect to the statement on number of enterprises and turnover (text contradicts table).	Unsatisfactory
177	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions VIIIa,b,d (Northern stock)(hke-nrtn) WKSOUTH	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards	In 2012, limited data has been collected for Hake, as demonstrated in the approved Annual Report 2012. The Netherlands delivered raised numbers at length to the stock coordinator in WGBIE on March 25, 2013. As planned in the approved National Programme, The Netherlands did not collect age data for Hake. WKSOUTH never requested data from The Netherlands.	NL only has minor quota (0.1-3.3%; Reg. 43/2014: IIIa - no quota, IIa/IV: 95t of 2874t, VI/VII: 272t of 45896t, VIIIabde: 27t of 30610t). Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
178	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Division IIIa and Subareas IV and VI(ang-ivvi) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline after EG	The deadline for data delivery set by WGCSE was set to April 15, 2013. The Netherlands provided the requested data on March 25, 2013. Hence, the data was delivered in time to the stock coordinator. The Dutch data for lophius is very limited as described in the approved 2012 Annual Report.	The data is only submitted to the stock coordinator and not uploaded to InterCatch. Because InterCatch isn't used for data processing the missing upload has probably no impact on the assessment. In general data have to be uploaded to InterCatch for documentary purpose in all cases.	NA
179	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Subarea IV (North Sea), Division VIII (Eastern Channel) and IIIa West (Skagerrak)(cod-347d) WGNSSK	Missing data: Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	In general, the deadlines for data deliveries are very tight. The Netherlands strives to deliver all data prior to the deadline. In this case the data was delivered in time for the WG, but the deadline was indeed missed. However, this was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
180	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Subarea IV (North Sea) and Division IIIa West (Skagerrak)(had-34) WGNSSK	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	As described in the approved National Programme, no age nor length data has been collected from the landings of haddock as haddock is a limited by-catch species in The Netherlands. As with Cod, some other data was delivered in time for the WG, but the deadline was indeed missed. However, this was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem.	NL had haddock landings in IV of only 41-191 t (of approx. 30,000t in total) in 2010-2012 (WGNSSK 2013).	Satisfactory
181	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVb (Off Horn Reef, FU 33)(nep-33) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	As with Cod, the data was delivered in time for the WG, but the deadline was indeed missed. However, this was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
182	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVbc (Botney Gut - Silver Pit, FU 5)(nep-5) WGNSSK	Missing data: Discards data Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	Virtually no discard data has been collected in FUS. The remaining data was indeed delivered after the dead line, but as with the other WGNSSK species, this was not considered as a problem by the WG.	NL had landings of 497t (of 1240t total, WGNSSK 2013) and it is not clear <u>why</u> no discard data have been collected.	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
183	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVb (Farn Deep, FU 6)(nep-6) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Limited data has been collected in FU6. The remaining data was indeed delivered after the dead line, but as with the other WGNSSK species, this was not considered as a problem by the WG.	NL landings in FU6 are negligible. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
184	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(ple-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The delay in data delivery was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem. As mentioned above, The Netherlands always strives to deliver the data in time, however, due to tight dead lines and the increased number of data calls , deadlines can't always be met. In these cases, a solution is sought in close cooperation with the appropriate stock coordinator.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
185	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice Subarea IV (North Sea)(ple-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The delay in data delivery was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem. As mentioned above, The Netherlands always strives to deliver the data in time, however, due to tight dead lines and the increased number of data calls , deadlines can't always be met. In these cases, a solution is sought in close cooperation with the appropriate stock coordinator.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
186	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Saithe in Subarea IV (North Sea) Division IIIa West (Skagerrak) and Subarea VI (West of Scotland and Rockall)(sai-3a46) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The Netherlands only delivers very limited data for saithe as saithe is a by-catch species of little relevance. The delay in data delivery was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem. As mentioned above, The Netherlands always strives to deliver the data in time, however, due to tight dead lines and the increased number of data calls , deadlines can't always be met. In these cases, a solution is sought in close cooperation with the appropriate stock coordinator.	OK, NL landings in 2012 were only 34t of approx. 70000t total (WGNSSK 2013). Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
187	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(sol-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The Netherlands only delivers very limited data for sole as sole landings from VIId are negligible. The delay was communicated with the stock coordinator. Given the virtual non-landings, this was not considered as a problem.	Duch sole landings from VIId are negligible. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
188	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)(sol-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The delay in data delivery was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem. As mentioned above, The Netherlands always strives to deliver the data in time, however, due to tight dead lines and the increased number of data calls , deadlines can't always be met. In these cases, a solution is sought in close cooperation with the appropriate stock coordinator.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
189	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting Subarea IV (North Sea) & Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(whg-47d) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The delay in data delivery was communicated with the stock coordinator and not considered as a problem. As mentioned above, The Netherlands always strives to deliver the data in time, however, due to tight dead lines and the increased number of data calls , deadlines can't always be met. In these cases, a solution is sought in close cooperation with the appropriate stock coordinator.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
301	Netherlands	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: European seabass in Divisions IVbc,VIa and VIId-h (Irish Sea, English Channel and southern North Sea)(bss-47) WGCSE	Missing data: Landings data Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline after EG	As planned, no age samples were collected in 2012. The age sampling for bass is triennial and based on international agreements through the RCMs, age sampling has taken place in 2010 and 2013. Due to apparent miscommunication, the dead line was not met. Measures have been taken to avoid these problems in the future.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
307	Netherlands	ICES	Ecoregion: Widely distributed stocks Stock: (hom-west)Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb, VIa, VIIa-c, e-k, and Subarea VIII (Western stock) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom-west.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom-west.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission / Data quality - No biological sampling Description: The landings fraction sampled to estimate biological parameters has been declining in recent years; it is important to keep those levels on target. As in previous years, and despite the data sampling regulations for EU countries, some countries with major catches have not conducted biological sampling programmes. Comments: Few biological samples available from the 2nd and 3rd quarter	The comment is not clear. As described in the approved Annual Report 2012, The Netherlands exactly met it targets in terms of number of fish to be sampled and the data was delivered to the WG in time. The spatial distribution of the samples follows the fishery based on the sampling protocol designed to collect data at the most important fishing ground during the year. The sampling thus follows the Dutch fishery and this might not reflect the main fishing areas for other countries. The fishery for horse mackerel is a seasonal fishery in The Netherlands. During the 2nd and 3th quarter, horse mackerel is of lesser importance. Both quarters combined deliver less than 30% of the annual landings, hence the lower sampling effort in these quarters, reflecting the seasonality of the fishery.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
321	Netherlands	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (her-irls)Herring in Divisions VIIa (South of 52°30'N) and VIIg,h,j,k (Celtic Sea and South of Ireland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/her-irls.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/her-irls.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Improved information on discards is required as this appears to have become a feature of this fishery in recent years; however, after the changes in the regulations of weekly quota allocations in 2012, the risk of discarding is reduced.	The Dutch herring fishery on the forementioned region is of limited relevance for The Netherlands, less than 4% of the annual Herring landings are derived from this area. As a result of the sampling design based on ranking as prescribed in the DCF, the sampling design is based on covering the major fisheries throughout the year by default. Hence, the fishery in this area might not be covered. However, The Netherlands will strive to cover this area when feasible.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
337	Netherlands	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (gug-celt)Grey gurnard in Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa-c and e-k (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/gug-celt.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/gug-celt.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Quality of landings data Description: Because the species is largely discarded, landings data do not reflect the actual catches. Comments: The landings values of the MS listed are very low	The Netherlands has virtually no bottom fishery in the region mentioned in the comment. Hence, landings data are very low, as are the discard rates in the pelagic fishery.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve sampling intensity	satisfactory
377	Netherlands	ICCAT	Task 1: fleet characteristics	Missing data	The Netherlands never received a request from ICCAT, probably due to the non-existence of tuna fishery in The Netherlands.	MS don't have to respond to the Data call	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	Pre-screening comments	EWG comment	STECF EWG - evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
12	Poland	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Poland provided all economic indicators for 2009-2011 at the national totals and segment level. For 2008 the only variable provided is production by specie.. Turnover and sales by specie covered all aquaculture production; while economic variables were collected and reported only for marine aquaculture. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Poland is required to collect and report only marine aquaculture for DCF. FAO and Eurostat data refers to total volume and value of aquaculture production for human consumption.	It is collected what is mandatory, so acceptable	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
33	Poland	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Some missing data due to confidentiality issues . DCF vessel tonnage significantly over-reported in 2008 compared to fleet register. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	2008 DCF data are correct the discrepancy caused by deep-sea vessel that entered fleet after January the 1st	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
50	Poland	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	Table A, catch: discards information for cod only for years 2004-2010, (for 2011 herring, sprat and flounder and for 2012 for cod, flounder, perch, plaice and turbot). No information on uptake of special conditions in 2012, except in Table E, landings by rectangle. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	The discards data collection and the estimates of cod discards have been done routinely on national level since the end of nineties of the last century. It was arranged within of EU funded on-board observer sea sampling programmes: EU project no 96/002 IBSSP „International Baltic Sea Sampling Program for Commercial Fishing Fleets”, EU project no 98/024 IBSSP II „International Baltic Sea Sampling Program II” – both focused on cod. The data was then used as a standard by the ICES Baltic Fisheries Assessment Working (WGBFAS) to estimate cod discards level (only cod discard has been estimated by the WGBFAS) primarily in order to evaluate unaccounted fishing mortality of cod. Since the Polish EU accession (2004) the national database was set in order to handle data for other species. This database was under constant development over the years and, finally, since 2010 data on other demersal species have been provided to STECF and since 2011 all other species available in the database as well. Special condition information are not available from administrative sources (logbooks).	cannot be evaluated (by economist)	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
69	Poland	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	“Imputed value of unpaid labour” was not provided (all years). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	To estimate the imputed value of unpaid labour Poland use the methodology proposed by STECF-EWG 11-18 Expert Working Group of. October 17 – 21, 2011 (Salerno, Italy). This has been implemented in 2013.	For the future acceptable, not for the past, as it was obviously really not provided	No justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
374	Poland	ICES	Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (trt-bal)Sea trout in Subdivisions 22–32 (Baltic Sea) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/trt-bal.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/trt-bal.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Misreporting Description: There are doubts on the accuracy of the reported landings. [...]Salmon catches are to some extent misreported as trout.	Poland makes continuous effort to decrease the misreporting. There is improving fisheries control made by inspectors confirmed by audit of EC, which will give more realistic number of salmon reported as a sea trout. Misreporting can happen mainly to offshore catch while coastal catch is reported properly. Presently, ICES WGBAST elaborated and applied methodology on use the Polish data obtained from DCF observed cruises in order to assess the real number of salmon and sea trout caught in Polish offshore fishery and it works. According to ICES WGBAST, the number of salmon misreported as a sea trout has decreased substantially comparing to previous years.	OK, MS efforts on improved reporting are acknowledged.	MS effort to use fisheries control and DCF observed fishing trips to improve the reporting quality is highly acknowledged.	Satisfactory



Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	Pre-screening comments	EWG comment	STECF EWG - evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
375	Poland	ICES	Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (sal-22-31)Salmon in Subdivisions 22–31 (Main Basin and Gulf of Bothnia) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sal-2231.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sal-2231.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Misreporting Description: A considerable amount of the total catch consists of unreported catches (Table 8.4.13.4), the estimation of which introduces uncertainties in the assessment. Catch per unit effort in the Polish offshore fishery and deviations in the reported species composition between Polish and other countries' longline fisheries indicate substantial misreporting of salmon as sea trout in the Polish fishery. Even though the magnitude of the misreporting has likely decreased, it still constitutes a significant catch. Internationally coordinated attempts at resolving the issue have occurred in the last year, but further progress is still needed.	Poland makes continuous effort to decrease the misreporting. There is improving fisheries control made by inspectors confirmed by audit of EC, which will give more realistic number of salmon reported as a sea trout. Misreporting can happen mainly to offshore catch while coastal catch is reported properly. Presently, ICES WGBAST elaborated and applied methodology on use the Polish data obtained from DCF observed cruises in order to assess the real number of salmon and sea trout caught in Polish offshore fishery and it works. According to ICES WGBAST, the number of salmon misreported as a sea trout has decreased substantially comparing to previous years.	OK, MS efforts on improved reporting are acknowledged.	MS effort to use fisheries control and DCF observed fishing trips to improve the reporting quality is highly acknowledged.	Satisfactory

**Data Transmission 2013 - Portugal**

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
13	Portugal	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	The following parameters were not submitted for 2008: wages and salaries; imputed value of unpaid labour; repair and maintenance; capital costs; extraordinary costs; capital value; employment (except total employees) See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	The Portuguese National Programme stated that data was to be collected for Aquaculture starting 2009, in line with the derogation for Eurostat. Some data was already available at the Directorate-General, but it was provided on a voluntary basis	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
34	Portugal	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Some minor missing data at the fleet segment level. Recreational catch data not submitted. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	The pilot survey to touristic operators show low levels of catches for sea bass, of about 400 kg. This level of activity doesn't show significant impact on the stock, so no further studies were made.	The MS has to refer to an approved derogation in order not to sample the recreational fishery. It is not possible to judge if "minor missing data " is important or not.	Unsatisfactory
51	Portugal	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	Table A, catch: age data provided for black scabbard fish only. Table C, effort by rectangle: no data for vessels < 10m in length. Table E, landings by rectangle: no data for vessels < 10m in length. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Vessels with less than 10 m don't have logbook and data is collected from sales notes. The resolution of the sales note doesn't allow to collect data by rectangle. We observe that this vessels, according to appendix II needs to be collected with a resolution of FAO level 3 only and, as so, out of scope with the Regulation.	MS provided reasonable justification	NA
70	Portugal	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity has been provided for one of the two mandatory years (i.e. 2011). However, these data were provided for years 2008 (mandatory) and 2010 (requested but not mandatory). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Accordingly to Decision 2010/93/EU, IV.B.2.2, "For enterprises that carry out fish processing but not as a main activity, it is mandatory to collect the following data, in the first year of each programming period...". Accordingly to the national programme, in 2011, the first year of the programming period, we collected data related to 2010.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
309	Portugal	ICES	Ecoregion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian waters Stock: (anp-8c9a)White anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius) in Divisions VIIIc and IXa Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/anp-8c9a.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/anp-8c9a.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve sampling Description: The stock is assessed using a length-based model, so length sampling is key information for this stock. Due to the broad size range of the species the length sampling should be increased to ensure adequate data for the assessment.	Portugal has already increased the sampling, and is also conducting a Pilot Study directed to anglerfish. The way of integrate both samples is understudy and will be discussed in the next ICES Data Collection Working Group (DCWK Anglerfish) in November 2014	Seems that the MS has responded to the Data call	Satisfactory
311	Portugal	ICES	Ecoregion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian waters Stock: (anb-8c9a)Black-bellied anglerfish (Lophius budegassa) in Divisions VIIIc and IXa Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/anb-8c9a.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/anb-8c9a.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve sampling Description: Due to the broad size range of the species, length sampling should be increased to ensure adequate data for future development of improved assessment methods. Comments:	Portugal has already increased the sampling, and is also conducting a Pilot Study directed to anglerfish. The way of integrate both samples is understudy and will be discussed in the next ICES Data Collection Working Group (DCWK Anglerfish) in November 2014	Seems that the MS has responded to the Data call	Satisfactory

Data Transmission 2013 - Portugal

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
313	Portugal	ICES	Ecoregion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian waters Stock: (hke-soth)Hake in Divisions VIIIc and IXa (Southern stock) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hke-soth.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hke-soth.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission - Lack of survey information used in the analytical assessment Description: The trawl survey (PtGFS-WIBTS-Q4) used to calibrate the model was not performed in 2012. [...]These indices were used to calibrate the model without the years mentioned. Comments: The survey didn't take place. That is the reason why ICES didn't get the data.	No action possible. None of the planned surveys in the Iberian waters was performed in 2012. Nation-wide budgetary and administrative constraints made the necessary reparations to R/V Noruega impossible, as well as the chartering of another research vessel. During 2013, and in the surveys already carried out in 2014, constraints have been overcome and survey data collection is being achieved as planned.	Seems that the MS has responded to the Data call	Satisfactory
314	Portugal	ICES	Ecoregion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian waters Stock: (hke-soth)Hake in Divisions VIIIc and IXa (Southern stock) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hke-soth.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hke-soth.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission - Lack of commercial tunning fleet used in the analytical assessment Description: [...]The LPUE (P-TR), also used to calibrate the model, was not updated in 2011 and 2012. These indices were used to calibrate the model without the years mentioned.	Due to incomplete logbook data (mostly due to the transition period from the paper logbooks to electronic logbooks), it was not possible to estimate the CPUE according to the rules established in the Benchmark. The issue is still being addressed and has not been entirely resolved. Further action is planned for the second half of 2014 to resolve this issue in future and homogenize CPUE standardization procedures for several ICES WG that require the same source data.	Seems that the MS has responded to the Data call	Satisfactory
315	Portugal	ICES	Ecoregion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian waters Stock: (hom-south)Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Division IXa (Southern stock) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom-soth.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom-soth.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission - Lack of survey information used in the analytical assessment Description: There was no survey index for 2012 from the Portuguese survey due to engine problems, so this index was not included in the assessment. Comments: The survey didn't take place, due to engine problems. That is the reason why ICES didn't get the data.	No action possible. None of the planned surveys in the Iberian waters was performed in 2012. Nation-wide budgetary and administrative constraints made the necessary reparations to R/V Noruega impossible, as well as the chartering of another research vessel. During 2013, and in the surveys already carried out in 2014, constraints have been overcome and survey data collection is being achieved as planned.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond to the Data call	Satisfactory
316	Portugal	ICES	Ecoregion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian waters Stock: (sar-south)Sardine in Divisions VIIIc and IXa Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sar-soth.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sar-soth.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission - Lack of survey information used in the assessment Description: [...] lack of an acoustic index for 2012 Comments: The survey didn't take place, due to engine problems. That is the reason why ICES didn't get the data.	No action possible. None of the planned surveys in the Iberian waters was performed in 2012. Nation-wide budgetary and administrative constraints made the necessary reparations to R/V Noruega impossible, as well as the chartering of another research vessel. During 2013, and in the surveys already carried out in 2014, constraints have been overcome and survey data collection is being achieved as planned.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond to the Data call	Satisfactory
388	Portugal	NAFO	Biological information (Sex, Length, Age)	Missing data for: 3M American Plaice	Portuguese length composition has been presented in the Portuguese Research Report (NAFO SCS Doc). Data is collected by sex but is provided together. Portugal is in charge of produce the American plaice ALK of the Flemish Cap Survey and the results has been presented in the NAFO SCR Doc. The ALK used in the assessment is the ALK of the Flemish Cap Groundfish Survey.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond to the Data call. To be double check by NAFO.	NA

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
14	Romania	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Romania didn't provide data for 2008. Number of enterprises by size category, employment indicators and total sales volume by segment are missing for 2011. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Romanian NP has begun in 2009 and so that 2008 is not covered. Regarding the number of enterprises by size category, employment indicators and total sales volume by segment, unfortunately, due to human error, was omitted to submit the data although the total values of these indicators was submitted. The adjustment was made, and in May - June 2014, when we will upload the 2012 data for aquaculture, we will upload again the correct/up-dated data 2011 year on JRC server.	Insufficient justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
35	Romania	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Capital values and investments data not submitted for 2008-2010. Capacity data under-reported for several years. Missing and data inconsistencies, significant inter-annual variations See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Romania up dated data for the irerespective years. Data has been transmitted in 08/04/2014, uploaded on JRC server.	Insufficient justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
71	Romania	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: "subsidies" (2008, 2009 and 2011); "extraordinary costs, net" (all years). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	In 2008, 2009, 2011 processing units in Romania did not have subsidies. In 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 were not recorded/declared by operators extraordinary costs for the processing industry. So, for both variables the value is equal to zero.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
84	Romania	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	Table A missing data from 2005-2007, Table B landings in tons missing 2006-2009, landings at length missing 2005-2006. Table C discards and Table D effort missing 2005-2007. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Romanian National Datta Collection Program started in 2008; as per the Annual Reports sent to the EC-DG MARE we stated this fact every year.	The implementation of Romanian National Data Collection Program started in 2008. No data have been collected before	Satisfactory
397	Romania	GFCM	Task 1 1 Fleet and area variables	No data provided	Romanian vessels records have been transmitted in 3 July 2013 (confirmation by DeRossi, Federico ) and also have been transmitted on 23.05.2014.	GFCM should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	NA
403	Romania	GFCM	Task 1 2 Main resource and activity components variables per Operational Units	No data provided	Data has been transmitted in 23.05.2014.	GFCM should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	NA
409	Romania	GFCM	Task 1 3 Economic component variables	No data provided	Data has been transmitted in 23.05.2014.	GFCM should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	NA
419	Romania	GFCM	Task 1 4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycatch	No data provided	Data has been transmitted in 23.05.2014	GFCM should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	NA
428	Romania	GFCM	Task 1 5 Provisional biological parameters	No data provided	Biological parameters have been transmitted annually by scientists at GFCM stock assessment meetings.	GFCM should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	NA

Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	Pre-screening comments	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
Slovenia	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	DCF vessel tonnage and engine power under-reported in 2012 compared to fleet register. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	In years 2012 and 2013 Slovenia performed the measure of permanent cessation of fishing vessels under the EFF. In 2012 6 vessels were permanently removed from the fishing fleet and 2 vessels were removed in 2013. With the implementation of the measure permanent cessation of fishing activities Slovenia reduced the capacity of the fishing fleet for 397.75 GT and 2.106,88 kW. The data that have been sent to the JRC are correct and in order.	Justification appears sensible. FR data of 2013 as listed in coverage report are very similar to data submitted for 2012 in data call. Discrepancy appears to be an end-of-the-year problem.	OK. MS provided reasonable explanation	Satisfactory
Slovenia	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: "subsidies" (2009 and 2011). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	In 2009 and 2011 there were no subsidies in the Slovenian fisheries processing industry.	OK	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
Slovenia	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	No MEDITS data for 2013 and TE file was submitted but contained no age readings. No submission of Medits data in response to the second deadline See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	We have submitted all data including MEDITS data at the first deadline. Nobody in Slovenia is able to read the otholiths of Mullus barbatus.	Slovenian NP planned to provide ALKs only for anchovy and sardine. The MEDITS protocol plans age reading obligations for several species. If MS is not able to do them, bilateral agreements shall be established with foreign MS Croatia or Italy.	In general, MS should try to fully comply with the request of the end users. The end user however, should also take care of the data availability following the Data presentation chapter in the NP proposal. Slovenian NP planned to provide ALKs only for anchovy and sardine. The MEDITS protocol plans age reading obligations for several species. If MS is not able to do them, bilateral agreements could be established with foreign MS. MS should try to improve for the future the work regarding the age reading.	NA
Slovenia	GFCM	Task 1 1 Fleet and area variables	No data provided	Our database system is designed to fulfill requirements of the DCF. And all data are processed in accordance with the DCF. GFCM Task 1 represents completely different approach to data collection (different segmentation, different operational units, different calculations). For enabling us to fulfill the demands of the Task 1 it requires a lot of manual work with the data and/or upgrading of the database from the national budget. Since the national resources are very limited and our staff is full time employed with other tasks, we didn't reported the data for Task 1. Please take in the consideration also that our administrative capacity is very limited and our fisheries sector is very small, on the other hand our obligations are the same like for the large fisheries sectors and countries with bigger administrative capacity. However until the end of May 2014 we will provide to the GFCM all the data for TASK 1 including the missing data.		In general, the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. It seems that the MS will try to respond, as much as possible, to the data call. There after end user should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	Unsatisfactory
Slovenia	GFCM	Task 1 2 Main resource and activity components variables per Operational Units	No data provided	Our database system is designed to fulfill requirements of the DCF. And all data are processed in accordance with the DCF. GFCM Task 1 represents completely different approach to data collection (different segmentation, different operational units, different calculations). For enabling us to fulfill the demands of the Task 1 it requires a lot of manual work with the data and/or upgrading of the database from the national budget. Since the national resources are very limited and our staff is full time employed with other tasks, we didn't reported the data for Task 1. Please take in the consideration also that our administrative capacity is very limited and our fisheries sector is very small, on the other hand our obligations are the same like for the large fisheries sectors and countries with bigger administrative capacity. However until the end of May 2014 we will provide to the GFCM all the data for TASK 1 including the missing data.		In general, the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. It seems that the MS will try to respond, as much as possible, to the data call. There after end user should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	Unsatisfactory

Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	Pre-screening comments	EWG Comments	STECF-EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
Slovenia	GFCM	Task 1 3 Economic component variables	No data provided	Our database system is designed to fulfill requirements of the DCF. And all data are processed in accordance with the DCF. GFCM Task 1 represents completely different approach to data collection (different segmentation, different operational units, different calculations). For enabling us to fulfill the demands of the Task 1 it requires a lot of manual work with the data and/or upgrading of the database from the national budget. Since the national resources are very limited and our staff is full time employed with other tasks, we didn't reported the data for Task 1. Please take in the consideration also that our administrative capacity is very limited and our fisheries sector is very small, on the other hand our obligations are the same like for the large fisheries sectors and countries with bigger administrative capacity. However until the end of May 2014 we will provide to the GFCM all the data for TASK 1 including the missing data.		In general, the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. It seems that the MS will try to respond, as much as possible, to the data call. There after end user should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	Unsatisfactory
Slovenia	GFCM	Task 1 4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycatch	No data provided	Our database system is designed to fulfill requirements of the DCF. And all data are processed in accordance with the DCF. GFCM Task 1 represents completely different approach to data collection (different segmentation, different operational units, different calculations). For enabling us to fulfill the demands of the Task 1 it requires a lot of manual work with the data and/or upgrading of the database from the national budget. Since the national resources are very limited and our staff is full time employed with other tasks, we didn't reported the data for Task 1. Please take in the consideration also that our administrative capacity is very limited and our fisheries sector is very small, on the other hand our obligations are the same like for the large fisheries sectors and countries with bigger administrative capacity. However until the end of May 2014 we will provide to the GFCM all the data for TASK 1 including the missing data.	Not acceptable. According to 2012 AR, 18 trips were sampled by MS, with sampling of retained and discarded parts of the catches for anchovy and sardine. Data to be provided by MS.	In general, the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. According to 2012 AR, 18 trips were sampled by MS, with sampling of retained and discarded parts of the catches for anchovy and sardine. It seems that the MS will try to respond, as much as possible, to the data call. There after end user should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	Unsatisfactory
Slovenia	GFCM	Task 1 5 Provisional biological parameters	No data provided	Our database system is designed to fulfill requirements of the DCF. And all data are processed in accordance with the DCF. GFCM Task 1 represents completely different approach to data collection (different segmentation, different operational units, different calculations). For enabling us to fulfill the demands of the Task 1 it requires a lot of manual work with the data and/or upgrading of the database from the national budget. Since the national resources are very limited and our staff is full time employed with other tasks, we didn't reported the data for Task 1. Please take in the consideration also that our administrative capacity is very limited and our fisheries sector is very small, on the other hand our obligations are the same like for the large fisheries sectors and countries with bigger administrative capacity. However until the end of May 2014 we will provide to the GFCM all the data for TASK 1 including the missing data.	Not acceptable for stocks variables. Slovenian NP planned to provide ALKs only for anchovy and sardine and AR is reporting that data. MS should provide at least data on anchovy and sardine.	In general, the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Under Module III.C and III.E of the current DCF, MS is collecting the request biological data. It seems that the MS will try to respond, as much as possible, to the data call. There after end user should confirm if the requested data have been received and the time of transmission	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
15	Spain	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	Data has been submitted for all economic parameters for years 2008-2011. Turnover by species was provided for 2008-2011 but sales volume as well as livestock volume was missing for 2008-2010. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Information sources provide data from heterogeneous measures volume. We did not have the coefficients of transformation to go from the number of units, which come some productions, to weight in tonnes. This homogenization is needed to add the partial yields and obtain total. The above coefficients were collected in the survey from 2011.	Insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
37	Spain	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Landings data not submitted for all years with the exception of landings weight submitted for 2012. Effort data not submitted for all years requested. Energy consumption figures not provided for all years. Estimated fleet depreciated value submitted only for 2011. Significant amount of other missing data at fleet segment level. Capacity data for 2013 not submitted. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Energy consumption are included in the annual economic survey conducted in Spain. Initially they were not sent due to a confusion because they are included with the transversal variables. As soon as it was clarified all energy consumptions were submitted in the JRC web. Data from the value of capital (depreciated replacement value and depreciated historical value) began to calculate based on data from 2011, previously we have not the information required for the calculation. In reference to capacity data for 2013, at the date of the data call it is impossible to know	Insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery. However, not all listed failures refer to data which are mandatory to be collected (e.g. 2013 capacity data, 2012 data)	Unsatisfactory
52	Spain	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	No data for 2010 and 2011. Table E, landings by rectangle: no data for 2003-2011. <u>No information on special conditions in 2012 data</u> . Vessel length categories, allowed activity, fishing activity and fishing capacity were not identified in data from 2002-2008 in areas 8c and 9a. Data for years before 2010: no EU/RFMO/COAST identification for ICES Subarea 10 and Divisions 7j, 7k, 8d, 8e, 8b, 14b and CECAF areas 34.1.2 and 34.2.0. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	No data before 2012 were uploaded because the action plan accorded between Commission and Spain for reviewed the systems for those years. Respect to "No Information on special conditions in 2012 data": There were no information on special conditions in 2012 because no Spanish vessel asked to be excluded from the effort regime, therefore there were no vessels under special conditions, all the vessels were under the effort regime of the recovery plan. This is explained in the report "Evaluation of Fishing Effort Regimes in European Waters - Part 1 (STECF-13-13)", page 480, first paragraph, last line: "In 2012 there is no Spanish effort under special	1st part not acceptable, unless the mentioned "action plan" provides any derogation (plan not accessible for prescreening) "Special conditions" issue: seems ok, but PScr is not in depth familiar with the issue. "Vessel length categories..." - no explanation for failure (unless the issue refers to "Special conditions" as well)	Unsatisfactory
73	Spain	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	The following economic variables were not provided: "male employees" and "female employees" (the variable "total employees" was provided, although the delivery was not mandatory); "imputed value of unpaid labour"; "depreciation of capital"; "debt"; "total value of assets". No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity has been provided for one of the two mandatory years (i.e. 2011). However, what requested was provided for years 2008 and 2009. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	We provided the data offered by the source of information (INE). We are working to have employment data by gender and of the allocation of the value of non-employees, until 2011. For 2012 data are sent with employment data by sex and the allocation of the value of non-wage earners. For other information, the necessary modifying for their achievement would have to do in the structural statistics of which leave these variables, while you are working to try to get this information from the commercial register.	Insufficient explanation for failure of data delivery. The collection and the delivery of the data are mandatory under DCF, regardless of Eurostat regulations.	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
82	Spain	JRC/DG MARE	Med and BS	Spain was late on both deadline submissions. Fishing effort before 2009 is missing for all GSAs (Table D) In Tables A, B and C before 2009 there seems to be one third of under-reporting of the number of species recorded in subsequent years .. Discards at age (Table A) and discards at length (Table C) data is incomplete in some years before 2009. The second upload of Medits data was after the second deadline and the second STECF meeting, Medits TE files contain no age readings. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	In the National Programme of Spain it is explained that the time necessary to prepare the data is 6 months after their collection. In the case of the DG Mare data call, the date to send the data will be 1st of July. In the tables A, B and C before 2009 the list of species is smaller because following the Regulation 1639/2001 and the ammended 1581/2004 the length sampling was focused only in this species. In the DCF (2009-present) the sampling squeme changed from the species based sampling to the concurrent sampling. Discards at age (Table A) and discards at length (Table C) were collected in a triannual basis, following the Regulation 1639/2001 and the ammended 1581/2004 of the Commission. The second upload of Medits was made 6 months after their collection, following the Spanish National	Seems that the MS has responded according to the EU regulations. Data missing are related to the requirements of the DCF before 2009: there was not the obligation to collect requested effort parameters. Concerning surveys, JRC should consider RCM Med&BS recommendation on delay for having effective avaiability and access to data collected.	Satisfactory
190	Spain	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions VIIIa,b,d (Northern stock)(hke-nrtn) WKSOUTH	Delay: after deadline	Spain received the data call about hke-nrth on 11 October 2013. Deadline was November 11th. <u>12 November 2013</u> : Spain started the Intercatch uploading process that had many problems. <u>13 November 2013</u> : a) Spain offered the stock coordinator send the data files by email while the uploading process was not finished. She said no because, due to other member states problems, she had postponed the download of the data until next week. b) Spain discovered that the uploading problem was that the metiers related to the hke-nrth stock were not included in Intercatch and contacted ICES,	According to 2012 AR, data have been collected. But impossible for the pre-screener to verify if they were effectively sent at the date mentioned by MS. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	NA
191	Spain	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Division IIIa and Subareas IV and VI(ang-ivvi) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline after EG	All the files were transmitted to ICES and chairs on 9 th May 2013 as official data by the General Secretary for Fisheries (National Correspondent Unit). Due to the high workload in this time of the year with several ICES WGs (WGHMM, etc) there was an oversight and this information was sent with a delay	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. Data call deadline should try to match the NP from relevant MS.	NA
279	Spain	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Megrim (Lepidorhombus spp) in Divisions IVa and VIa(meg-4a6a) WGCSE	Missing data: Landings data Discards data Delay: after deadline after EG	All the files were transmitted to ICES and chairs on 9 th May 2013 as official data by General Secretary for Fisheries (National Correspondent Unit). Due to the high workload in this time of the year with several ICES WGs (WGHMM, etc) there was an oversight and this information was sent with a delay	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. Data call deadline should try to match the NP from relevant MS.	NA
308	Spain	ICES	Ecoregion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian waters Stock: (ane-pore)Anchovy in Division IXa Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ane-pore.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ane-pore.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission - Lack of survey information used in the analytical assessment Description: No survey estimates in Division IXa South were available in 2012 [...]. Comments: The survey didn't took place. That is the reason why ICES didn't get the data.	These are not comments about supposed data transmission fails. These are comments about technical aspects of the sampling. They must be made inside the questions about the corresponding Annual Technical Report (Commission-Member State ping-pong process). The standard summer acoustic survey <i>ECOCADIZ (not financed by the DCR)</i> was not conducted in 2012 by the IEO due to lack of funding. In order to overcome this lack of information on the pelagic stocks, the Spanish Fisheries Secretariat funded that year an autumn acoustic survey, the <i>ECOCADIZ-RECLUTAS 1112 (10<sup>th</sup> – 27<sup>th</sup> November 2012)</i> , aimed at the acoustic assessment of Gulf of	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call	satisfactory



Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
310	Spain	ICES	Ecoregion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian waters Stock: (anp-8c9a)White anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius) in Divisions VIIIc and IXa Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/anp-8c9a.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/anp-8c9a.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve sampling Description: The stock is assessed using a length-based model, so length sampling is key information for this stock. Due to the broad size range of the species the length sampling should be increased to ensure adequate data for the assessment.	These are not comments about supposed data transmission fails. These are comments about technical aspects of the sampling. They must be made inside the questions about the corresponding Annual Technical Report (Commission-Member State ping-pong process). Spain does not agree with this comment. The anp-8c9a length sampling quality is the standard in Europe. In 2013 we have sampled 10% of the trips for the most important metiers, which is very high level.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage in increasing the sampling in the future.	satisfactory
312	Spain	ICES	Ecoregion: Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian waters Stock: (anb-8c9a)Black-bellied anglerfish (Lophius budegassa) in Divisions VIIIc and IXa Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/anb-8c9a.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/anb-8c9a.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve sampling Description: Due to the broad size range of the species, length sampling should be increased to ensure adequate data for future development of improved assessment methods. Comments:	These are not comments about supposed data transmission fails. These are comments about technical aspects of the sampling. They must be made inside the questions about the corresponding Annual Technical Report (Commission-Member State ping-pong process). Spain does not agree with this comment. The anb-8c9a length sampling quality is the standard in Europe. In 2013 we have sampled 10% of the trips for the most important metiers, which is very high level.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage in increasing the sampling in the future.	satisfactory
322	Spain	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ang-78ab)Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b,d Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ang-78ab.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ang-78ab.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards Description: The increase in discarding in recent years has resulted in uncertainties in recent catch values.  Reliable estimates of discards are not available. The increase in discarding may be related to larger year classes recruiting in the fishery. Information from research surveys indicates an increase in smaller fish on the fishing grounds in recent years. Discarding is also known to be partly dependent on market conditions and quota restrictions. Efforts should be made to obtain reliable estimates of total catches in order to improve the assessment.	These are not comments about supposed data transmission fails. These are comments about technical aspects of the sampling. They must be made inside the questions about the corresponding Annual Technical Report (Commission-Member State ping-pong process). Spanish Anglerfish discards series since 2003 is sent updated <u>each year</u> to the WGBIE (former WGHMM) since 2007, but systematically the Working Group finds deficiencies in the input data. WGHMM 2013 also mentioned that after an extensive analysis of discard data by WKFLAT 2012, discard estimates were considered not to be precise enough to be used in the assessment. Spain does not agree at all about that technical consideration, discard data are correct and with good quality. The rejection of discards	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to obtain reliable estimation of discards.	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
325	Spain	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ang-78ab)Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Divisions VIIb-k and VIIIa,b,d Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ang-78ab.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ang-78ab.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Improved sampling of length composition and accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment. An ageing exchange study for L. piscatorius took place in 2011 to compare the different approaches that are used (otoliths and illicia). Improved sampling of length composition and accurate estimates of growth parameters are needed to facilitate the development of an analytical assessment.	These are not comments about supposed data transmission fails. These are comments about technical aspects of the sampling. They must be made inside the questions about the corresponding Annual Technical Report (Commission-Member State ping-pong process). Accurate estimates of growth parameters ( $L_{\infty}$ : 162.31; k: 0.088; t0:-0.894) for the Divisions VIIb-k of this stock of L. piscatorius were presented in the IEO study (Landa et al., 2013) and are available for the assessment of this stock using growth information. In addition to these growth parameters provided by IEO, it would useful to have also those from the other areas of this stock estimated by other European institutes for the stock assessment. Recommendation for an international collaborative study in age and growth of L. piscatorius was proposed by ICES (2014) and it could help improve. References: ICES. 2014. Report of	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call. MS to be encourage to improve age & growth data.	satisfactory
344	Spain	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (nep-16)Nephrops on Porcupine Bank (FU 16) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/Nep-VII-FU%2016.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/Nep-VII-FU%2016.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards sampling intensity Description: Discard observer coverage is low and should be increased, to sample the landings and any discards that might be occurring.	These are not comments about supposed data transmission fails. These are comments about technical aspects of the sampling. They must be made inside the questions about the corresponding Annual Technical Report (Commission-Member State ping-pong process). Sampling coverage is not specific for Nephrops. Around 300 hauls and 10 to 12 ships are sampled each year for discards estimations in ICES Subarea VII. Spain does not agree about the supposed low coverage of discard sampling. A big quantity of information about FU 16 Nephrops was provided by Spain to the 2013 ICES Nephrops Benchmark (February), including discard rates and weight discard	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data call	satisfactory
376	Spain	ICCAT	Task 1: fleet characteristics	Missing data	Please, check this comment because this information is sent periodically by the Control Unit. Perhaps the problem is that it	End-user/Commission to double chekx about missing data.EG not able to coment.	NA
379	Spain	ICCAT	Task 2	Missing data for: ALB-AN, ALB-AS, ALB-MED, BFT-MED, BET-AT and SKJ-AE	Please, chech this comment because this information has been sent as usual. We have not comments from ICCAT about	End-user/Commission to double chekx about missing data.EG not able to coment.	NA
389	Spain	NAFO	Biological information (Sex, Length, Age)	Missing data for: 3M American Plaice	Fishery with TAC=0. This species was sampled in the international Flemish Cap Groundfish Survey and by observers on board. Achieved data of weight, sex-ratio an maturity@length transmitted in AR on Spanish Data Collection Programme 2012. Age data were performed by	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the Data cal. End-user/Commission to double chekx about missing data.	NA
392	Spain	IOTC	Longliners	No info on effort and length frequencies for any species but swordfish	We are checking this point	Seems that MS was in position to respond to the Data call but as not perform it properly.	unsatisfactory
393	Spain	IOTC	Purse seiners	No info at all on sharks	There are no data about sharks because they are collected by observers on board and the observers programme is cancelled since 2009 due to the insecurity provoked by piracy.	Seems that MS should be in position to respond to the Data call but as not perform it properly. MS to find a way to collect relevant data.	unsatisfactory
395	Spain	WCPFC	TASK II data (Aggregate catch/effort data) and TASK III (operational data)	Missing the NUMBERS OF FISH information (considered as "HIGH" priority for assessments) Missing the HOOKS . (An estimate of hooks was provided but actual "HOOKS" for each set should be provided, according to the requirements) Missing HOOKS BETWEEN FLOATS (considered as "LOW" priority for assessments although it is a requirement in the data provision rules)	This information is complicate to obtain from the official data	Seems that MS was in position to respond to the Data call but as not perform it properly.	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
411	Spain	GFCM	Task 1 3 Economic component variables	Partially completed (50%)	The variables sent are in relation to Comission Decision 2010/93.GFCM ask for information no stablished in the mencioned DecisionThe aggregation of the Task1 sent in 2013 was not correct. In May 2014 Spain sent to the GFCM the Task1 2013 completed	In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	Satisfactory
421	Spain	GFCM	Task 1 4 Catch and effort variables catch effort discard bycatch	Mostly completed (75%)	The aggregation of the Task1 sent in 2013 was not correct.In May 2014 Spain sent to the GFCM the Task1 2013 completed	In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	Satisfactory
430	Spain	GFCM	Task 1 5 Provisional biological parameters	Mostly completed (75%)	The aggregation of the Task1 sent in 2013 was not correct.In May 2014 Spain sent to the GFCM the Task1 2013 completed	In general the MS should try, conforming to the requirements of the DCF, to fully comply with the request of the end users. Nevertheless, it seems that the MS has responded as much as possible according to the data call	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
16	Sweden	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	No major deviations from the data call. FTE by gender by segment, which is optional for aquaculture data collection, was missing. The data set also covered aquaculture activities in fresh water. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Most of the data on aquaculture comes from registers. Collecting data on FTE by gender by segment separately has not been done so far.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
38	Sweden	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Capacity data for 2013 not submitted. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Data is not reported for 2013 since there is no possibility to do the segmentation, which by the DCF definition is built on how the vessels fish, before the end of the year.	OK. No failure.	Satisfactory
74	Sweden	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Values equal to zero: "extraordinary costs, net" (all years). See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	SE confirms that "extraordinary costs, net" are zero.	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
192	Sweden	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Dab in Subdivisions 22 - 32 (Baltic Sea)(dab-2232) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	Due to small landings of Dab, no biological sampling for landings are planned according to Swedish NP 2011-2013. Length distributions sampled in seasampling submitted in a separate document (as requested by WGBALFLAT). Intercatch requires mean individual weights for length data and could therefore not be used for lengths.	MS explanation is acceptable, MS landings of dab have been negligible in 2010-2012 according to WGBFAS 2013.	Satisfactory
193	Sweden	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 22 and 23(fle-2223) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	No biological sampling of landings of flounder in this area. Length distributions collected in sea sampling submitted in a separate document (as requested by WGBALFLAT). Intercatch requires mean individual weights for length data and could therefore not be used for lengths.	MS explanation is acceptable, MS landings of flounder have been 22 t in SD 22-23 in2012 according to WGBFAS 2013.	Satisfactory
194	Sweden	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder pelagic in Subdivisions 26 and 28(fle-2628) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings	Limited biological sampling of flounder in this area. Length distributions submitted in a separate document (as requested by WGBALFLAT). Intercatch requires mean individual weights for length data and could therefore not be used for lengths.	MS explanation is acceptable, MS landings of flounder have been 15 t in SD 26 and -28 in 2012 according to WGBFAS 2013.	Satisfactory
195	Sweden	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Flounder demersal in Subdivisions 27 and 29-32(fle-2732) WKBALFLAT	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards	No biological sampling of flounder in this area. Length distributions submitted in a separate document (as requested by WGBALFLAT). Intercatch requires mean individual weights for length data and could therefore not be used for lengths. Estimates of discards not possible since for main fishery in this area (gillnet) no discard sampling is done for this stock.	MS explanation is acceptable, MS does not perform the biological sampling of flounder in this area.	Satisfactory
196	Sweden	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions VIIIa,b,d (Northern stock)(hke-nrtn) WKSOUTH	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	Due to small landings of Hake, no biological sampling for landings are planned according to Swedish NP 2011-2013. Length distributions collected in sea sampling provided in a separate document. Intercatch requires mean individual weights for length data and could therefore not be used for lengths.	Sweden only has a small quota of hake in IIIa (<10% of Union TAC, ref. Reg. 43/2014) and negligible landings of the total stock. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
197	Sweden	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Subarea IV (North Sea) and Division IIIa West (Skagerrak)(had-34) WGNSSK	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	Due to small landings of haddock, no biological sampling of landings are planned according to Swedish NP 2011-2013.	Sweden has derogation for haddock and only small quota in IIIa and IV (<10% and 0.5% of Union TAC, ref. Reg. 43/2014) and negligible landings (IIIa: 209 of 2481 t, IV: 103 of 30379 t; WGNSSK 2013). Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
198	Sweden	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IIIa (Skagerak Kattegat, FU 3.4)(nep-3-4) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	The data was sent one day after deadline since quality checks of data was not taken place as planned. However, the delay in data delivery did not have any impact on the assessment work in WGNSSK.	Explanation acceptable	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
319	Sweden	ICES	Ecoregion: North Sea Stock: (spr-kask)Sprat in Division IIIa (Skagerrak – Kattegat) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/spr-kask_201303102249.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/spr-kask_201303102249.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Even though the sampling intensity conforms to the DCF regulation, it does not provide a good enough representation of the fishery catches for use in an analytical assessment. Sampling intensity of commercial catches should be increased.	Presently, there are more problem with the surveys indices than with the commercial catches for the assessment of this stock. Main reason is that the surveys cover only part of the sprat distribution, commercial catches show coastal aggregations in areas not covered by the survey. Overall, sampling intensity of Swedish commercial catches in IIIA reflects the amount of landings. In 2012 we could have done a better job in Q1 (approx 4 samples per 1000 t), while in Q4 (when 79% of SWE catches are concentrated) our sampling effort has been much higher compared to the other countries (approx 9 samples per 1000 t vs. an average of 4 samples collected by DNK and zero samples collected by NOR). As shown in table 9.2.3 of the 2013 HAWG report the level of sampling of the Swedish commercial catches is not the bottleneck for the assessment of this stock.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call. In this contxt it is irrelevant what other MS do and what might be right sampling intensity considering the stock situation. Nevertheless, it is good practice to adjust the sampling intensity to the actual requirements for the given situation.	unsatisfactory
317	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Ecoregion: North Sea Stock: (sol-kask)Sole in Division IIIa and Subdivisions 22–24 (Skagerrak, Kattegat, and the Belts) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sol-kask.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sol-kask.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Sampling of landings is complicated by the low total landings which are dispersed spatially. Comments: The problems of sampling intensity are due to the low landings.	Due to small landings of sole, no biological sampling of landings are planned according to Swedish NP 2011-2013.	Swedish landings of sole in Div. III and SD 22-24 have been 30 t (<10% of total). Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
372	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (cod-2532)Cod in Subdivisions 25–32 (Eastern Baltic Sea) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-2532_201304112231.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-2532_201304112231.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Ageing inconsistencies Description: Ageing problems are a concern for the quality of the assessment.	Ageing is one area of quality concerns important for the stock assessment of cod in the Baltic. Ageing discrepancies between countries have been recognised for a long time but the recent trend in growth rate may have increased the consequence of this problem. Large inconsistencies exist in age determinations for the Baltic cod stocks owing to the lack of clear growth rings in the otoliths. ICES has attempted to resolve these inconsistencies in age determinations for this stock, but no consensus was reached on the age determinations. A EU-funded study initiated in 2007 (project DECODE) has taken a different approach to delivering validated aging data for the assessment, but this method is not fully validated from tagging studies. The SSB index used to provide this year's advice (2014), being based on lengths, excludes the problem connected with age estimation, but as viewed only as an interim solution and the ageing problems needs to be resolved in order to generate an accepted analytical assessment.	MS effort to improve age determination quality is highly acknowledged.	Satisfactory
373	All countries exploring the stock	ICES	Ecoregion: Baltic Sea Stock: (fle-2232)Flounder in Subdivisions 22–32 (Baltic Sea) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/fle-2232_201304122320.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/fle-2232_201304122320.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Improve discards sampling Description: The uncertainty of the discard estimates is of concern. Discarding practices are controlled by factors such as market price and cod catches. Given the high variability in the discard ratios, estimating discards is very uncertain without an extensive sampling programme	The statement that discarding practices of flounder are controlled by factors such as market price and cod catches is of relevance. Also the statement that the high variability in the discard ratios, estimating discards is very uncertain without an extensive sampling programme. Discard data on flounder are collected in sea sampling on trawlers targeting cod, and follows the planned sampling level for that fishery. To increase sampling level due to flounder would just not be economically justifiable.	MS explanation is acceptable.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
17	United Kingdom	JRC/DG MARE	Aquaculture	UK didn't respect the deadline of the data call. During 2013 data call for aquaculture data UK provided data for 2011, the other part of the data set been imported from 2012 data call data base. Compared to 2012 data call the coverage of UK data (reference year 2011) improved, however most of indicators were still missing on the segment level. For DCF data, the following parameters were missing: Turnover 2008-2010 segment level; Subsidies and other income 2008-2011 segment level; Wages and salaries and other operating costs 2008-2010 segment level; Imputed value of unpaid labour 2009-2010, no data on the segment level for 2008-2011; Energy costs, raw material costs and repair and maintenance 2008-2010; Depreciation, financial costs net, Extraordinary costs net, net investments, debt, raw material volume 2008-2010, 2011 data provided only on national total level; Total value of assets no data on segment level; Total sales volume 2008-2010; Employment - no data on segment level; Number of enterprises by size category – no data on segment level. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	The UK is aware of the deficiencies in supply of aquaculture data including scope of collection, timeliness and quality. A pilot study was conducted in 2013 to determine DCF obligations could best be met. The pilot is being transitioned to full data collection to address the 2014 data call.	Insufficient justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
39	United Kingdom	JRC/DG MARE	Fleet economics	Capacity data for 2013 not submitted. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Total capacity was provided but figures by segment for 2013 only were omitted in error. The more detailed data were available as for the other years that were provided.	OK. No failure.	Satisfactory
53	United Kingdom	JRC/DG MARE	Effort	GBR (without Scotland) no data provided until during EWG 13-06. Data submitted to the upload facility only between EWG 13-06 and EWG 13-13. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Data were provided electronically in advance of the meeting. There was confusion caused by problems with FTP upload during the meeting. JRC agreed to delete this comment - see email chain	OK. MS provided reasonable justification	Satisfactory
75	United Kingdom	JRC/DG MARE	Processing	Although the data were submitted only one day after the deadline, the final figures uploaded after the conclusion of the STECF EWG 13-15 meetings. The following economic variables were not provided: "male employees" and "female employees" (also "total employees", which was requested although not mandatory, was not provided); "subsidies"; "extraordinary costs, net"; "other income". No information on enterprises carrying out fish processing not as a main activity. See: <a href="http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage">http://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/coverage</a>	Seafish will collect data on subsidies, other income, unpaid labour costs and extraordinary costs in the future and the survey form has been updated to reflect this. As work is already underway for the 2012 financial data survey, Seafish will ensure to contact processors who participate in the survey in order to obtain this additional data for reference year 2012.	Insufficient justification for failure of data delivery	Unsatisfactory
199	United Kingdom (Channel Island Guernsey)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Divisions VIIe-k (Celtic Sea cod)(cod-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Guernsey has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days after the deadline.	Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
200	United Kingdom (Channel Island Guernsey)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIe (Western Channel)(ple-echw) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Guernsey has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days after the deadline.	Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
201	United Kingdom (Channel Island Guernsey)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIe (Western Channel)(sol-echw) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Guernsey has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days after the deadline.	Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
202	United Kingdom (Channel Island Guernsey)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIe-k(whg-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Guernsey has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days after the deadline.	Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
203	United Kingdom (Channel Island Guernsey)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(pol-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Guernsey has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days after the deadline.	Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
204	United Kingdom (Channel Island Jersey)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Divisions VIIe-k (Celtic Sea cod)(cod-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Jersey has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days after the deadline.	Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
205	United Kingdom (Channel Island Jersey)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIe (Western Channel)(ple-echw) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Jersey has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days after the deadline.	Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
206	United Kingdom (Channel Island Jersey)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIe (Western Channel)(sol-echw) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Jersey has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days after the deadline.	Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
207	United Kingdom (Channel Island Jersey)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(pol-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Jersey has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days after the deadline.	Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
208	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Division IIIa and Subareas IV and VI(ang-ivvi) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official data call deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
209	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Divisions VIIe-k (Celtic Sea cod)(cod-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
210	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(cod-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
211	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(cod-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
212	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Divisions VIIb,c,e-k(had-7b-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
213	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(had-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
214	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(had-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
215	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Megrim (Lepidorhombus spp) in Divisions IVa and VIa(meg-4a6a) WGCSE	Missing data: Discards data Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory



Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
216	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIb,c,j,k (Porcupine Bank, FU 16)(nep-16) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings	No data collected so none to report.	Nephrops FU16 not planned in MS NP 2012. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
217	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIb,c (West of Ireland)(ple-7b-c) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
218	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Divisions VIIh-k (Southwest of Ireland)(ple-7h-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
219	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Divisions VIIf,g (Celtic Sea)(ple-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
220	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIe (Western Channel)(ple-echw) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
221	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(ple-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
222	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Divisions VIIh-k (Southwest of Ireland)(sol-7h-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
223	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Divisions VIIf, g (Celtic Sea)(sol-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
224	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIe (Western Channel)(sol-echw) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
225	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(sol-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
226	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIe-k(whg-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
227	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(whg-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
228	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(whg-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
229	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(pol-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 2 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
230	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Subarea IV (North Sea), Division VIII (Eastern Channel) and IIIa West (Skagerrak)(cod-347d) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 5 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Five days are serious but not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
231	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Subarea IV (North Sea) and Division IIIa West (Skagerrak)(had-34) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 5 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Five days are serious but not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
232	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVa (Norwegian Deeps, FU 32)(nep-32) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	All Nephrops data for IV are uploaded in the same file, so I have no idea why FU32 is reporting data as being late.	Nephrops FU32 not planned in MS NP 2012. Only FU05 to FU10 are identified in the NP for North Sea. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
233	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division IVbc (Botney Gut - Silver Pit, FU 5)(nep-5) WGNSSK	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Discards data Age or length data for discards	No data collected so none to report.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
234	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIII (Eastern Channel)(ple-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 5 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Five days are serious but not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
235	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice Subarea IV (North Sea)(ple-nsea) WGNSSK	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards Delay: after deadline	ditto. Stock is not sampled for age or length. Most landings are made into overseas ports and landings cannot be sampled.	According to 2012 AR, 23749 plaices were measured by UK in subarea IV (landings + discards, table III.C.5). MS to provide data. Bi-lateral agreements (contracts) should be established if significant landings are made	Unsatisfactory
236	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Saithe in Subarea IV (North Sea) Division IIIa West (Skagerrak) and Subarea VI (West of Scotland and Rockall)(sai-3a46) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 5 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Five days are serious but not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
237	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIII (Eastern Channel)(sol-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 5 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Five days are serious but not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
238	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)(sol-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 5 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Five days are serious but not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
239	United Kingdom (England)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting Subarea IV (North Sea) & Division VIII (Eastern Channel)(whg-47d) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Deadline missed by 5 days! A series of deadlines/milestones are set by CEFAS 5 months prior to the working group with a final 'submission' deadline set 3-4 weeks before the WG commences. This deadline was met but was just after the official datacall deadline (which was set just 2 months prior to the WG).	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Five days are serious but not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
240	United Kingdom (Isle of Man)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(cod-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The Isle of Man has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
241	United Kingdom (Isle of Man)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(had-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The Isle of Man has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days after the deadline.	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
242	United Kingdom (Isle of Man)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(ple-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The Isle of Man has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days after the deadline.	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
243	United Kingdom (Isle of Man)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(sol-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The Isle of Man has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days after the deadline.	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
244	United Kingdom (Isle of Man)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(whg-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The Isle of Man has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days after the deadline.	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
245	United Kingdom (Isle of Man)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(pol-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	The Isle of Man has never supplied data directly to ICES working groups and their landings data has always been requested by UK(England). Their data is uploaded to Intercatch by UK(England). Data was uploaded to Intercatch just 2 days after the deadline.	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Two days are not crucial and particularly if the problems are communicated to the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
246	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions VIIIa,b,d (Northern stock)(hke-nrtn) WKSOUTH	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Age or length data for discards	Data call for WKSOUTH not received. Landings and discard data provided for Hake in VII under WGBIE	Based on the information ready available, it is impossible to sort out who to blame in this situation.	NA

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
247	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Division IIIa and Subareas IV and VI(ang-ivvi) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
248	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Divisions VIIe-k (Celtic Sea cod)(cod-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
249	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(cod-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
250	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(cod-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
251	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Divisions VIIb,c,e-k(had-7b-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
252	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(had-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
253	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(had-scow) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
254	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Megrim (Lepidorhombus spp) in Divisions IVa and VIa(meg-4a6a) WGCSE	Missing data: Discards data Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
255	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIa (South Minch, FU 12)(nep-12) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
256	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIa (Firth of Clyde + Sound of Jura, FU 13)(nep-13) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
257	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIa (Irish Sea East, FU 14)(nep-14) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
258	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIa (Irish Sea West, FU 15)(nep-15) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
260	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIg (Celtic Sea, the Smalls, FU 22)(nep-22) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
261	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Divisions VIIf,g (Celtic Sea)(ple-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
262	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(ple-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
263	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Divisions VIIf, g (Celtic Sea)(sol-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planed with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
264	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(sol-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
265	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIe-k(whg-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
266	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(whg-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
267	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIa (West of Scotland)(whg-scov) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
268	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Grey gurnard in Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa-c and e-k (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(gug-celt) WGCSE	Missing data: Landings data Delay: after deadline	All relevant and mandatory data available uploaded. Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
269	United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(pol-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Initial upload to InterCatch before deadline. Supplementary information re uploaded. Improved reporting / update facilities required in InterCatch to track submission dates	Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
270	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Hake in Division IIIa, Subareas IV, VI and VII and Divisions VIIIa,b,d (Northern stock)(hke-nrtn) WKSOUTH	Delay: after deadline	Many years data requested within a short time (20 days) . They were submitted to stock coordinator on 15 Nov (provided for benchmark meeting WKSOUTH)	Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
271	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Anglerfish (Lophius piscatorius and L. budegassa) in Division IIIa and Subareas IV and VI(ang-ivvi) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Scotland are the stock coordinators for anglerfish. Knowing that work would not be started until all other MS had uploaded, this wasn't regarded as late. S Coor intent in making sure data supplied for other stocks first so the other S Coords were not delayed.	Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
272	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: European seabass in Divisions IVbc,VIIa and VIId-h (Irish Sea, English Channel and southern North Sea)(bss-47) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload. Only 10T landed mainly into France.	Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
273	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Divisions VIIe-k (Celtic Sea cod)(cod-7e-k) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload. Only around 20T landed - mainly into Ireland	Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
274	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(cod-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
275	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Cod in Division VIb (Rockall)(cod-rock) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
276	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Divisions VIIb,c,e-k(had-7b-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
277	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Haddock in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(had-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator. Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory
280	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Megrin (Lepidorhombus spp) in Divisions IVa and VIa(meg-4a6a) WGCSE	Missing data: Discards data Delay: after deadline	Landings data submitted 2 days late. Discards estimates calculated for VI rather than VIa so could not be re-process within deadline.	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
281	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Megrin (Lepidorhombus spp) in ICES Division VIb (Rockall)(meg-rock) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	In general MS has to respect data call deadlines irrespectively of national defined deadlines. Corrections of data are crucial even after deadline and should be made if possible. This should in all cases be discussed and planned with the stock coordinator.	Satisfactory
282	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Nephrops in Division VIIb,c,j,k (Porcupine Bank, FU 16)(nep-16) WGCSE	Missing data: Age or length data for landings	From 2013 data call, the stock assessors were <b>not expecting</b> length frequency data from FU16. Also, all catches by Scottish vessels are landed into Ireland. All catches from this FU are, apparently, frozen at sea so no sampling is possible.	Seems that the MS has responded according to the data call.	Satisfactory



Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
285	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Divisions VIIh-k (Southwest of Ireland)(ple-7h-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
286	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Divisions VIIf,g (Celtic Sea)(ple-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
287	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIe (Western Channel)(ple-echw) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
288	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(ple-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
289	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Divisions VIIf, g (Celtic Sea)(sol-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
290	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Division VIIa (Irish Sea)(sol-iris) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
291	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIe-k(whg-7e-k) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
292	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Whiting in Division VIIb (Rockall)(whg-rock) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	Delay due to metier in InterCatch not being available. Much of the Scottish data were submitted in one large file. Due to IC not having correct code, the whole set of data did not upload.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
293	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Grey gurnard in Subarea VI and Divisions VIIa-c and e-k (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(gug-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	This was inadvertently missed in the data call. Once informed, Scotland provided data within 3 days.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory
294	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland)(pol-celt) WGCSE	Delay: after deadline	This was inadvertently missed in the data call. Once informed, Scotland provided data within 3 days.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
295	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice in Division VIId (Eastern Channel)(ple-eche) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Attempted to upload within time limit. Upload failed. MS was only aware of the problem of failure some days later (at that point no email was automatically sent to report success or failure of upload). Attempted upload twice more with no success. Data were sent to the stock coordinator who attempted to upload 3 times with no success. Problem eventually solved.	In general it is advisable for the MS to plan the national deadlines in such ways that a certain margin is available to handle unforeseen problems such as problem with upload etc. without violating the data call deadline.	Satisfactory
296	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Plaice Subarea IV (North Sea)(ple-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Attempted to upload within time limit. Upload failed. MS was only aware of the problem of failure some days later (at that point no email was automatically sent to report success or failure of upload). Attempted upload twice more with no success. Data were sent to the stock coordinator who attempted to upload 3 times with no success. Problem eventually solved.	In general it is advisable for the MS to plan the national deadlines in such ways that a certain margin is available to handle unforeseen problems such as problem with upload etc. without violating the data call deadline.	Satisfactory
297	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Saithe in Subarea IV (North Sea) Division IIIa West (Skagerrak) and Subarea VI (West of Scotland and Rockall)(sai-3a46) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Data were submitted 10 minutes (GMT) after deadline	Is to be regarded as being within the deadline.	Satisfactory
298	United Kingdom (Scotland)	ICES	Data call under Intercatch for: Sole in Subarea IV (North Sea)(sol-nsea) WGNSSK	Delay: after deadline	Attempted to upload within time limit. Upload failed. MS was only aware of the problem of failure some days later (at that point no email was automatically sent to report success or failure of upload). Attempted upload twice more with no success. Data were sent to the stock coordinator who attempted to upload 3 times with no success. Problem eventually solved.	In general it is advisable for the MS to plan the national deadlines in such ways that a certain margin is available to handle unforeseen problems such as problem with upload etc. without violating the data call deadline.	Satisfactory
302	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Widely distributed stocks Stock: (hom-west)Horse mackerel (Trachurus trachurus) in Divisions IIa, IVa, Vb, VIa, VIIa-c, e-k, and Subarea VIII (Western stock) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom-west.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/hom-west.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data transmission - Transmission of discard data Description: Discards are included in the assessment. However, not all countries provide data on discards; consequently, there is no estimate of the total amount of discards in the horse mackerel fisheries.	UK(England) - No discard data. UK (Scotland) - no discard data	According to table III.C.5 of the 2012 AR, 2576 horse mackerels were sampled in length, of wich 1808 from the discards. This refute the excuse given in the responce from the MS.	Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
328	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (cod-rock)Cod in Division VIb (Rockall) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-rock.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-rock.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - No biological sampling Description: Available data provide information on landings only. There are doubts on the accuracy of the reported landings as these are reported by vessels operating in both Divisions VIa and VIb. Comments: Landings of this stock are very low (32 tonnes on 2012), which is the reason for the lack of biological sampling	UK(England) - no sampling! UK(Scotland) - no sampling, but note: this stock is not assessed by ICES and as the comments under the 'Issue' column makes clear itself, landings are very low; it is meaningless to consider biological sampling for assessment/mangement purposes	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call. MS to be encourage to put in place biological sampling	Satisfactory
331	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (cod-scow)Cod in Division VIa (West of Scotland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-scow.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/cod-scow.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Discard information is imprecise compared to landings data because of lower sampling coverage. Because catch is now dominated by discards it is very important to maintain the highest possible sampling (observer) coverage of vessels in Division VIa. Comments: Note that discards are available from Scottish and Irish trawlers are used in the assessment.	UK (England) No sampling MSS samples according to clearly defined sampling frames within a statistically sound sampling scheme as developed within ICES expert groups. Market-based sampling intensity across sample frames are distributed in proportion to landings and observer 'at-sea' sampling is also proportionate. For both market and at-sea observations, sampling is probabilistic.	Seems that MS should be in position to provide the requested data. MS to improve discard sampling.	Unsatisfactory
334	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (gug-celt)Grey gurnard in Subarea VI and Divisions VIa-c and e-k (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/gug-celt.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/gug-celt.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Quality of landings data Description: Because the species is largely discarded, landings data do not reflect the actual catches. Comments: The landings values of the MS listed are very low	UK(England) most landings are recorded as GUX (mixed gurnards). Attempt made to provide estimate of grey gurnard component using relevant survey data. UK(Scotland) MSS samples according clearly defined sampling frames within a statistically sound sampling scheme as developed within ICES expert groups. Market-based sampling intensity across sample frames are distributed in proportion to landings and observer 'at-sea' sampling is also proportionate. For both market and at-sea observations, sampling is probabilistic.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond according to the data call.	satisfactory
340	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (had-7b-k)Haddock in Divisions VIIb-k Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/had-7b-k.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/had-7b-k.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: There is considerable uncertainty around the estimated discard numbers-at-age due to the diverse fishing (and discarding) practices and relatively low numbers of discard samples. Improving discard estimates would require a significant increase in the number of observer trips or other monitoring means.	UK(England) - no sampling! UK(Scotland) - not a stock of relevance to Scotland	Seems that MS should be in position to provide the requested data. MS to improve discard sampling.	unsatisfactory
342	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (nep-14)Nephrops in Irish Sea East (FU 14) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/Nep-VII-FU%2014.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/Nep-VII-FU%2014.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards and length distribution data quality Description: No reliable length composition has been available since 2010 due to reduced sampling by the United Kingdom, and no up-to-date estimates of discard rates exist.	Increased sampling effort has been made in 2013 and 2014.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond.	satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
345	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (nep-16)Nephrops on Porcupine Bank (FU 16) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/Nep-VII-FU%2016.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/Nep-VII-FU%2016.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards sampling intensity Description: Discard observer coverage is low and should be increased, to sample the landings and any discards that might be occurring.	E&W landings represent 2% of international landings. UK (Scotland) - all Scottish vessels land into Ireland. All catches are frozen at sea (by box) due to long fishing trip length. They cannot be sampled at port.	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond. MS to be encourage to increase discard coverage sampling.	Satisfactory
351	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ple-iris)Plaice in Division VIIa (Irish Sea) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-iris.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-iris.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Discards sampling intensity Description: The discard data are noisy and the assessment would benefit from increased sampling intensity. Discard information from Northern Irish and Irish Nephrops fleets became available for the first time this year, enabling improved discard estimates for the most recent years (2010–2012). Because no time-series of this information was available to be incorporated in the assessment model, the previous discards computation was used. However, the new discard information was used to quantify the catch advice.	? (WG benchmark issue)		Satisfactory
356	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ple-7h-k)Plaice in Divisions VIII–k (Southwest of Ireland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-7h-k.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-7h-k.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Age composition of younger individuals Description: The assessment is only based on age 4 and older; ICES does not have information on younger ages.	UK(England) - no sampling - minimal landings! UK(Scotland) - not a stock of relevance to Scotland	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond.	Satisfactory
359	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (ple-7b-c)Plaice in Divisions VIIb,c (West of Ireland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-7b-c.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/ple-7b-c.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. Comments: This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 29 tonnes.	UK(England) - no sampling - minimal landings! UK(Scotland) - not a stock of relevance to Scotland	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond.	Satisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
360	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (pol-celt)Pollack in Subareas VI and VII (Celtic Sea and West of Scotland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/pol-celt.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/pol-celt.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Biological data and landings figures Description: Some length frequency data are available for recent years, but area-specific data on life history parameters are missing and should be collected in surveys and through market sampling. Data on growth and maturity, as well as more information from the fisheries, are needed. Landings figures are incomplete and erratic and further scrutiny of this information is required. More information is needed on: stock identity of pollack within the ICES area; details of the fisheries (more spatial detail in landings data – especially for the earlier years in the time-series, landings by gear, length compositions, discards); life history/biological parameters (surveys and commercial sampling); and recreational fisheries (catch and effort statistics).	? (WG benchmark issue) Reference to 'failures' can only be made to data collected from 2009 onwards under the present DCF as these are the only data that can be requested under the current regulation (Commission correspondence passim).	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond.	Satisfactory
365	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (sol-7b-c)Sole in Divisions VIIb,c (West of Ireland) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sol-7b-c.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/sol-7b-c.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Catches in this area are too low to support the collection of the necessary information for an assessment of the stock status. Comments: This stocks is a category 6 stock (by-catch) and landings(the necessary data for that category) data are available. Additional data to "upgrade" the stock is not available. The total landings of this stock is 44 tonnes.	UK(England) - no sampling - minimal landings! UK(Scotland) - not a stock of relevance to Scotland	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond.	Satisfactory
368	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (whg-rock)Whiting in Division VIb (Rockall) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/whg-rock.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/whg-rock.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Quality of landings data Description: There are doubts on the accuracy of the reported landings as these are reported by vessels operating in both Divisions VIa and VIb. Comments: Official landings were 9 tonnes in 2011 and 1 tonne in 2012	UK(England) - no sampling - minimal landings! UK(Scotland) - no sampling, but note: this stock is not assessed by ICES and as the comments under the 'Issue' column makes clear itself, landings are very low. It is meaningless to consider biological sampling for assessment/mangement purposes	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond.	Satisfactory
371	United Kingdom	ICES	Ecoregion: Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Stock: (wgh-iris)Whiting in Division VIIa (Irish Sea) Reference: <a href="http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/wgh-iris.pdf">http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2013/2013/wgh-iris.pdf</a>	Type of issue: Data quality - Sampling intensity Description: Since 2003 the low landing levels have resulted in poor sampling coverage of the stock and no reliable estimates of catch numbers-at-age. Comments: Landings of this stock are low (~ 50 tonnes on 2012)	As the comments under the 'Issue' column makes clear itself, landings are very low. It is meaningless to consider biological sampling for assessment/mangement purposes	Seems that the MS has tried as much as possible to respond.	Satisfactory
378	United Kingdom	ICCAT	Task 1: fleet characteristics	Missing data	Task 1 and 2 forms sent but Task 1 fleet characteristics omitted in error.	MS has to reply on this issue	NA
384	United Kingdom	ICCAT	Task 2	Missing data for: YFT	No Yellowfin Tuna were landed in 2012		Unsatisfactory

Issue ID	Country	End user	Data requested	Issue	MS response	EWG comments	SECF EWG evaluation (satisfactory, unsatisfactory)
385	United Kingdom	NAFO	Biological information (Sex, Length, Age)	Missing data for: 3M COD	there were no landings into the UK from the NAFO region	Seems that the MS has reply possible to respond.	NA
394	United Kingdom	IOTC	Long line	No info on length frequencies for any species	All was landed abroad into South Africa and Mauritania . Only 3 trips / 513 days fishing in 2013 attributable to the UK	Seems that MS should be in position to provide the requested data. MS to improve discard sampling.	Unsatisfactory

**ANNEX 4 – TEMPLATE OF THE EVALUATION FORM FOR THE ANNUAL REPORT EVALUATION**

Member State:

[ ]

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

Overall compliance

2013

Compliance class

Judgement levels

Compliance level

No  
Partly  
Mostly  
Yes  
NA

<10%  
10-50%  
50-90%  
>90%  
not applicable

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG  
Action needed?

I General framework

Are derogations listed?

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 a national DCF website available?  
Is the information provided on the website in line with legal requirements (COM Reg. 665/2008 art. 8.2)?  
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?  
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?

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?

B Economic variables

Is information under III.B.1-4 for each supra-region given?

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

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 Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea

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

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?

C Biological metier related variables

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

Region Baltic Sea

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR  
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR  
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR  
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR  
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  
Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?





Member State:

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

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

	Were the relevant derogations listed?		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described ?		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
C4	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
D	<b>Recreational fisheries</b>		
	Is information on III.D.1-4 given for each respective region?		

**Region Baltic Sea**

D1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
D2	<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?		
D3	<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?		
D4	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

D1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
D2	<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?		
D3	<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?		
D4	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

**Region North Atlantic**

D1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
D2	<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?		
D3	<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?		
D4	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

**Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea**

D1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
D2	<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?		
D3	<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?		
D4	<b>Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

**Region Other regions**

D1	<b>Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
D2	<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?		
D3	<b>Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations</b>		
	Were the relevant derogations listed?		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		

Member State:

--

AR year  
Version of the AR reviewed  
Version of the NP proposal

Overall compliance

2013	Judgement levels	
	Compliance class	Compliance level
EWG Answer	No	<10%
	Partly	10-50%
	Mostly	50-90%
	Yes	>90%
	NA	not applicable

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

D4 **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?


E **Biological stock-related variables**

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

--	--	--

**Region Baltic Sea**

E1 **Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  
Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?


E2 **Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
Were CV estimates provided?  
Were CV targets met?  
Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?


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


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


**Region North Sea and Eastern Arctic**

E1 **Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  
Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?


E2 **Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
Were CV estimates provided?  
Were CV targets met?  
Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?


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


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


**Region North Atlantic**

E1 **Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  
Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?


E2 **Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
Were CV estimates provided?  
Were CV targets met?  
Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?


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


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


**Region Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea**

E1 **Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?  
Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?  
Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?


E2 **Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**  
Were CV estimates provided?  
Were CV targets met?  
Are the deviations explained?  
Are the deviations justified?


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


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


**Region Other regions**

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?




Member State:

--

Judgement levels

AR year	2013	Compliance class	Compliance level
Version of the AR reviewed		No	<10%
Version of the NP proposal		Partly	10-50%
		Mostly	50-90%
		Yes	>90%
		NA	not applicable

Overall compliance

EWG Answer

EWG COMMENTS

EWG judgement

EWG

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
<b>B</b>	<b>Collection of data concerning the processing industry</b>		
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR		
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR		
<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?		
<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?		
<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?		
<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?		
<b>V</b>	<b>Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem</b>		
	<b>1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal</b>		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Are the relevant derogations listed?		
	<b>2 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	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>		
	<b>1 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?		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
	<b>2 Actions to avoid shortfalls</b>		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described ?		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
<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?		
<b>VIII</b>	<b>List of acronyms and abbreviations</b>		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?		
<b>IX</b>	<b>Comments, suggestions and reflections</b>		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ?		
<b>X</b>	<b>References</b>		
	Is there a complete list of references?		
<b>XI</b>	<b>Annexes</b>		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

ANNEX 5 –EXERCISE ON THE USE OF A QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

Compliance class		Compliance level	Points
No	N	<10%	0
Partly	P	10-50%	3
Mostly	M	50-90%	7
Yes	Y	>90%	10
NA	NA	not applicable	-

2014	Module	BEL	BUL	CYP	DEN	EST	FIN	FRA	GER	GRE	IRL	ITA	LAT	LTU	MAL	NLD	POL	POR	ROM	SVN	ESP	SWE	GBR	HRV	
	Compliance class	M	N	M	M	M	10	M	10	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	Y	M	M	M	M	10	M	M	
	<b>OVERALL COMPLIANCE (%)</b>	<b>69.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>83.2%</b>	<b>86.2%</b>	<b>67.0%</b>	<b>90.0%</b>	<b>73.8%</b>	<b>91.6%</b>	<b>57.4%</b>	<b>79.6%</b>	<b>87.4%</b>	<b>80.2%</b>	<b>67.4%</b>	<b>68.8%</b>	<b>79.6%</b>	<b>94.6%</b>	<b>72.0%</b>	<b>61.4%</b>	<b>79.0%</b>	<b>74.8%</b>	<b>96.4%</b>	<b>77.2%</b>	<b>62.6%</b>	
Weight	OVERALL COMPLIANCE (points)	6.9	0	8.32	8.62	6.7	9	7.38	9.16	5.74	7.96	8.74	8.02	6.74	6.88	7.96	9.46	7.2	6.14	7.9	7.48	9.64	7.72	6.26	
0.04	Module I	10	0	10	10	0	10	10	10	7	10	10	10	0	10	10	10	10	0	10	10	10	10	10	10
0.04	Module II	3	0	7	7	7	7	7	10	7	10	7	3	3	3	7	10	7	7	3	7	10	7	3	3
0.02	IIIA	10	0	10	10	10	7	10	10	10	10	10	3	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
0.12	IIIB	7		7	10	10	10	7	10	7	3	10	10	10	7	7	10	7	7	10	10	7	7		
0.14	IIIC	7	0	10	10	3	10	3	10	3	7	7	10	3	3	7	7	10	0	3	7	10	7	7	7
0.06	IIID	3			3	10	10	7	3	10	10	7	10	7	10	10	10	3	10	7	10	10	7	3	3
0.14	IIIE	7	0	10	7	3	10	3	7	7	7	10	7	7	10	7	10	7	3	7	7	10	7	7	7
0.06	IIIF	10	0	10	10	3	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	7	7	10	3	10	10	3	10	10	10	10
0.14	IIIG	7	0	10	7	10	7	10	10	3	10	7	7	10	10	10	10	7	7	10	7	10	7	10	10
0.06	Module IV.A			7	10	10	10	10	10	3	7	10			0	7	10	7	7	10	7	10	7	10	10
0.06	Module IV.B	7	0	7	10	10	10	10	10	7	7	10	10	10	0	10	10	7	10	10	3	10	7	0	0
0.04	Module V	10	0	7	10	7	10	10	10	3	10	7	7	10	10	7	10	10	10	7	10	10	10	10	10
0.04	Module VI	10	0	7	10	10	10	10	10	3	10	10	10	7	7	7	10	3	10	7	7	10	10	10	10
0.04	Module VII	10	0	10	10	3	0	10	10	7	10	10	10	3	10	7	7	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0

**Comments on the exercise on the adoption of a use numbers (3, 2, 1, 0) instead of using compliance class (Yes, Mostly, Partly, No) to create an overall compliance by MS, following methodology suggested by STECF EWG 13-07.**

1. The EWG is of the opinion that the current subjective system should be replaced by a more objective way of calculating the overall compliance.
2. The EWG (13-07) have discussed and agreed the different modules in the Annual Report are not equally important and therefore a weighting factor for each module has to be agreed upon. Suggestions were made in 2013 but needs to be revised.
3. Instead of using No, Partly, Mostly, Yes in the overall compliance table, the numbers 0, 1, 2, 3 could be used accordingly. The top score for a MS would then be 3.0.
4. To calculate the overall compliance, the weighted average over all modules divided by 3 would result in a percentage fulfillment either presented in % or converted to a Yes, Mostly, Partly, No using the current limits (N= 0-10% ; P= 10-50%; M= 50-90 % ; Y= 90-100%)

## **ANNEX 6 - REPORT ON IMPROVEMENT OF EVALUATION PROCESS, STECF EWG 14-07**

### **1. Term of reference**

“Evaluate how the exercise of Annual Report preparation and evaluation by STECF could be simplified in future, including through electronic filling in, and pre-screening of the Annual Reports, simplification of the Annual Report formats taking into account the achievements and conclusions from the STECF EWG 13-25.”

The conclusions from STECF EWG report 13-25 (meeting STECF EWG 13-08) are in Annex I.

### **2. Current situation**

#### **Member states**

- Hand in a NP proposal which contains the plans for the data collection, including number of samples, days at sea, etc.
- Have to make their data collected publicly available, and often upload the data collected under DCF in international databases.
- Respond to data calls from end-users.
- Spend a lot of time and effort in preparing Annual Reports by compiling data, recommendations, clarifying deviations, and providing actions to avoid shortfalls.

#### **STECF EWG:**

- Carries out (a) pre-screening work, and then (b) a (re-) evaluation of the pre-screening results by 30 experts during a 5-day meeting.
- Although all experts do their best to focus on the content of the report and tables and on the data collection carried out -or deviations in the data collection-, it is difficult to study the AR in depth due to time constraints.
- The evaluation sheet used by pre-screener and the EWG mainly focuses on completeness of tables, and consistency with the guidelines. The questions in the evaluation sheet are sometimes twofold, e.g. ‘Are design AND achievements consistent with the NP proposal?’, which in some cases complicates the evaluation.
- (pre-)screeners spend a lot of time on checking if the information is complete, if the reports contain all information, and if any deviations apply.

All in all, many hours and manpower is spent to provide and evaluate the Annual Reports. STECF EWG 14-07 assumes that the (pre-)screeners are the only experts that read the full report submitted by a MS, which means that in total approx. 15 (4 pre-screener and 8 STECF EWG members, and may be some others) read (parts of) one report in detail. One could wonder if this is worth the effort spent by the MS in compiling the report.



### **3. Long-term scenario**

#### **7. Assumptions**

The Commission is interested in:

1. Data collection:
  - a. If the data collection was carried out in accordance with internationally agreed best practice standards;
  - b. Which deviations occurred from the NP;
  - c. How the problems were solved/will be avoided in future;
  - d. If the data collected is useful, i.e. whether the data is fit for purpose.
2. Data transmission:
  - a. Whether data were transmitted (to international databases, by responding to data calls)
  - b. What required data has not been transmitted, and the impact of this non transmission, on the data end - users i.e. Which data transmission deviations have occurred
  - c. Are those transmitted data in line with what has been reported in the previous years' AR as collected and achieved.
  - d. How problems with data transmission were solved/will be avoided in future.
3. How MS followed-up recommendations from end-users

#### **8. The way forward**

Given the still unclear situation on the future of the DCF, in particular with regards to the model to be adopted for the data provision, data storage and data management; and on the current regional differences in terms of the development and implementation of regional databases; this scenario shall be further developed when more detailed information on the future becomes available. However it shall be highlighted that regardless on the model adopted, for some regions much of the information the Commission is interested in is already available in international databases, which could be thought as one of the starting points to develop more efficient and effective methods to evaluate the MS's Annual Reports

By using the current databases as one of the sources of information for the DCF AR's, it may be as simple as developing a number of extra reports in order to support the evaluation process. It is clearly important that any reports would use standardised tables across all MS's to provide comparative reports. Database reports (extracts) can be used as the basis for consistency checks between NP, AR and data transmission. Deviations can then be spotted easily and automatically.

Evident problems could be automatically highlighted by using databases and the time of experts could then be used to focus on problems.

### **4. Improvement of AR evaluation process on the short term (for evaluation process AR 2014)**

#### **9. Assumptions**

As the current reporting period is being concluded, there is little to be gained by putting an extra burden on MS to change fundamental things in reporting. Only functional changes in tables and/or text formats should be made. The current evaluation can be improved without major impacts on the MS.

The evaluation process should be made more effective. This means that the effort spent might not decrease, but at least means that the effort is spent in a better way.

## **10. Things to be kept**

Apart from the improvements listed in the text below, it is important to keep in mind that the following things should be kept.

The information pre-screeners and STECF EWG 14-07 received prior to or during the meeting consisted of:

- AR tables by MS
- AR text by MS
- Evaluation sheets by MS (for STECF EWG 14-07 filled in with pre-screeners' comments)
- Data transmission information by MS, provided by end-users, with MS reply

and the following reference documents:

- AR reporting guidelines
- DCF derogations by MS
- Overview of ICES data calls
- ICES recommendations database

This information should be provided to the pre-screeners and evaluation EWG in future years. The pre-screeners were also provided with the most recent versions of the National Programme proposals (text and tables). Ideally, the subsequent EWG should also have easy access to these files.

The current system of pre-screening and evaluation by STECF EWG works well and should be continued in future.

During STECF EWG 14-07, the transversal variables were checked by a combined subgroup of economists and biologists. This should be continued in future.

## **11. Improvements: (First priority, easy implementation)**

Many suggestions from STECF EWG 13-07 (report STECF-13-25) have been taken into account, which contributed to the evaluation efficiency and consistency. Below, topics listed in that reports as well as new suggestions for improvements are listed.

### **a. Reference years**

There are two important things to mention related to reference years:

1. Due to the (unexpectedly) long running time of the current programme, there is a time-lag between the reference years as used in the NP (2007-2008) and the reporting year. Especially in the commercial fisheries, many changes have taken place. STECF EWG 14-07 recommends that MS are asked to update a limited number of targets in a separate table which can be used by the STECF EWG evaluating the AR2014. The update should be arranged in a simple way so MS will not have to spend much time on adding the information and sending the update. It should be checked if the update of the information also influences the text part of the report.

2. In the AR guidelines, 'reference year' is being used as the reporting year. In the AR tables, 'reference year(s)' sometimes seems to relate to the sampling/reporting year (e.g. III.B.3), and sometimes to the NP reference years (e.g. Table III.C.3). This should be clarified.

**b. Evaluation consistency**

3. There shall be explicit and clear evaluation guidelines for the pre-screeners and the STECF-EWG. The guidelines should be publicly available well before the (pre-) screening of the ARs. The guidelines should **at least** contain:
  - a. Guidance on the allowable text/values in the columns of the evaluation sheet;
  - b. Guidance (decision tree) on how to report on follow-up questions, like 'Are deviations justified?' if no deviations were mentioned;
  - c. Guidance on how to evaluate and follow-up on Module IX (comments, suggestions, reflections);
  - d. Guidance on how to report on minor issues that do not need immediate follow-up but might be taken into account by the MS in next year's AR (e.g. make a comment with suggestion and write 'No action needed', or recommend action for next year's report);
  - e. Information on the final evaluation report format to be created for the MS;
  - f. 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. (Recommended by STECF EWG 13-07).
4. For consistency over years, provide evaluation results for the full period of the program (already recommended by STECF EWG 12-08) to the (pre-) screeners.
5. 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 (recommendation from STECF EWG 13-07).
6. The questions in the evaluation sheet are sometimes twofold, e.g. 'Are design AND achievements consistent with the NP proposal?' which sometimes complicates the evaluation. E.g. in section III.G (surveys), the design can be consistent with the NP proposal, but the achievements might not be, as a result of unexpected problems (technical, weather, etc.). Suggestion: Split question into two where twofold complicates evaluation, being:
  - c. Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal? (all modules where question occurs)
  - d. Is Table XXXX complete and consistent with AR guidelines? (all modules where question occurs) –the alternative is to change the question into 'Is Table XXXX consistent with the AR guidelines?', assuming that completeness is part of that, as splitting the question might only add information to the reporting quality of the MS.
7. Follow-up of STECF recommendations:
  - a. Prepare a list of the relevant STECF recommendations by MS (Module VII) before the EWG meeting evaluating the AR 2014.

- b. Prepare a list of the relevant LM recommendations by MS (Modules III.A.3, III.B.3, III.C.3, III.D.3, III.E.3, III.F.2, III.F.3)

These preparations could be conducted by ad-hoc contract or EWG 14-18.

8. Module III.D (recreational fisheries):

- a. Data quality targets: it is not clear how relevant the current quality targets are. It is recommended that either the evaluation questions are modified, or that sensible data quality targets are being developed.
- b. Questions on derogations in III.D.1 and III.D.3 are confusing. It is not clear what the difference is. It is recommended that one of the questions is deleted.

9. It is not clear how to evaluate B3 “Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations”, in the cases where MS don’t explicitly mention their recommendations of the Liaison Meeting. Specifically, when the MS states that there are no relevant recommendations, should the evaluation of the EWG be “Not applicable (NA)” or “YES”?

**e. Reporting consistency by MS**

10. Related to the AR Tables:

a. Module III.C:

- i. Revise/merge tables III.C.3/III.C.4 and III.C.5/III.C.6 and remove redundancy, as it creates unnecessary work for MS and evaluation.
- ii. Revise table III.C.5 as there are internal inconsistencies and the table is inconsistent with the requirements from the Decision. AR2013 of SWE and NED (section IX) contain details on the inconsistencies, which are also compiled in STECF EWG 14-07 subgroup 4 report.
- iii. Use current fish stock definitions in Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6.
- iv. It must be clear in the guidelines that Table III.C.6 (when kept) should contain all species encountered during concurrent sampling, even those not included in Appendix VII of COM Decision 2010/93/EU.
- v. For MS who now use statistically sound sampling procedures (in line with WKACCU, MERGE, PRECISE) different tables are required for the NP/AR as sampling by metier is not pursued. Eg III\_C\_3. A change to the scrutiny is also required as ‘achievements by metier’ are not relevant.

- b. Module III.D: add table as proposed by STECF EWG 14-07 (see figure below).



**f. Data transmission evaluation**

12. Split up 'non-submissions' for data calls by MS into the following categories:
- Data collected by MS (following NP) and requested by end-user, but not submitted by MS
  - Data requested by end-user, but no data collection by MS (following NP)
  - Data requested by end-user before the planned date of data transmission defined by MS in the NP
  - Data submitted by MS in response to data call, but not used by the end-user

**g. Overall judgement**

13. Change over-all judgement levels to “done well“, “minor issues” and “serious problems”

**h. Practicalities**

14. Facilitate multiple file download at once from the web folder
15. Discuss screening guidelines for STECF EWG at the start of the meeting, by showing an example on the screen in plenary
16. Stick to the deadline for AR delivery. In exceptional cases, a postponed update of report prior to pre-screening might be accepted, but there should never be AR re-submissions between pre-screening and EWG evaluation. In case re-submissions occur, be clear to pre-screener and STECF EWG which version to evaluate.

## **12. Further improvements in the medium term**

**i. Evaluation consistency**

17. Use a numerical scale and pre-defined weighting factors in the evaluation sheets. A first version was created and tested by STECF EWG 14-07. Scaling suggestions were provided and presented. It is important to further investigate how to combine the information into a final result. Based on the results of the exercise carried out during STECF EWG 14-07, the group recommends that this is taken into account by the subgroup that will work on the long-term perspective during the AR2014 evaluation STECF EWG.
18. (Re-)develop/update an electronic tool in order to support (pre-)screening with respect to terminologies and formats used and with NP figures. Some years ago, an R script was developed to do this exercise. There is one condition for automatic screening: formats should be consistent throughout MS. Although an electronic check will not be able to fully carry out the (pre-)screening exercise, a mix of automated screening and human screening is most adequate as by using electronic screening (pre-)screeners can concentrate on conceptual and compliance issues.

**j. Reporting consistency by MS**

19. Related to the AR Tables:
- Where possible and useful, facilitate consistent input, e.g. by the use of drop down lists. This action requires complete reference lists for a number of variables, listed in section 5 (Reference Tables) of this report.
  - The stock area descriptions in the DCF do not always correspond with the ICES working group stock areas. Especially for data transmission, it is extremely important to compare

the right stocks. It is recommended that stock description consistency between DCF/DC-MAP and ICES descriptions is checked for all stocks. Ideally, there should be no deviations between stock assessment units and stocks listed in DCF/EU-MAP tables.

- c. Table VI.1 (Data transmission): It is difficult to get a complete overview of all data calls relevant for the DCF. It is advisable to have a list of relevant data calls compiled on the basis of inputs from all end users (ICES, STECF, GFCM etc.). These lists should be available both for MS, pre-screeners and the EWG evaluating Annual Reports.

20. Related to text report:

- a. VII (follow-up of STECF recommendations): store and update recommendations and their follow-up in a central electronic document, which MS can refer to. The ICES recommendations database might serve as an example, see <http://community.ices.dk/admin/Recomendations/layouts/15/start.aspx#/SitePages/Home.aspx>

## 5. Reference tables

Variable	Used in AR table(s)	Reference list available	Reference list to be developed by
Aquaculture segments	IV.A.2, IV.A.3		
Data collection scheme	III.B.3, III.C.4, III.F.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.3		
Data sources	III.B.3, III.E.3, III.F.1, IV.A.3, IV.B.2		
Expert/planning groups and project acronyms	II.B.1, III.G.1, VI.1		
Fish and shellfish farming techniques	IV.A.1		
Fishing ground	III.C.1, III.C.2, III.C.3, III.C.5, III.C.6, III.E.3		
Fleet segments	III.B.1, III.B.2, III.F.1		
Fleet segments vessels	III.B.3		
Fleet segments vessels length classes	III.B.1, III.B.3		
Gear			
Indicator code	V.1		
Indicator description	V.1		
Metier	III.C.1, III.C.2, III.C.3, III.C.6		
MS short codes	All		
Presentation	III.F.2		
Processing industry segments	IV.B.1, IV.B.2		
Region	III.A.1, III.C.1, III.C.2, III.C.3, III.C.4, III.C.5,		

	III.C.6, III.E.1, III.E.2, III.E.3		
RFMO	II.B.1, III.C.3, III.C.4, III.C.5, III.C.6, III.E.1, III.E.2, III.E.3	Yes	
Sampling frame (fishing activities, geographical location, seasonality)	III.C.3, III.C.4		
Sampling activities	III.G.1		
Sampling scheme	III.C.3, III.C.4		
Sampling strategy	III.C.3, III.C.4		
Species group	III.C.5, III.C.6, III.E.2, III.E.3		
Species	III.C.5, III.C.6, III.E.1, III.E.2, III.E.3, III.F.2, VI.1		
Stock	III.E.1, III.E.2, III.E.3, VI.1		
Sub-area	III.A.1		
Supra region	III.B.1, III.B.2, III.B.3		
Target assemblage	III.C.1, III.C.3		
Variable	III.B.3, III.E.3, III.F.1, IV.A.2, IV.B.2	Yes for: IV.A.2 (Annex X of ??) IV.B.2 (Annex XII of ??)	
Variable group	III.B.3, III.F.1		



European Commission

EUR 26811 EN – Joint Research Centre – Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Title: Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries. Evaluation of 2013 MS DCF Annual Reports & Data Transmission  
(STECF-14-13)

Authors:

STECF members: 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., Kraak, S., Kuikka, S., Malvarosa, L., Martin, P., 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-14-07 members: Adamidou Angeliki, Armesto Angeles, Avdic Edo, Bell Margaret, Berkenhagen Jörg, Brigaudeau Cecile, Carpentieri Paolo, Davidjuka Irina, de Boois Ingeborg, Degel Henrik, Dias Marina, Ebeling, Michael, Hansson Maria, Jung Armelle, Kazlauskas Edvardas, Knittweis Leyla, Moura Carlos, Nermer Tomasz, Ní Chonchúir Gráinne, RADU Gheorghe, Raid Tiit, Raykov Violin, Gambino Monica, Sintori Alexandra, Stransky Christoph, Stroie Constantin, Ulleweit Jens, Vandemaele Sofie, Yankova Maria, Zarauz Lucia.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

2014 –257 pp. – 21 x 29.7 cm

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

ISBN 978-92-79-39783-7

doi:10.2788/12174

Abstract: The Expert Working Group meeting of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries EWG 14-07 was held from 23 –27 June in Oostende to evaluate MS Annual Reports for 2013, the MS's data transmission to the end-users over 2013 and to identify actions to improve these exercises in the future. At the end 22 ARs were evaluated, 439 data transmissions issues from seven end-users were assessed and judged and the actions for the future were identified. The EWG report was reviewed by the STECF plenary14 -02 held from 7 to 11 July 2014 in Copenhagen (Denmark).

**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 with the Member States, the scientific community and international partners.

---

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.

