



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

**Report of the Working Group on
research needs (SGRN-08-02)**

**Evaluation of 2007 national data
collection programs undertaken under
Commission Regulation
(EC) NO 1639/2001**

30 JUNE - 5 JULY, 2008, ISPRA, ITALY

Edited by Joel Vigneau, Sarunas Zableckis & Hendrik Dörner

EUR 23631 EN - 2008

The mission of the Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen (IPSC) is to provide research results and to support EU policy-makers in their effort towards global security and towards protection of European citizens from accidents, deliberate attacks, fraud and illegal actions against EU policies

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

Contact information

Address: TP 051, 21027 Ispra (VA), Italy
E-mail: stecf-secretariat@jrc.it
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 49004

EUR 23631 EN
ISBN 978-92-79-10867-9
ISSN 1018-5593
DOI 10.2788/32806

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

© European Communities, 2008

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

Printed in Italy

**SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR
FISHERIES (STECF)**

**STECF COMMENTS ON THE REPORT OF THE SGRN-08-02
WORKING GROUP EVALUATION OF THE 2007'S TECHNICAL
REPORTS (DCR)**

30 June – 5 July, 2008 Ispra, Italy

STECF UNDERTOOK THE REVIEW DURING THE PLENARY MEETING

HELD IN BRUSSELS 3-7 NOVEMBER 2008

STECF is requested to review the report of the **SGRN-08-02** of June 30 – July 5, 2008 (Ispra) meeting, evaluate the findings and make any appropriate comments and recommendations.

Terms of reference

1. Evaluation of 2007 TR's

The advice should consider at least the measures taken by each MS, the appropriateness of the methods used and the results achieved as regards data collection and data uses. The aim is to deliver a critique scientific review of the situation by evaluating what MSs had proposed in their National Programmes for 2007 and what they have finally achieved. Evaluation of the achievements should consider the international obligations of the EU in regards to the Regional Fisheries Organizations, the transmission and the uses of the data and the quality aspects. ICES will provide tables on data flow to illustrate the discussion.

2. Pilot studies: State of play and missing reports;

3. Bluefin Tuna and Swordfish Tagging 2005-2007: Summary of actions undertaken by Member states and evaluation;

4. Evaluation of the situation regarding the response by MS to the call for economic data launched to produce the draft report on the "Economic Performance of EU Fishing Fleet: Annual Report 2008"

5. SGRN 08-01: Presentation of the main outputs of the meeting and establishment of sound scientific criteria for the evaluation of NP and TR (as recommended by SGRN 08-01).

STECF comments

The STECF comments below equally apply to the evaluation of the delayed UK Technical Report (TR) 2007, see Annex B of the SGRN-08-02 report..

STECF endorses the **SGRN-08-02** report and supports the initiative regarding the implementation of a regional perspective for the evaluation of the Technical Reports. STECF agrees with the methodology used by SGRN, in particular the use of ICES data tables to complement the evaluation. STECF encourages the constitution of integrated regional databases gathering data from all DCR modules and not only statistics and biological information. As a first step, STECF recommends that the definition of the data exchange format is included as an agenda item for the next STECF plenary and that the format is in line with the specifications of the new DCR. Experts from the data user side should be invited for that agenda item. STECF supports the request of SGRN for the workshop on the quality of economic data (now postponed to the first quarter of 2009) to address the question of the representativeness of sampling for economic data.

STECF notes that not all Member States have fulfilled their obligations under the provisions of Council Regulation 1543/2000 (DCR) and its subsequent amendments and that in some cases the shortfalls in data provision are compromising the ability of the STECF to give appropriate management advice. STECF understands that some Member States are not allocating the necessary funds to carry out the sampling called for under the DCR until the matched financial contribution from the Commission has been received. STECF therefore urges the Commission to remind Member States of their obligations under the DCR to ensure that the required data are collected in a timely fashion irrespective of the timing of funding from the EU.

Concerning the specific issue related to the tagging programme on large pelagic species, which was extensively analysed for the period 2005-2007, STECF shares the SGRN-08-02 conclusion that the tagging activities for bluefin tuna and swordfish carried out within the DCR framework in these years had only partly achieved the targets.

Besides the tagging achievements, it was important to understand how and if the data were used in stock assessments and SGRN-08-02 noted that no comprehensive summary of the results from the tagging programme was included in the reports of the Planning Group on Tuna Tagging (PGTT) in 2007. Concerning the ICCAT use of tagging data, there is an ongoing effort to include these data into the bluefin tuna stock assessment, particularly in the two-box VPA approach, which runs a tuned VPA for each stock area including exchange rate parameters, to account for migratory and mixing effects. The last PGTT report (20-22 October 2008) was received by STECF during the plenary in draft format. This report includes more information, maps and analysis than any other previous report. Previous STECF remarks on tuna tagging programmes have been addressed in the 2008 PGTT report. .

STECF notes that tagging activities are excluded from the DCR from 2009 onwards. In principle, according to the 2008 PGTT report, the results from tagging programmes have the potential to provide valuable information for stock assessment and could be eligible for inclusion in the DCR programme. However, STECF is of the opinion that their value for stock assessment purposes should be clearly supported by results as a prerequisite to such programmes being considered for inclusion in the DCR, otherwise STECF considers that such studies should be funded by other means.

STECF, sharing the opinion of SGRN-08-02, recommends that Member States and the Commission pay particular attention to all issues related to large pelagic species because of large discrepancies in data reported to Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) and in the DCR National

Programme (NP) proposals, and particularly for the fishing activities carried out in distant waters. Granted derogations should be properly documented.

STECF is very much concerned with the need to maintain the quality of the evaluation process for future NP proposals and TRs in the light of the increasing number of Member States, the introduction of new modules in the DCR and the need to support a more integrated approach to fisheries management (biological, economic and ecosystem) at the regional level.

STECF recommends improving the timing of the evaluation process and supports the move towards a regional perspective. For the NP evaluation, it suggests that prior to NP submission, Regional Co-ordination Meetings (RCMs) should agree coordinated data collection methodologies at regional level where appropriate. The NP evaluation should then refer to the RCM reports and recommendations. The TR evaluation should be preceded by an analysis of the data collected at regional level, based on regional integrated databases. This preliminary task should be conducted in close collaboration between JRC and SGRN.

REPORT OF
THE SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC
COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF)

WORKING GROUP ON RESEARCH NEEDS (SGRN)

EVALUATION OF 2007 NATIONAL DATA COLLECTION PROGRAMS
UNDERTAKEN UNDER COMMISSION REGULATION
(EC) NO 1639/2001

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

Ispra 30 June -5 July, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 1 | INTRODUCTION | 8 |
| 1.1 | LIST OF PARTICIPANTS..... | 8 |
| 1.2 | TERMS OF REFERENCE..... | 9 |
| 2 | THE EVALUATION PROCESS | 10 |
| 2.1 | ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS..... | 10 |
| 2.2 | SGRN APPRECIATION AND COMMENTS..... | 11 |
| 3 | EVALUATION OF THE 2007 TECHNICAL REPORTS GENERAL COMMENTS | 12 |
| 3.1 | MAJOR DRAWBACKS..... | 12 |
| 3.2 | TRANSLATION PROBLEMS..... | 12 |
| 3.3 | ON THE QUALITY OF THE TECHNICAL REPORTS..... | 12 |
| 3.4 | ON THE EXECUTION OF NP REGARDLESS OF FINANCIAL DELAYS..... | 13 |
| 3.5 | ON THE USE OF ICES DATA TABLES..... | 13 |
| 3.6 | ON FISHING OUTSIDE COMMUNITY WATERS..... | 14 |
| 3.7 | ON PRECISION LEVELS..... | 14 |
| 3.8 | ON THE FUTURE OF MONITORING RECREATIONAL FISHERIES..... | 15 |
| 3.9 | ON OTOLITH READING..... | 15 |
| 3.10 | ON CYCLES FOR MODULE I SAMPLING..... | 16 |
| 3.11 | ON PARAMETER DEFINITION FOR MODULE J..... | 16 |
| 3.12 | ON REPRESENTATIVENESS OF ECONOMIC SAMPLES..... | 16 |
| 4 | EVALUATION OF THE 2007 TECHNICAL REPORTS COMMENTS BY MS | 17 |
| 4.1 | COUNTRY: BELGIUM..... | 17 |
| 4.2 | COUNTRY: CYPRUS..... | 22 |
| 4.3 | COUNTRY: DENMARK..... | 27 |
| 4.4 | COUNTRY: ESTONIA..... | 32 |
| 4.5 | COUNTRY: FINLAND..... | 37 |
| 4.6 | COUNTRY: FRANCE..... | 42 |
| 4.7 | COUNTRY: GERMANY..... | 48 |
| 4.8 | COUNTRY: IRELAND..... | 53 |
| 4.9 | COUNTRY: ITALY..... | 58 |
| 4.10 | COUNTRY: LATVIA..... | 64 |
| 4.11 | COUNTRY: LITHUANIA..... | 69 |
| 4.12 | COUNTRY: MALTA..... | 74 |
| 4.13 | COUNTRY: NETHERLANDS..... | 80 |
| 4.14 | COUNTRY: POLAND..... | 86 |
| 4.15 | COUNTRY: PORTUGAL..... | 92 |
| 4.16 | COUNTRY: SLOVENIA..... | 97 |
| 4.17 | COUNTRY: SPAIN..... | 102 |
| 4.18 | COUNTRY: SWEDEN..... | 108 |
| 5 | EVALUATION OF THE PILOT STUDIES | 113 |
| 6 | BLUEFIN TUNA AND SWORDFISH TAGGING ACTIVITIES IN THE PERIOD 2005-2007: SUMMARY OF ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN BY MS AND EVALUATION | 115 |
| 6.1 | BACKGROUND..... | 115 |
| 6.2 | DISCUSSION ON BLUEFIN TUNA AND SWORDFISH TAGGING PROGRAMMES 2005-2007. | 118 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|------------|
| 6.3 | THE USE OF TAGGING RESULTS IN STOCK ASSESSMENT | 119 |
| 6.4 | CONCLUSIONS ON BLUEFIN TUNA AND SWORDFISH TAGGING PROGRAMMES 2005-2007... .. | 120 |
| 6.5 | EXTENSION OF THE ANALYSIS TO SAMPLING FOR LARGE PELAGIC SPECIES BETWEEN 2005-2007 IN THE DCR. | 121 |
| 7 | RESPONSE BY MS TO THE CALL FOR ECONOMIC DATA..... | 124 |
| 8 | IMPROVEMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS..... | 127 |
| 9 | SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS BY MS IN THEIR TR | 129 |
| 9.1 | TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION | 129 |
| 9.2 | TO BE CONSIDERED BY SGRN | 129 |
| 10 | REFERENCES CITED IN THE REPORT | 130 |
| | ANNEX A. PARTICIPANTS CONTACT DETAILS | 132 |
| | ANNEX B. ADDENDUM EVALUATION OF UK TECHNICAL REPORT 2007 | 138 |
| | ANNEX C. EXPERT DECLARATIONS | 146 |

INTRODUCTION

1.1 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1.1.1 STECF members

| | |
|-----------|--------------|
| Cardinale | Massimiliano |
| Di Natale | Antonio |
| Hatcher | Aaron |
| Gustavson | Tore |

1.1.2 Invited experts

| | | |
|--------------|----------|---------|
| Adamidou | Angeliki | |
| Armesto | Angeles | |
| Arneri | Enrico | |
| Bell | Margaret | |
| Berkenhagen | Joerg | |
| Charilaou | Charis | |
| Collet | Isabelle | |
| Degel | Henrik | |
| Ebeling | Michael | |
| Grzebielec | Ryszard | |
| Heessen | Henk | |
| Kornilovs | Georgs | |
| Maertens | Bart | |
| Morgado | Cristina | |
| Moura | Olga | |
| Ní Chonchúir | Gráinne | |
| Statkus | Romas | |
| Ulleweit | Jens | |
| Vigneau | Joel | (Chair) |

1.1.3 European Commission

| | | |
|-----------|---------|------------------------|
| Cervantes | Antonio | DG MARE |
| Zableckis | Sarunas | JRC, STECF secretariat |

Contact details are attached in ANNEX A.

1.2 TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Sub-Group on Research Needs (STECF-SGRN) met in Ispra, from June 30th till July 5th, 2008, with the following Terms of Reference:

1. Evaluation of 2007 TR's: The advice should consider at least the measures taken by each MS, the appropriateness of the methods used and the results achieved as regards data collection and data uses. The aim is to deliver a critique scientific review of the situation by evaluating what MSs had proposed in their National Programmes for 2007 and what they have finally achieved. Evaluation of the achievements should consider the international obligations of the EU in regards to the Regional Fisheries Organizations, the transmission and the uses of the data and the quality aspects. ICES will provide tables on data flow to illustrate the discussion.
2. Pilot studies: State of play and missing reports;
3. Bluefin Tuna and Swordfish Tagging 2005-2007: Summary of actions undertaken by Member states and evaluation;
4. Evaluation of the situation regarding the response by MS to the call for economic data launched to produce the draft report on the "Economic Performance of EU Fishing Fleet: Annual Report 2008"
5. SGRN 08-01: Presentation of the main outputs of the meeting and establishment of sound scientific criteria for the evaluation of NP and TR (as recommended by SGRN 08-01)

2 THE EVALUATION PROCESS

2.1 ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS

The Technical Reports submitted to SGRN were examined in five sub-groups: one sub-group was composed of economists who analysed the section on economic data of the fleet (Module J) and the section on the processing industry (Module K), while the remaining sections (Modules C-I, Databases, National and international co-ordination) were analysed by four biologists sub-groups.

A new procedure was tested to evaluate the Technical Reports with a regional perspective. The MS were allocated to the region where the majority of its fishing vessels operate and all MS from one region were analysed in one sub-group. In addition, specific actions of every MS in a given region were included for evaluation in all relevant sub-groups. In summary, each sub-group was analysing fully the TR from MS operating in mainly in the given region, plus all actions from the other MS in that given region. In the process, it was ensured that experts would not be asked to analyse the Technical Report from their own country. All sub-groups had common guidelines on which aspects of the Technical Reports they had to address in particular. The findings of the different sub-groups were then discussed in plenary.

The Technical Reports were to be written and summaries of collected data were to be provided following Guidelines put together by SGRN and available on the JRC website. The evaluation process and the comments by MS (section 4) strictly followed the structure of the Guidelines to facilitate the comprehension of SGRN comments and analysis.

To keep the evaluation process consistent, SGRN has elaborated and extended its comments based on former general SGRN recommendations, on the comparison with the 2007 National Programme proposals, and on all the relevant RCM recommendations. The feedback process with the end-users is an ongoing process (see section 4) and information was available from ICES assessment working groups on the quality and/or deficiencies of data received. For the first year, SGRN used this data in the evaluation (see section 3.5).

As in the previous years, SGRN particularly focused on the extent to which MS had met, or had tried to meet, the DCR requirements. For those parts of the DCR where the DCR requirements can be translated in terms of actual numbers (e.g. number of stations or vessels to be sampled, number of fish to be measured for length and age, etc.), MS were considered to have complied with the DCR if they had achieved more than 90 % of its requirements. However, the fact that SGRN has introduced this 90 % threshold to evaluate the levels of achievement does not mean that MS should only try to achieve 90 % of the DCR requirements. **Ultimately, MS should keep trying to achieve the full 100 % of the requirements.**

For several Modules of the DCR, MS have proposed to do (considerably) more than what is required by the DCR, in order to maintain or increase the quality of the data series concerned. This particularly applies to sampling for length and age of stocks that are under an EC recovery plan or whose data series are used for tuning purposes or when a precision level is targeted. Quite often, MS also applied for – and have been granted – additional funding to perform such sampling in excess of the DCR requirements. In SGRN's opinion, the submission of such proposals and their subsequent acceptance by the EC implies that there is a moral obligation for the MS to at least try to achieve the proposed level of sampling, even though there is no formal obligation to do so. In line with the amendment of the DCR (EU Regulation 1581/2004), which promotes sampling towards precision level objectives, SGRN considered the proposed and agreed sampling levels in the National Programme proposals as the targets to be achieved by the MS.

Generally speaking, when a MS failed to meet its data collection requirements, this may be due to two major reasons: (i) anything that could be classified as "*force majeure*" (e.g. bad weather conditions or damage to sampling gear during a survey, fishers refusing to have their landings sampled or to take sea-going

observers, temporal closures of fishing areas, etc.), and (ii) anything that could be classified as "lack of initiative" or "poor organisation". In SGRN's opinion, "*force majeure*" is an acceptable reason for non-compliance with the DCR requirements, while lack of initiative and poor organisation are not.

The compliance with the Guidelines has led to better clarity and homogeneous structure of reports, and enabled SGRN to evaluate more effectively the actions undertaken.

2.2 SGRN APPRECIATION AND COMMENTS

In its evaluation of the Technical Reports, SGRN has addressed several issues, related to (i) the reports in general, and more particularly their structure and presentation, and (ii) each Module section of the DCR separately. For each MS, SGRN's assessment of the achievements is summarised in two tables: firstly, a table with overall "ratings" and comments on the Technical Report as a whole, and secondly, an extensive table with Module-specific "ratings" and comments. The achievements under the Minimum Programme (MP) and under the Extended Programme (EP) are given side by side to provide a comprehensive overview of the MS's actions. The terminology used by SGRN in answering the questions and its meaning is given below:

Specific for the Extended Programme column

/ MS has not set up a programme for this module

Generic for all the questions

| | |
|--------|---|
| Yes | If the answer to the question does not suffer exceptions, or ambiguity. |
| Mostly | If the answer to the question is Yes but not in totality or with exceptions. |
| Partly | If only a part (generally less than half) of the planned actions was undertaken., or not <u>all</u> the relevant information was available. |
| No | If none or only a marginal part of the planned actions was undertaken, or no information at all was given. |
| NMS | No Major Shortfalls, and hence no need for an explanation. |
| ? | If SGRN was incapable of drawing a final conclusion. |
| NA | If MS did not apply for any actions for the specific section. |
| Derog. | If MS obtained derogation for the specific section |

3 EVALUATION OF THE 2007 TECHNICAL REPORTS GENERAL COMMENTS

3.1 MAJOR DRAWBACKS

By the time of the start of the meeting, two MS - Greece and the UK - had not provided a TR. In the case of Greece, the MS had carried out very few actions under the provisions of the DCR, not even the scientific surveys, because of unresolved financial issues. SGRN has commented on this issue in the section on the execution of NP regardless of financial delays.

In the case of the UK, the actions planned in the NP 2007 have apparently been carried out. However, the TR was missing at the beginning of the meeting and only tables provided by the scientists were available. SGRN made a decision not to undertake an evaluation in the absence of a complete and official TR document at the beginning of the meeting. SGRN once again insists that MS scrupulously respect the deadline for the submission of reports, in order that the Commission can ensure that all TRs are available at least two weeks before the SGRN meeting.

3.2 TRANSLATION PROBLEMS

SGRN notes that two reports (France and Spain) were submitted in languages other than English. Since there was insufficient time to translate these reports prior to the meeting of SGRN, the reports were read and evaluated in their original version by those experts capable of reading these languages. This year, **there were no economists able to read Spanish**, so the report had to be translated by software with all the restrictions concerning the poor quality of such a procedure. In general, a report written in a national language, other than English, implies that this report cannot be fully evaluated by all experts present at the meeting.

SGRN still noted some problems in the naming, as the DCR rules were not always respected and some of the species are not recorded by their scientific name in the TR tables, as previously recommended.

3.3 ON THE QUALITY OF THE TECHNICAL REPORTS

In general, SGRN was pleased with the quality of the Technical Reports. An overview of the overall quality has been summarised in the text table below. The major difference with last year is in the compliance with the Guidelines, where last year's figures were 8 Yes and 11 Mostly. .

| | NA | Yes | Mostly | Partly | No |
|---|----|-----------|-----------|--------|----|
| Compliance with the Guidelines | | 11 | 6 | 1 | |
| All necessary tables present in the report | | 17 | | 1 | |
| All necessary information present in the report | | 4 | 12 | 2 | |
| Individualisation of RCM regions | 6 | 11 | | 1 | |

There are still countries having major shortfalls in the production of the Technical Reports, and an effort needs to be made to provide a better explanation of the actions undertaken and the remedies proposed to avoid the shortfalls in the future. SGRN re-iterates its standpoint that the Technical Reports should be as concise as possible, while at the same time providing all the information that is necessary for the evaluation of the MS's achievements.

3.4 ON THE EXECUTION OF NP REGARDLESS OF FINANCIAL DELAYS

SGRN reminds the MS that the proper execution of the NP proposal is an obligation, regardless of the level of financing by the Commission. Thus, any delays in the approval of the budget by the Commission cannot be used as an excuse for not starting the sampling programme on January 1st. SGRN observes that the situation on this issue is deteriorating and that in 2007 one MS has not carried out any of the NP claiming administrative problems, and a second MS started their data collection very late in the year. This jeopardizes the consistency and the quality of the data collected, especially where scientific surveys at sea are concerned; other MS have claimed the same excuse for deficiencies in minor parts of their NP.

SGRN understands that the DCR budget agenda results in difficulties within MS and that the Commission is working on improving the situation. SGRN insists that all actions planned for the new DCR, regardless of any funding agenda issue, actually starts on the 1st of January 2009.

3.5 ON THE USE OF ICES DATA TABLES

3.5.1 ICES perspective

The Assessment Working Groups (AWGs) are the ICES structure that analyse the available data and make the decisions on the data used for stock assessment. AWGs also provide comments on the data deficiency and other problems that comprise the assessment. Usually this information is available in the WG reports but not in a complete manner. Due to the workload related with the implementation of the new structure on ICES advice, this year it was not possible to improve the practicalities on the feedback from the Assessment Working Groups (AWGs) to the data collectors on data deficiency and data problems. However, ICES provide data tables on a stock basis with information on catches (landings and discards), length composition (landings and discards), ALKs, weight at age, maturity data and tuning series. Except for the stocks that are assessed in WGWIDE, all the data provided to SGRN were based on 2008 assessments (with 2007 data).

ICES secretariat will improve the feedback from the Assessment Working Groups (AWGs) on data deficiency and data problems that compromise the quality on the assessment.

ICES have asked SGRN on what kind of information is more suitable for the evaluations of the TR.

3.5.2 The evaluators perspective

The ICES Secretariat, with the help of ICES stock coordinators, provided SGRN with an overview of the data available/provided by ICES countries for all stocks for which ICES provides advice. In the evaluation carried out this meeting, SGRN was able to compare the stock tables with the information provided in the Technical Reports, but only on a random basis.

Although this was very helpful and that improved the evaluation from previous years, there were contradictions between the information contained in the TR and the information contained in the data tables and SGRN was not in a position to assess which was the reality. To improve this situation, ICES should continue to provide information on the data received and used by the different assessment working groups concerning the whole range of variables. This information should be on a database format rather than in a quantity of excel spreadsheets. In addition, a document containing comments on the data issues, i.e. missing information and reasons for not using the information received, should be also provided to SGRN.

SGRN sees as essential the role of the feedback from the end-user to the data collectors as one of the steps toward better quality of the stock assessments. This role was expressed in PGCCDBS 2007, and taken forward by SGRN July 2007 report and the Liaison Meeting in 2008. The DCR central data catalogue website, envisaged to support the whole process by automating the upload of the NP proposal

and TR Excel tables and making this information downloadable to any end-user was seen complex to implement and of double use with other initiatives. The alternative resides for the future in the creation of regional databases and the extension of ICES Intercatch features and use, with the shortcoming that such initiatives will cover only the statistics and biological information. Other RFMOs should also develop a feedback process with the data collectors. For the Mediterranean, it was experienced this year an extensive call for data within STECF/SGMED subgroup in preparation of the forthcoming GFCM stock assessment. The feedback from SGMED was also used in this evaluation.

In the short term, SGRN has produced database-like Excel tables as part of the guidelines in support of the NP proposal 2009-2010 (SGRN-08-01) and will provide the same system for the TR. It is anticipated that this formatting of tables will allow (i) automatic filling of the data and (ii) possibilities to retrieve the information by the end-users for their own reporting.

3.6 ON FISHING OUTSIDE COMMUNITY WATERS

EU Reg. 199/2008 Article 3, referring to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation's Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and the Agreement relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks, which both emphasise the need to develop research and data collection with a view to improving scientific knowledge of the sector, clearly stipulates that MS must set up a «A multi-annual Community programme for collection, management and use of biological, technical, environmental, and socio-economic data concerning (a) commercial fisheries carried out by Community fishing vessels (ii) outside Community waters;»

The FAO code of conduct is very clear on the responsibility of MS regarding the vessels flying its flag. Moreover, in order to combat IUU fishing, all EU vessels must be authorised to fish and thus be included in the Community Fishing Fleet Register. In the DCR, although the population of vessels is defined as all vessels in the Community Fishing Fleet Register, there is little indication on the actions to undertake when landings of EU vessels occur in non-EU countries.

In summary, MS are responsible for collecting the data on landings and discards for all the vessels flying their flag, wherever they fish, and provide data to the organisation responsible for advice and/or management. To SGRN opinion, all necessary information should be included in MS National Programme and gathered following the provisions of the DCR and the relevant RFMO (when the provisions of the RFMO is more specific or more precise than the provisions of the DCR).

When landings occur in a EU country, the Member State on whose territory the first sale take place, shall be responsible for ensuring that biological sampling occurs according to the standards defined in this Community Programme (section B1-3.1 (a)).

When landings occur in a non-EU country, MS shall make as much effort as possible to organise sampling by its own staff or make arrangements with the local state to ensure that the data is provided to the relevant RFMO. The information on landings, effort and sampling intensity, the description of methodology used and data transmission should be included in MS DCR National Programme.

3.7 ON PRECISION LEVELS

Since the beginning of the DCR, SGRN has commented every year on precision level issues. The difficulty encountered by MS (SGRN, June 2005, Evaluation 2004 TR), the need for a common tool to harmonise the calculation at the European level (SGRN, July 2007, Evaluation of 2006 TR), the use of precision levels as DCR target (SGRN, July 2006, Evaluation 2005 TR) and general comments on precision levels in general. SGRN reiterates the comment made in July 2007 (SGRN, Evaluation of 2006 TR) :

“SGRN has repeatedly recommended every MS to estimate the precision of the data obtained by sampling in order to assess the quality of the associated estimates. In SGRN opinion, the best way to explore data is to evaluate the precision with the aim of optimising the sampling design (see Section 7.2 in SGRN-06-03 report, Anon. 2006). More than the exact

quantification of the level of uncertainty, the objective of calculating precision levels should be to improve the quality of the data that is collected. In parallel, SGRN has supported the idea of developing a common tool for assessing the accuracy and precision of the biological parameters estimated through sampling programmes. Such a tool has been granted financial support by the Commission through the Call for Service Contracts FISH/2006/15. [...] SGRN will continue to request all MS to assess the quality of the estimates even if the different methodologies used prevent the direct comparisons of the results between MS.”

The common tool to evaluate the precision of the biological parameters (COST project), will be available to the public early in 2009. This tool will authorise all MS to evaluate the bias and calculate the precision of the biological parameters, provided that they export their data following the agreed Data Exchange Format. **All MS are then invited to become acquainted with this format and to anticipate the exportation of their data**, since the Data Exchange Format is now fully operational and available on the project website (<http://www.ifremer.fr/cost>).

3.8 ON THE FUTURE OF MONITORING RECREATIONAL FISHERIES

In accordance with the provision of the DCR, MS are obliged to sample recreational fisheries of cod, salmon and bluefin tuna in EU waters. STECF (STECF November 2007) has already stated that the developing and agreement of a standard methodology for sampling recreational fisheries is a crucial issue that should be tackled in the near future and the process should also involve ICES through ad hoc workshops. It is clear that all MS should evaluate the recreational fisheries as required in the current and future DCR. However, it is also fundamental to develop a “follow up strategy” **after robust estimates of recreational catches become available**. Beside international obligations (e.g. reporting recreational catches of bluefin tuna in ICCAT), SGRN suggests that:

- ✓ When catches of aggregated recreational fisheries (all MSs catches combined) are less than 5% of the total catches of the stock, only update estimates should be mandatory once every five years, for example, within DCR.
- ✓ When catches of aggregated recreational fisheries (all MSs catches combined) are between 5-10% of the total catches of the stock, MSs should coordinate and develop (through Regional Coordination Meetings) sampling of recreational fisheries catches in order to estimate total quantity landed but would be exempted from sampling for length.
- ✓ When catches of aggregated recreational fisheries are more than 10% of the total catches of the stock, MS should coordinate and develop (through Regional Coordination Meetings) a monitoring and sampling scheme of their recreational fisheries catches in order to estimate both total quantity landed and length structures.

3.9 ON OTOLITH READING

All MS are requested to collect calcified structures for stocks listed in Appendix XV whether they have the facilities to read them or not. The non-reading possibilities could result in accumulation of large quantities of un-aged calcified structures residing in institutes.

It is strongly recommended that, in cases like this MS should continue the collection and

- seek agreement, in the relevant RCM, with another MS who has the expertise and willingness to accept to age them or
- consider having a staff member trained in assessing the otoliths.

The fact that age reading is not currently used in analytical stock assessment, should not be an excuse for not collecting the calcified structures. The modifications of the DCR requirements can only be done following STECF approval.

3.10 ON CYCLES FOR MODULE I SAMPLING.

SGRN notes that there is confusion on the interpretation of the requirement to triennially update the estimates of "Other biological parameters". In SGRN's opinion there are several ways of organising data collection on these parameters in compliance with the requirements of the DCR (SGRN July 2006 report):

- (i) Data are collected annually but reported every three years.
- (ii) Data are collected and reported once every three years, with fixed years for the collection of all data types, for all species (e.g. 2002, 2005, 2008 etc.).
- (iii) Data are collected and reported once every three years, with an alternating system for the different parameters or for different stocks, e.g. 2002, 2005, etc. for growth for all species; 2003, 2006, etc. for sexual maturity for all species; and 2004, 2007, etc. for fecundity for all species, or 2002, 2005, etc. for all parameters for one third of the species; 2003, 2006, etc. for all parameters for another third of the species; and 2004, 2007, etc. for all parameters for the remaining third of the species.

SGRN does not understand that, in the alternatives listed above, the possibility is offered to sum up 3 years of data in order to derive one set of parameters. This strategy which is currently used by some MS should be evaluated by ICES PGCCDBS and PGMED.

Regardless of which system is chosen, it is necessary for a MS to report on sampling achieved and associated precision levels in the TR, at least once within the three year cycle. Many Member States stated that they did not carry out any sampling for other biological parameters for Module I in 2007. However as 2007 was the final year of the 3-year cycle, and as no precision levels had been reported on biological sampling from 2005 – 2007 by some MS, it is impossible for SGRN to evaluate the effectiveness of these programmes and whether or not DCR targets have been met for this 3 year period.

SGRN reminds MS that achieved precision levels in Table 11.2 and 11.3 only needs to be filled in each time an actual update of a biological parameter is made.

The new three year cycle began in 2008 and will run to 2010 (2008 – 2010) as specified in the Guidelines for the new DCR.

3.11 ON PARAMETER DEFINITION FOR MODULE J

SGRN requests MS to clearly define the economic parameters collected under Module J of the DCR, with particular reference to fixed/capital costs.

SGRN urges MS to follow the definitions given on the JRC data collection website, which closely reflect the definitions to be used in the new DCR. Here "fixed costs" are defined as operational costs not related to fishing effort, and not the costs of capital (in contrast to the definition in the current DCR). "Capital costs" are defined as the sum of depreciation and the opportunity cost of capital (i.e., the estimated capital value multiplied by an appropriate interest rate). Note that on the JRC data collection website capital value is called INVESTMENT as in the current DCR.

3.12 ON REPRESENTATIVENESS OF ECONOMIC SAMPLES

SGRN states that information on data quality and representativeness is still poor in several cases. Yet no procedures have been established which can be applied as standard by all MS. SGRN had stressed this point repeatedly, in particular since the concept of precision level as used for biological variables is not applicable for economic variables. SGRN suggests having these issues addressed in the workshop on quality of economic data, which has been announced for the 4th quarter of 2008.

4 EVALUATION OF THE 2007 TECHNICAL REPORTS COMMENTS BY MS

4.1 COUNTRY: BELGIUM

a. General comments

| | |
|---|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE/ STECF-GRN Guidelines? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-GRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Mostly |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | NA |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: Belgium stopped estimating the precision levels in 2007 for all biological variables.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|-------------|
| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | No | 1 |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Yes | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | 2 |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | NMS | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |

1 See general comment On precision levels.

2 MS to clarify the lack of information for Nephrops data in FU 5.

| Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | NA | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | Yes | | 3 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | / | |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | NA | / | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | 4 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | NA | / | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | 5 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | NA | / | |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |

- 3 See also module J.
- 4 SGRN was informed that Nephrops landings in FU 5 has continuously decreased during the past years and fallen below 100 tonnes since 2006, thus allowing MS to stop sampling activities for this stock. Sampling of Nephrops landings was included in the NP but it is not mentioned in the TR.
- 5 In December 2005, SGRN suggested that "*all MS concerned (Belgium, Denmark, Netherlands and UK) enter into multilateral negotiations to ensure a minimum level of sampling on the Nephrops fisheries in the southern North Sea in 2006 and beyond, through task sharing*". To SGRN understanding, Belgium should be included in this agreement but not be the leader.

| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | 6 |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Yes | / | 7 |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | | | |
| | Demersal Young Fish Survey | Yes | / | |
| | North Sea Beam Trawl Survey | Yes | / | |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | 8 |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Mostly | / | 9 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | 10 |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Mostly | | 11 |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Yes | / | |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | 12 |

- 6 In line with SGRN December 2006 recommendation not to present any inland survey for eel in the current DCR, the proposed pilot study on eel in Inland waters has not been executed.
- 7 See general comment on CPUE.
- 8 See comment 3.
- 9 Rajidae is undersampled. All stocks under recovery plans or where data is needed for tuning series are sampled according to what was planned, except *Solea solea* VIIIfg for age which is under-sampled.
- 10 Number planned in the NP proposal are slightly different from what is reported in the TR. To be clarified by MS.
- 11 There is no explanation for under-sampling Rajidae. Information to be provided by MS.
- 12 See comment 1. No exploratory analysis of the precision level of the discard has been conducted. ??

| <i>Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | NA | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| <i>Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Mostly | / | 13 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |

- 13 The data in Table 12.1 refer to 2005 and not 2006 as stated in the text. To be clarified by MS.
The meaning of “pseudo-random” is unclear. How is a precision level of “1” derived in this case?
The definition and derivation of employment parameters is not sufficiently well explained. SGRN insists that clear description is provided in NP proposal 2009-2010 / 2008 TR.
A precision level of “1” is not appropriate for exhaustive sampling.
Fleet parameters are missing from Table 12.2. Missing information to be provided by MS.

| Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|---|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | No | / | 14 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 14 : Databases | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described? | Yes | | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| Section 15 : National and International co-ordination | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | | |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops? | Yes | | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through? | No | | 15 |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through? | No | | |
| Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | None | | |

-
- 14 There is no improvement on Module K coverage since last year. The total population is not clearly specified, smaller companies are excluded, the sampling strategy is unclear. Also, the planned sample appears to exceed the total population. SGRN insists that MS follows the provisions of the DCR and takes SGRN recommendations into account in the NP proposal 2009-2010 / 2008 TR.
- 15 MS stated that RCM/SGRN recommendations that were made in 2006 and 2007 did not impact the 2007 work plan, but did not list all relevant recommendations with appropriate comments. Information to be provided by MS.

4.2 COUNTRY: CYPRUS

a. General comments

| | |
|---|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-GRN Guidelines? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-GRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Mostly |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | NA |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: The Cypriot TR is well presented and contained most of the information required. However more details about the calculation of precision levels and the sampling programme for the <10m vessels is required.

In some cases the MS provided more data than was required by the DCR (discard sampling and tuna sampling) SGRN appreciates this additional work and considers this not to be against the spirit of the Regulation.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|-------------|
| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Partly | 1 |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | No | 2 |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | 3 |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | NA | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |

-
- 1 Precision levels provided for Modules C, Part of Module D, Part of Module E, Part of J and Module K. See also general comment On precision levels.
 - 2 No information on methodologies provided. MS should provide this information in future TR.
 - 3 The MS experienced difficulties with the subcontractor hired to calculate the precision level analysis and as a result could not complete this analysis in 2007.

| <i>Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | Mostly | | 4 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Mostly | / | 5 |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | / | 6 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | NA | / | 7 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | NA | / | |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

- 4 See module J.
- 5 For vessels <10m (<12m stated in the TR) the MS conducted sampling of 15% of the population based on declarative forms (production reports) but since no precision levels were provided we are unable to evaluate whether this level of sampling was sufficient.
- 6 Hake was also planned in the NP but not reported in the 2007 TR. SGRN was informed that information from logbook is available.
- 7 10 trips were observed on board in the mixed bottom trawl fishery for other purpose than discards, but discards information has been collected.

| | | | | |
|---|--|----------------------|------------|----------------|
| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | 8 |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | | | |
| | MEDITS | Yes | / | |
| | Tuna Tagging | Yes | / | 9 |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | 10 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | NA | / | |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

8 MS refers to a derogation approved in SEC(2005)255 STECF – SGRN report for recreational fisheries.

9 See section 6.

10 Only 1 tonne of Bluefin Tuna was landed in 2007, so the 10 tuna sampled represent 100% of the landings

| <i>Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|----------------------|----|----------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | NA | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| <i>Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Mostly | / | 11 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| <i>Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met ? | Yes | / | 12 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |

11 The reference year is specified as 2007, which appears to be an error. There are more vessels in the fleet register than are indicated in Table 12.1. To be clarified by MS.

The segmentation in Table 12.1 should conform to Appendix III of the DCR.

12 It is not clear how investment has been measured.

The definition of “fixed costs” is unclear. To be clarified by MS.

| | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Section 14 : Databases | | SGRN Appreciation | See comment |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | Yes | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |
| Section 15 : National and International co-ordination | | SGRN Appreciation | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | No | 13 |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | Yes | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | |
| Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections | | SGRN Appreciation | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | None | |

-
- 13 No formal National coordination meeting together with the representative of the Commission was held in Cyprus in 2007.

4.3 COUNTRY: DENMARK

a. General comments

| | |
|--|-----|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-SGRN Guidelines? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-SGRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Yes |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | Yes |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: None.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|---|-------------------|----|-------------|
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Mostly | | 1 |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Yes | | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | | |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | NA | | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |

- 1 No precision levels provided for fuel consumption and most of biological parameters. See also general comment On precision levels.

| <i>Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | Mostly | | 2 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | / | |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Discards | | | | 3 |
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 4 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | No | / | 5 |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Partly | / | 6 |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 7 |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |

- 2 See Module J.
- 3 The area described in Table 5.3 of the NP proposal does not match those specified in table 7.1 of the TR.
- 4 The number of observed trips has been reduced due to merging Nephrops discard sampling and demersal trawl discard sampling and due to decrease in the landings. An additional fishery was sampled for the 1st time (sprat fishery), although not included in the 2007 NP, for evaluating the amount of discards.
- 5 There is no mention of the <10m vessels in the text of the TR. Information to be provided by MS.
- 6 See comment 4.
- 7 SGRN notes a discrepancy between what was planned in the NP and what was achieved, in terms of area coverage (Sound was not included in 2007 survey). MS to report to the Commission the results of the continuation of the pilot study for cod recreational fisheries for evaluation by the next SGRN meeting. See also section 5.

| <i>Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | Sec comment |
|---|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | Sec comment |
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | IBTS 1st quarter | Yes | / | |
| | IBTS 3rd quarter | Yes | / | |
| | BIT'S 1st quarter | Yes | / | |
| | BIT'S 4th quarter | Yes | / | |
| | NS herring acoustic survey | Yes | / | |
| | Atlan/Scand. Herring survey | Yes | / | |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | Sec comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | 8 |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Partly | / | 9 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Mostly | | 10 |

- 8 SGRN recommended in its December 2007 report to detail in an annex of the TR the origin of the derogations obtained. This information is missing and should be provided together with the NP proposal 2009-2010 as specified in the new guidelines.
- 9 The National targets were not met for most of the species (25/46 stocks did not reach the 90% threshold for length sampling and 26/37 stocks did not reach the 90% threshold for age sampling). The sampling against the minimum requirement improves the results but still 12/48 stocks did not reach the 90% threshold for length sampling and 11/44 stocks did not reach the 90% threshold for age sampling against the minimum requirement. 3 stocks under recovery plan were under sampled. Justification is given for all deviations.

For sandeel, it appears that much larger samples than reported in table 10.1 has been collected, analysed and used for assessment in ICES WG. SGRN agrees with the approach taken by MS but would like to have the correct figures in the table, even though part of the data is collected outside the DCR framework.

Eel was not sampled at all although it is a species under recovery plan. SGRN was informed that this is a mistake. Correct information to be provided by MS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 11 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| <i>Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 12 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | NA | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

-
- 10 For eel, justification and action taken are not acceptable. MS should follow the provisions of the DCR.
- 11 For some species (Hake, herring and mackerel), age sampling of the discard was not reported. To be clarified by MS.
- 12 For Anglerfish, 2007 sampling of sex ratio and maturity is missing. Missing information to be provided by MS.

| Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|----------------------|----|----------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 13 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 14 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Section 14 : Databases | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | Yes | | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| Section 15 : National and International co-ordination | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | | |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | Yes | | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | | |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | NA | | |
| Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | None | | |

- 13 The distinction between vessels and “fishing units” is explained but leads to some confusion. It is stated that less active vessels are covered by data collection but this is not reflected in the tables : it appears that inactive vessels have been excluded, despite the description of the survey coverage. Table 12.2 is missing a number of the parameters required. SGRN insists that all the population of vessels included in the national fleet register be covered. All necessary information to be provided by MS.

Some indication of how representative the samples are should be given in the survey description in the NP proposal 2009-2010 / TR 2008.

- 14 The report states that data for smaller enterprises is limited and is therefore imputed. This is not reflected in the sampling rates given in Tables 13.1 and 13.2. To be clarified by MS.

4.4 COUNTRY: ESTONIA

a. General comments

| | |
|---|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-SGRN Guidelines? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE/ STECF-SGRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Mostly |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | Yes |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: None.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|---|-------------------|----|-------------|
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | No | | |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | No | | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | Yes | | |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | | |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | NMS | | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

- 1 No precision estimates were provided due to the absence of a common tool for estimating precision. See general comment On precision levels.

| Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort | | SGRN Appreciation | | Sec comment |
|--|--|----------------------|-----|----------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | ? | | 2 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | / | 3 |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings | | SGRN appreciation | | Sec comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | Yes | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | Yes | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | NMS | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 4 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | ? | / | 5 |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

- 2 See Module J.
- 3 The MS is reminded on the SGRN recommendation (December 2005) on upgrading the effort unit requirements for passive gears from the EP to the MP. SGRN calls the attention on the fact that this information will become mandatory in the future DCR.
- 4 SGRN does not understand the rationale for estimating “potential discards” as this cannot be an approximation of the real discarding behaviour. MS referred in the past to a 2005 pilot study and has undertaken a 2007 pilot study on discarding in the skate fishery. MS should take the opportunity to report these pilot studies, and address all issues related to discards estimates. This pilot studies report should be made available for the next SGRN meeting. See also section 5.
- 5 To be clarified by MS whether vessels <10m are included in the sampled coastal fishery.

| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | Mostly | 6 |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | NMS | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | Herring Acoustic Survey 3 rd quarter | Yes | / | |
| | Herring Acoustic Survey 4 th quarter | Yes | / | 7 |
| | BIT'S | Yes | / | |
| | Sprat Acoustic Survey | Derog. | / | 8 |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

6 MS states that reporting of recreational catches is mandatory since 2005.

MP: Recreational catches of MP species were available from declarative forms. MS notes that an internet inquiry study will also be performed in 2008. SGRN calls the attention that there is a workshop on methodology to use for recreational fisheries in preparation, and that MS methodology should be provided in such a forum.

EP: Recreational catches of EP species were available from declarative forms. The 2007 planned questionnaire-based survey on under-ice angling was not performed.

SGRN recalls that a provisional derogation has been granted to MSs on sampling recreational fisheries, until a standard methodology is developed (see SGRN 2007 July comment).

7 MS is requested to use the correct name of the survey.

8 Although the survey is included in Table 9.1, it is not referenced in the text.

| <i>Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|--------|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | Partly | 9 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | Yes | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | Yes | 10 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | NA | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| <i>Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | Yes | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | NA | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | Yes | 11 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | NMS | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | Yes | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | NMS | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | NA | / | 12 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

9 **M.P:** Table 10.1 contains some error values. More than 50% of the Baltic stocks were oversampled, while one stock (eel) was under-sampled. Sebastes in NAFO area is not under a recovery plan as stated in the TR. Insufficient length sampling was carried out but more than sufficient age sampling. SGRN would like to have explanation on the rationale of the approach used. Rays in NAFO are not sampled at all.

E.P: Table 10.2 contains some error values. 3 out of 5 sampled stocks are under-sampled (as in 2005 and 2006), while the other 2 are sampled in excess.

10 See comment 4 concerning the measurement of “potential” discards.

11 Table 11.1 is not fully completed concerning the long-term planning of sex ratio.

12 It is assumed that fecundity sampling included in Table 11.4 (EP) is a mistake.

| Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels | | SGRN appreciation | | Sec comment |
|--|---|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | ? | / | 13 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry | | SGRN appreciation | | Sec comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | No | / | 14 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | no | | |
| Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections | | SGRN appreciation | | Sec comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | None | | |

- 13 Table 12.2 refers to 2007 data. This may be an error or a misinterpretation of the DCR since the TR should refer to data collection activities in 2007.

The naming of the segments in Table 12.1 should conform with Appendix III of the DCR.

A definition is missing for several parameters, e.g. FTE, replacement value, and interest rates.

The sampling strategy for vessels other than ‘trawlers’ is not clear for cost parameters.

It is not clear how cost items for ‘trawlers’ are derived from the samples.

A segmentation of vessels by activity level is not provided for in the DCR. Information on what was actually achieved in 2007 and clarification on sampling strategies and parameters definitions to be provided by MS.

- 14 No or insufficient information is provided on sampling and parameter definition. Insufficient information is provided to permit a thorough analysis on the compliance of the TR with the DCR requirements.

No surveys planned have been reported. The information provided on sampling does not refer to data collection activities in 2007. SGRN insists that MS follows the provisions of the DCR.

4.5 COUNTRY: FINLAND

a. General comments

| | |
|--|-----|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-SGRN Guidelines? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-SGRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Yes |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | NA |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: The report was well written and structured, providing all necessary information required.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|---|-------------------|----|-------------|
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Mostly | | 1 |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Yes | | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | | |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | NMS | | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |

- 1 Precision level has not been estimated for all stocks for parameters included in Modules H&I. See general comment On precision levels.

The achieved level of precision for fishing effort, specific fishing effort, and landings is not specified as « All » in Table 3.1, although the text mentions an exhaustive collection of information. To be clarified by MS.

| <i>Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|---|--|-------------------|-----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | ? | | 2 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | / | |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| <i>Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 3 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | NA | / | |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | Yes | 4 |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | NMS | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| <i>Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |

- 2 Fuel consumption reported to be collected but not provided to the call for data in January 2008. See section 7.
- 3 No discard sampling undertaken following exemption rules and NP Proposal 2007.
- 4 MS refers to a pilot study for cod and salmon conducted during 2007 within the NP, for which some information is given. It is reminded that a provisional derogation has been granted to MS on sampling recreational fisheries, until a standard methodology is developed (see SGRN 2007 July comment). Nevertheless, carrying a pilot study should lead to the provision of a report, which was already required for March 2007. MS is urgently requested to provide the report on their pilot study. See also section 5.

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | BITS (4 th quarter) | NA | / | 5 |
| | Herring acoustic survey | Yes | / | |
| | Sprat acoustic survey | Derog. | / | |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Partly | Mostly | 6 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | Yes | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | NA | / | |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | 7 |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

- 5 SGRN notes that, within the BITS working group, MS has not been asked to provide vessel time in the BITS survey, and has participated by providing staff.
- 6 **M.P** : There was a shortfall in sampling for more than 50% of stocks sampled ; however, achieved samples were in most cases well in excess than those required by DCR.
E.P : There was a shortfall in sampling for one of the 3 sampled stocks ; however achieved samples were well in excess than those required by DCR.
SGRN recommends to use guidance of precision levels to redistribute their sampling intensities and try to reach their own planned objectives.
- 7 The inclusion of salmon river sampling (both in MP & EP) is not in conformity with the DCR (see previous SGRN comment on the evaluation of the 2007 NP).

| Sex ratios | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 8 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | 9 |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | NA | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 10 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 11 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |

8 Sexual maturity sampling was not performed for salmon and sea trout, although SGRN had previously insisted that MS carry out such sampling. See SGRN comment on the evaluation of the 2006 TR.

9 Although sexual maturity of salmon and sea trout are not included in the 2007 NP, it is not explained why there is a deviation from DCR requirements.

10 MS excludes non-active vessels from the sampling. SGRN insists that all the population of vessels included in the national fleet register be covered.

The methodology for calculation of “employment” (FTE, full-time/part-time) is not explained. SGRN insists that clear description is provided in NP proposal 2009-2010 / 2008 TR.

More information on the sampling procedure for cost parameters would be helpful.

11 Parameters are not sufficiently well defined. To be clarified by MS.

It is not clear which method the MS has applied for the calculation of the Investment (asset value) – historical, replacement or insurance value. To be clarified by MS.

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|-------------|
| Section 14 : Databases | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | Yes | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |
| Section 15 : National and International co-ordination | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | Mostly | 12 |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | |
| Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | None | |

-
- 12 Although participation was planned for Workshop on Age Reading on Flounder and Workshop on Discard Raising Procedures, the attendance in these meetings was cancelled with no explanation given.

4.6 COUNTRY: FRANCE

a. General comments

| | |
|--|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-SGRN Guidelines? | Mostly |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Partly |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-SGRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Partly |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | Yes |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: The major drawback of the report is that tables regarding age sampling for discards (10.3) and module I (11.1; 11.2 and 11.3) do not contain the necessary information. Species names are given in different language through the TR and the NP proposal. SGRN already recommended using Latin names in all occasions. The report was available to SGRN only in French before the meeting (see section 3.2).

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|-------------|
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Partly | 1 |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Yes | 2 |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Mostly | 3 |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | Yes | 4 |

- 1 Although the TR states that "*Dans l'ensemble, les niveaux de précision statistique requis par le règlement sont atteints. Les tables jointes (fichier Excel, feuille 3.1) fournissent une information plus précise à ce sujet.*", Table 3.1 is mostly empty. Missing data to be provided by MS. (same comment as 2007 SGRN report). See also general comment On precision levels.
- 2 Full details on methods used are given, both in the main body of the report and in annexes, but there is no cross-reference to them in Table 3.1. (same comment as 2007 SGRN report)
- 3 For all species, no quantities of discards have been sent to North Sea WG. The same applies for SGRST required data. Cod in VIId is not sampled for length because of exemption rules although this information is required by the WGNSSK. See general comment on ICES tables
- 4 The information is given for not transmitting the megrim age information and a solution has been provided for 2009.

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| 43 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were DCR targets met | | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | Mostly | | 5 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | / | |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Mostly | / | 6 |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were DCR targets met ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were DCR targets met ? | No | / | 7 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | No | / | |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | 8 |

5 See Module J.

6 Vessels <10m in Mediterranean are only partially sampled (Languedoc and Roussillon).

7 Almost all discard sampling programmes were far below the targets. MS should provide all information regarding actions planned to circumvent the recurrent poor sampling of discards in the future.

8 SGRN understands that the problem of under-achievement in 2007 is, amongst others, again due to a lack of co-operation from the fishing sector. However, in view of the large number of vessels from which candidates can be recruited for sea-going observer trips, the decrease in level of achievement is unacceptable. (comment from 2007 SGRN July report). See also general comment On the execution of the DCR requirements.

| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were DCR targets met ? | ? | / | 9 |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Na | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Na | | |
| Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Mostly | / | 10 |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Na | | |
| Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were DCR targets met ? | | | |
| | IBTS 1st quarter | Yes | / | |
| | West IBTS 4th quarter, EVHOE | Yes | / | |
| | Sardine, Anchovy, Horse Mackerel Acoustic Survey | Yes | / | |
| | MEDIT'S | Yes | / | |
| | CGFS | Yes | / | |
| | Blue Whiting Survey | Yes | / | |
| | European Tuna Tagging Programme | Yes | / | |
| | PELMED | / | Yes | |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | | | |

- 9 There is no reference on the reporting to ICCAT of catches of bluefin tuna by recreational fishermen in the Mediterranean. Information to be provided by MS. See also general comment On the following international obligations regarding recreational fisheries.
- 10 Two CPUE series concerning hake were dropped (VIII and VIIIa,b). SGRN agreed already last year on the approach taken by MS, but reference to SGRN comments should be properly referenced.

| Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|-----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Mostly | Yes | 11 |
| | Were national targets met ? | Mostly | / | |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Mostly | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Partly | / | 12 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were DCR targets met? | ? | / | 13 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were DCR targets met? | ? | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

- 11 Recovery plan species are well sampled; *Lepidorhombus* spp are not sampled for age in VII and VIIIb although they are tuning series (the reference to the section where an explanation is given should be found in the text, see footnote 4); other species e.g. *Coryphenoides rupestris* are not sampled for age but no explanation is given; SGRN considers that no derogation was ever granted for not sampling bluefin tuna for length in Mediterranean. Eel in all areas is not sampled. Discrepancies were found between the NP proposal and the TR in the Mediterranean. To be clarified by MS.
- 12 MS states that discards were sampled for age but no information is provided in table 10.3. SGRN recommends that these numbers should be provided in the TR.
- 13 Inconsistencies between table 11.1 and 11.2. and 11.3. E.g. *Merlangus merlangus* in IV and VIId foreseen in 2007 in table 11.1 and not planned in table 11.2 and 11.3; *Lophius piscatorius* and *Lophius budegassa* in North East Atlantic foreseen in 2007 in table 11.1 and not planned in table 11.2 and 11.3; Nephrops as well. SGRN recommends MS to provide new tables
No precision levels were reported. However as 2007 is the final year of the 3 years cycle, and as no precision levels have been reported on biological sampling from 2005 – 2007 it is impossible for SGRN to evaluate the effectiveness of this programmes and whether or not DCR targets have been met for this 3 year period. See also general comment On the cycles for Module I sampling.

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were DCR targets met? | ? | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were DCR targets met? | ? | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Mostly | / | 14 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Yes | / | 15 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 14 : Databases | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | Yes | | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |

14 The MS excludes the Corse and Overseas vessels (Martinique, Guadeloupe etc.), which is a substantial part of the (EU-water- or by bilateral agreements associated Non-EU water-) fleet. SGRN insists that all the population of vessels included in the national fleet register be covered.

The MS reports “full time employment” without providing a clear calculation method. To be clarified by MS.

15 Companies not belonging to fish processing should be excluded from the TR.

More information on parameter definition and a clearer presentation would be helpful.

The number of companies stated in the TR is not in accordance with the NP (apparently the NP has not been updated from the template). To be clarified by MS.

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|-------------|
| <i>Section 15 : National and International co-ordination</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | Yes | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | |
| <i>Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | Yes | 16 |

16 See section 9.1.

4.7 COUNTRY: GERMANY

a. General comments

| | |
|--|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-SGRN Guidelines? | Mostly |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-SGRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Yes |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised? | Yes |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: MS should use the naming convention used in the DCR and in the guidelines. No information is provided concerning fishing in CECAF area. See also general comment On fishing outside Community waters.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|---|-------------------|----|-------------|
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Yes | | |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Yes | | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | | |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | NA | | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |

1 See general comment On precision levels.

| <i>Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|---|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | Mostly | | 2 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | / | |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | 3 |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Mostly | / | 4 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| <i>Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |

-
- 2 See Module J.
 - 3 SGRN understands that vessels not submitted to log-books are implicitly the vessels <10m but this should be clearly specified in future NP proposals and TR.
 - 4 Sampling areas in table 7.1. are not consistent with 10.1. Thus, it is difficult to evaluate if MS achieved what was planned in the NP. Moreover, name of the species should be consistent with DCR. MS should avoid the use of acronyms and local names for species name. Modification of the tables is requested.

| <i>Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | Sec comment |
|---|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | | |
| | International hydro-acoustic Oceanic redfish survey | No | / | 5 |
| | Baltic International Trawl Survey (BITS) | Yes | / | |
| | Baltic Herring Acoustic Survey (BIAS) | Yes | / | |
| | Baltic Sprat Acoustic Survey | Yes | / | |
| | International Bottom Trawl Survey (IBTS) | Yes | / | |
| | Atlanto-Scandian Herring Acoustic Survey | Yes | / | |
| | North Sea Herring Acoustic Survey | Yes | / | |
| | North Sea Beam Trawl Survey (BTS) | Yes | / | |
| | Demersal Young Fish Survey | Yes | / | |
| | Mackerel and Horse Mackerel Egg Survey | Yes | / | |
| | International Hydro-Acoustic Oceanic Redfish Survey | Yes | / | |
| | Blue Whiting Survey | Yes | / | |
| | Greenland bottom trawl survey | / | Mostly | 6 |
| | Herring Larvae Survey (Baltic) | / | Yes | |
| | German Flatfish Survey | / | Yes | |
| | Herring Larvae Survey (North Sea) | / | Yes | |
| | German Cod Survey | / | Yes | |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | Yes | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| <i>Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | Sec comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Mostly | / | 7 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Mostly | | 8 |

- 5 Survey was not carried out because of vessel breakdown.
- 6 85 of the 110 hauls planned were achieved, due to bad weather and heavy ice conditions.
- 7 National target were not met for 5/23 stocks for length sampling and 3/10 stocks for age sampling (cod in North Sea and Baltic sea, which are the stocks under recovery plan were fully sampled). Compared to the minimum requirement, 9/23 stocks did not reach the 90% threshold for length sampling and 2/10 stocks did not reach the 90% threshold for age sampling.
- 8 In case of lack of space on board of small fishing vessel, MS should explore the possibility of self-sampling.

| <i>Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|----------------------|----|----------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Mostly | / | 9 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| <i>Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Mostly | / | 10 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |

- 9 The survey for static gear vessels < 12m has not been carried out. SGRN insists that the survey is implemented in NP proposal 2009-2010 / 2008 TR.

No information on the representativeness of the non-random sampling survey and the census on vessels >40m is provided. SGRN requests a clear analysis on representativeness in NP proposal 2009-2010 / 2008 TR.

- 10 It is not clear whether all collected data are representative for the sector. To be clarified by MS.
The definition of fixed costs is unusual and not appropriate. To be clarified by MS.

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|-------------|
| <i>Section 14 : Databases</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | Yes | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |
| <i>Section 15 : National and International co-ordination</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | Yes | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | |
| <i>Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | Yes | 11 |

11 See section 9.1.

4.8 COUNTRY: IRELAND

a. General comments

| | |
|---|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-GRN Guidelines? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-GRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Mostly |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | Yes |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: None

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|---|-------------------|----|-------------|
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Yes | | |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Yes | | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | | |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | NMS | | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | No | | |
| <i>Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Na | | |

1 See general comment On precision levels.

2 See general comment on the use of ICES tables.

| Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
|---|--|----------------------|----|----------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | Yes | | |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | / | |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Na | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Partly | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | No | / | 3 |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Partly | / | 4 |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Mostly | | 5 |
| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | 6 |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

- 3 There is no mention of vessels < 10 m in the section on discards. To be clarified by MS (repetition from evaluation of Technical Reports 2006).
- 4 Deviations are given only for >10m vessels.
- 5 Suggested actions only for >10m vessels.
- 6 SGRN recalls that the report of the pilot study for cod carried out in 2006 is still missing and should be provided for evaluation during the next SGRN meeting. See also section 5.

| <i>Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|---|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | | | |
| | International Norwegian Acoustic Survey | Yes | / | |
| | NW Herring Acoustic Survey | Yes | / | |
| | International Blue Whiting Survey | Yes | / | |
| | Celtic Sea Herring Acoustic Survey | Yes | / | |
| | Western IBTS Q4 | Yes | / | |
| | Mackerel/Horse mackerel Egg production | Yes | / | 7 |
| | Bluefin Tuna Tagging | No | / | |
| | Nephrops UWTV | / | Yes | |
| | Deepwater Trawl Survey | / | Yes | |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| <i>Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Mostly | Yes | 8 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | NA | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Partly | / | 9 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | 10 |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |

7 Mackerel/Horse mackerel Egg production survey is described in table 9.1 but not mentioned in the text.

8 *Sardina pilchardus* was planned for sampling in the NP but is not mentioned in the text nor in table 10.1 of the TR. To be clarified by MS.

The NP fell short of the national targets for many species and stocks. From the recovery stocks, none met the sampling targets; as well as for most of the tuning stocks. The reasons are well explained and actions to remedy these shortfalls should permit full achievement of the sampling intensity in the future.

9 17 métiers were planned in NP, 14 were actually sampled (table 7.1) but information for only for 6 métiers are provided in table 10.3. To be clarified by MS.

10 Explanation is given in the text regarding Module E and H (landings fraction). SGRN recalls MS to indicate in the appropriate section where the reader should find the information.

| <i>Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|----------------------|----|----------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | 11 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Mostly | / | 12 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |

11 SGRN was informed that Column "N° achieved" in Table 11.2 and 11.3 refers to two different sources but this would have needed a clarification in the text.

12 SGRN appreciates the very informative report.

The sampling strategy applied does not ensure a random sample and data may therefore not be representative. MS is aware of the problem.

The parameter definition is confusing and not clear in all cases and does not correspond with table 12.2. To be clarified by MS.

Tables 12.3 and 12.4 should be erased, there is no extended programme performed.

| Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|----------------------|----|----------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Mostly | / | 13 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | 14 |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 14 : Databases | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | Yes | | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | NA | | |
| Section 15 : National and International co-ordination | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | | |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | Yes | | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | | |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | | |
| Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | None | | |

-
- 13 The correspondence between data collected by BIM and DCR parameters is not always clear. It is not clear from the Table 13.2 if the production costs are collected by cost category or not. To be clarified by MS.

No information is provided on the representativeness of the data collected. SGRN requests a clear analysis on representativeness in NP proposal 2009-2010 / 2008 TR.

- 14 The deviation on raw material is sufficiently described, but the issue of representativeness is not addressed.

4.9 COUNTRY: ITALY

a. General comments

| | |
|---|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-GRN Guidelines? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-GRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Mostly |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | NA |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: The Italian sampling design for module H was modified in the course of 2007 following Commission request and SGRN July recommendation. No information on these changes in sampling design is evident in the 2007 TR, which leads to a confusing mis – match between planned sampling levels for length in the TR vs. the NP proposal.

The MS experienced severe problems in implementing its NP due to administrative difficulties with its Government, leading to the inability to conduct the GRUND survey, and an inability to complete planned sampling in Module H. Actions to avoid such shortfalls in the future should be provided by MS.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|-------------|
| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Mostly | 1 |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Yes | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | NMS | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |

- 1 There was no sampling under Module I in 2007 and no precision levels were reported. However as 2007 is the final year of the 3 year cycle, and as no precision levels have been reported on biological sampling from 2005 – 2007 it is impossible for SGRN to evaluate the effectiveness of this programme and whether or not DCR targets have been met for this 3 year period. See also General comment on the cycles for Module I sampling and general comment On precision levels.

| <i>Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|-----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | ? | / | 2 |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| <i>Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | Yes | | 3 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | Yes | 4 |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | NA | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | Yes | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | Yes | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | NA | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Mostly | / | 5 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |

- 2 Italy uses the vessel register to calculate fishing capacities, there is no mention in the TR how MS distinguish the fleet segmentation as in the appendix III, especially for vessels <10m. To be clarified by MS.
- 3 See also Module J.
- 4 SGRN appreciates that MS has included a pilot study to estimate fishing effort in line with the Metier based sampling approach in the new DCR, as recommended in Nantes meeting (Anon. 2006a). SGRN recommends to include the report of this pilot study as an annex of the NP Proposal 2009-2010. See also section 5.
- 5 Discard estimates are triennial in the Mediterranean, and discards were sampled and reported in the MS 2006 TR. SGRN requested in July 2007 that missing information be provided. MS to remedy this omission.

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | 6 |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | Yes | |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | NMS | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | | | |
| | MEDITS | ? | / | 7 |
| | Tuna Tagging | Partly | / | 8 |
| | Swordfish Tagging | Partly | / | 9 |
| | GRUND Survey | / | No | 10 |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | No | 9 |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | 11 |

- 6 SGRN was informed that catches and figures have been reported to ICCAT. In future TR MS should provide information on the follow-up given to ICCAT obligations with regards to recreational fisheries for BFT.
- 7 MEDITS survey has been delayed in 2007, putting at risk the consistency of the historical time series. Any substantial modification of the design of a survey must receive the authorisation of STECF (Article 8.1 of EU Reg. 1639/2001) and the quality of the 2007 indices must be evaluated by the MEDITS working group.
No planned days at sea nor achieved days are reported for any of the surveys in table 9.1 and 9.2. Information to be provided by MS.
- 8 Tagged only 50% of the planned tunas (10/20). See discussion in section 6.
- 9 Tagged only 51% of the planned swordfish in 2007 (76/150). Also no map is provided for the swordfish tagging survey. See discussion in section 6.
- 10 Italy did not carry out the GRUND Survey due to administrative problems, but does not elaborate any further. SGRN reminds the MS that the proper execution of the NP proposal is an obligation regardless of whether funding is available through the DCR or not. See general comment On the execution of the DCR requirements.
- 11 No actions proposed to remedy the shortfalls in achieving planned targets for Module G. Information to be provided by MS.

| <i>Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Partly | / | 12 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | 13 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | ? | / | 1 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | ? | / | 14 |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | ? | | |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | ? | / | 1 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | ? | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | ? | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | ? | / | 1 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | ? | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | ? | | |

- 12 Planned sampling targets for length differ significantly between those outlined in Table 8.1 of the NP and those detailed in Table 10.1 of the TR. SGRN acknowledges that the July recommendation for modification explains such a mismatch, but this should have been made clear in the text of the 2007 TR. Also the planned levels for sampling of length is lower than the levels planned for age for some species : Lophius spp. (600 length v's 1090 age) and Coryphaena (800 length v's 2012 age.). To be clarified by MS.

National target (according to NP proposal) was not met for 7/27 species for length and for 7/17 species for age. Minimum requirement was not met for 9/27 species for length and for 14/17 species for age.

- 13 See footnote 5.
- 14 No precision levels were reported. However as 2007 is the final year of the 3 years cycle, and as no precision levels have been reported on biological sampling from 2005 – 2007 it is impossible for SGRN to evaluate the effectiveness of this programmes and whether or not DCR targets have been met for this 3 year period. See also general comment On the cycles for Module I sampling.

| Fecundity | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|-----|----------------|
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | NA | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | Yes | 15 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | Yes | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Mostly | / | 16 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 14 : Databases | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | No | | 17 |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| Section 15 : National and International co-ordination | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | | |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | Yes | | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | ? | | 18 |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | No | | 19 |

- 15 The naming of the segments in Table 12.1 should conform to Appendix III of the DCR.
- 16 Definition on financial position, investment and employment are not clear. To be clarified by MS.
No information is provided on the representativeness of the data collected. SGRN requests a clear analysis on representativeness in NP proposal 2009-2010 / 2008 TR.
- 17 The database workplan as outlined in the NP 2007 is not reported in the TR. Information to be provided by MS.
- 18 The MS refers to RCM recommendations from the RCM meeting which took place in 2007. The TR should also refer to the recommendations made by the 2006 RCM meeting and actioned by the MS in 2007.

| <i>Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
|---|---|-------------------|-------------|
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | None | |

-
- 19 The report states that no SGRN recommendation was applicable to MS, although SGRN, December 2006 , "Insists that the MS takes the necessary steps to remedy this mistake and sure that the DCR is correctly implemented" concerning Module H implementation. No information is supplied in the TR on this recommendation.

4.10 COUNTRY: LATVIA

a. General comments

| | |
|--|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-SGRN Guidelines? | Mostly |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-SGRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Mostly |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | Yes |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: The report was well structured and followed the Guidelines. However, the numbering of sub-sections was not strictly followed, and some mandatory sections were skipped. Though all standard tables were available, there was some inconsistency between some of them (see relevant sections). No biological information is provided concerning fishing in CECAF area. See also general comment On fishing outside Community waters.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|-------------|
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Mostly | 1 |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Yes | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | Yes | 2 |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | NMS | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |

- 1 Precision levels for module H& I parameters is estimated for about 50% of the species included in the NP. See general comment On precision levels.
- 2 The MS refers to the need in developing a common software for estimating precision levels. See general comment On precision levels.

| <i>Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | ? | | 3 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | / | 4 |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Mostly | / | 5 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Mostly | / | 6 |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | 7 |
| <i>Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

- 3 Fuel consumption reported to be collected but not provided to the call for data in January 2008. See section 7.
- 4 The MS is reminded on the SGRN recommendation (December 2005) on upgrading the effort unit requirements for passive gears from the EP to the MP. SGRN calls the attention on the fact that this information will become mandatory in the future DCR.
- 5 MS notes that specific fishing effort data are not obtained from the High Sea and coastal fisheries. The provisions of the DCR is by species (Appendix VI), regardless of vessel size or fisheries location/ MS should clarify how complete is the coverage of this information, especially regarding the High Sea.
- 6 As stated in the TR, fishing effort was not estimated precisely concerning this fleet until 2007.
- 7 Changes were introduced in 2007 for estimating precisely the fishing effort of the coastal fisheries.

| Discards | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 8 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | ? | / | 9 |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | 10 |
| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Derog. | / | |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.1 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | BT'S 1 st quarter | Yes | / | |
| | BT'S 4 th quarter | Yes | / | |
| | Herring Acoustic Survey | Yes | / | |
| | Sprat Acoustic Survey | Yes | / | |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | Yes | 11 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | NA | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |

- 8 There was a shortfall in sampling 1 (out of 8) metier in the Baltic Sea. That métier (salmon driftnet) is forbidden from 2008. The trip planned for observing the discards in the NEAF area was not carried out.
- 9 There is no reference whether vessels <10m are included in the discard sampling.
- 10 No remedies proposed for NEAF area.
- 11 There was sampling in excess of what was planned of some stocks in both MP& EP, but on national expenses.

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 12 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | 13 |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 14 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | NA | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Mostly | / | 15 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |

- 12 Information on salmon driftnet and salmon coastal fisheries length and age sampling is missing from Table 10.3.
- 13 Although in the 2007 NP Proposal an EP is proposed for 3 stocks, in the 2007 TR these stocks are included in the MP. MS should correct the 2007 TR accordingly.
- 14 There is an inconsistency between the length-at-age samples (Table 11.2) and age-samples (Tables 10.1 or 10.3) concerning cod, since more individuals are sampled for biological information at age than number of individuals actually sampled for age.
- 15 The naming of the segments in Table 12.1 should conform to Appendix III of the DCR.

Some cost items are not attributed to the correct category. Information on parameter definition is insufficient. FTE indicators are not provided. SGRN insists that MS follows the provisions of the DCR and takes SGRN recommendations into account in the NP proposal 2009-2010 / 2008 TR.

| Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|----------------------|----|----------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were Data Collection requirements met? | Mostly | / | 16 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 14 : Databases | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | Yes | | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| Section 15 : National and International co-ordination | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | | |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | Yes | | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | | |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | | |
| Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | Yes | | |

16 Several parameters are not provided in table 13.2: raw material, fixed costs, investment, price/product. Information on parameter definition is insufficient. FTE indicators are not provided. SGRN insists that MS follows the provisions of the DCR and takes SGRN recommendations into account in the NP proposal 2009-2010 / 2008 TR.

The description of “financial costs; share of own/borrowed capital” is inappropriate. To be clarified by MS.

17 See section 9.1.

4.11 COUNTRY: LITHUANIA

a. General comments

| | |
|---|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-GRN Guidelines? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-GRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Mostly |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | Partly |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: The report was well written and structured. However, it contains only information on fishing activities within the Baltic Sea; no information is provided concerning other fishing areas. See also general comment On fishing outside Community waters.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|---|-------------------|----|-------------|
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Yes | | |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Yes | | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | ? | | |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | ? | | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

- 1 Table 3.1. contains some blank cells, however the information required is provided in the text. See also general comment On precision levels.
- 2 Table 4.1 seems incomplete (see sections 7.6, 9.1 of 2007 TR where reference to data transmission to WGs is provided). Completed table to be provided by MS.

| <i>Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | Partly | | 3 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | / | 4 |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 5 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | ? | / | 6 |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 7 |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |

- 3 See Module J
- 4 The MS is reminded on the SGRN recommendation (December 2005) on upgrading the effort unit requirements for passive gears from the EP to the MP. SGRN calls the attention on the fact that this information will become mandatory in the future DCR.
- 5 Two metiers have been merged from the NP proposal and the number of trips planned has not been correctly updated in the TR. The correct number of trips planned for cod & flounder demersal fishery should be 13 and 9 have been achieved. In general, there was a small shortfall in all sampled metiers.
- 6 There is no reference in the text whether vessels <10m were included in the discard sampling.
- 7 A monitoring programme was performed on recreational fishery for cod ; it is reminded that a provisional derogation has been agreed to MSs on sampling recreational fisheries for cod, until a standard methodology is developed (see SGRN 2007 July comment).

| <i>Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|---|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 8 |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | BITS 1 st quarter | Yes | / | |
| | BITS 4 th quarter | Yes | / | |
| | Sprat acoustic survey | Yes | / | |
| | Herring acoustic survey | Yes | / | 9 |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 10 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |

- 8 Although CPUE data series are provided, no data series were proposed in the 2007 NP proposal.
- 9 MS should use the DCR reference name of the survey in the TR.
- 10 Although length sampling of northern shrimp (NAFO) was planned in 2007 NP Proposal, it is not referenced in the 2007 TR. To be clarified by MS. Stocks were over-sampled for reaching a precision target, with no cost implications for the programme.

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | NA | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Partly | / | 11 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 12 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 14 : Databases | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | Yes | | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |

- 11 The procedure of excluding inactive vessels is not clear. The population to be investigated is in the National Fleet Register, regardless of activity level. SGRN insists that all the population of vessels included in the national fleet register be covered.

The parameter « fixed costs » is not appropriately defined. To be clarified by MS.

More information on the interpretation of the investigation on representativeness should be provided. To be clarified by MS.

- 12 More information is needed on the representativeness of the data collected. SGRN requests a clear analysis on representativeness in NP proposal 2009-2010 / 2008 TR.

The parameter « fixed costs » is not appropriately defined. The parameter « price per product » is missing. To be clarified by MS.

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|-------------|
| <i>Section 15 : National and International co-ordination</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | Yes | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | 13 |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | Mostly | 14 |
| <i>Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | None | |

-
- 13 MS refers only to the 2007 RCM Baltic. Information from 2006 RCM Baltic and 2006 NAFO RCM with implications on the 2007 MS programme should be provided.
- 14 SGRN, in its 2006 November report, recommended MS to resubmit a NP proposal to consider their fisheries in other regions than the Baltic Sea. There is no reference to this recommendation and the TR does not reflect neither any actions in other regions than the Baltic Sea. See also general comment On CECAF fisheries.

4.12 COUNTRY: MALTA

a. General comments

| | |
|---|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-GRN Guidelines? | Mostly |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-GRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Mostly |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | NA |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: MS has not made any progress on Modules J and K compared with the previous year, some mismatch exists between the NP and TR tables (8.1 and 10.1) and the sections on RCM and SGRN follow – up are missing.

There also seems to be mis-interpretation of annual length sampling requirements for Tuna.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------|-------------|
| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Partly | 1 |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Partly | 2 |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | NMS | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |

- 1 Precision levels calculated for Modules C, D and for landings in Module E. See also general comment On precision levels.
- 2 Very limited details provided for estimation method used for analysis. More information to be provided by the MS.

| <i>Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | ? | | 3 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | / | |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 4 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | ? | / | |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | 5 |

3 See Module J.

4 Planned 5 observer trips and achieved 3. Completed 8 of 10 planned hauls on trawlers < 24m. Also the information on species composition given in text Table 7 should be included in Table 10.3.

5 No actions are proposed on the basis of reluctance of masters of fishing vessels to accept observers-on-board. See previous general comment on "The recurrent problems of sending on board observers" (SGRN-07-02) and the provisions of the new DCR (199/2008, article 11) regarding this issue.

| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
|---|--|----------------------|------------|----------------|
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | NA | / | |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 6 |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | Survey n° 1 MEDIT'S | Yes | / | |
| | Survey n°2 Tuna Tagging | No | / | 7 |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | 8 |

-
- 6 SGRN recommends that the MS elaborate the three species proposed in the NP (table 6.1) for CPUE in Table 8.1 of the TR for clarity instead of stating "All landed species".
- 7 Tuna Tagging Survey was not conducted in 2007. See section 6.
- 8 No actions outlined to remedy this shortfall in tuna tagging.

| <i>Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | Sec comment |
|--|--|----------------------|----|----------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 9 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Partly | / | 10 |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Partly | | 11 |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 12 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| <i>Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | NA |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | ? | / | 13 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | ? | / | 1” |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | ? | / | 13 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |

9 Two stocks out of three reached the required sampling levels. Only one species out of three reached the planned sampling target and this was only for length.

10 Length samples are required annually for Tuna not on a three year cycle as indicated by the MS in its TR. SGRN insists that the MS collects length data annually as specified in the Regulation. For the age sampling, refer to the SGRN 07-04 General comments "On length and age sampling for highly migratory species in the Mediterranean". SGRN reminds MS on the obligation to sample tunas in the tuna cages within their territorial waters. All information to be provided by MS for 2007 and 2008 and sampling programme to be elaborated in the NP proposal 2009-2010.

The planned levels reported in Table 8.1 of the NP proposal are not the same as those reported as planned in table 10.1 of the TR. To be clarified by the MS.

No explanation of undersampling of planned sampling targets for swordfish and dolphinfish is given.

11 Action suggested for ageing the Bluefin Tuna landings only.

12 See footnote 4.

13 Data collected in 2007 is not outlined in Table 11.1 and there are no precision calculations which would allow an evaluation of whether or not the DCR targets were met.

| Fecundity | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|----|----------------|
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | NA | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | ? | / | 14 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | ? | / | 15 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 14 : Databases | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | Yes | | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| Section 15 : National and International co-ordination | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | | |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | Yes | | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | No | | 16 |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | No | | 17 |

- 14 SGRN has insufficient information to perform a thorough analysis on the compliance of the TR with the DCR requirements. SGRN insists that MS follows the provisions of the DCR.
- 15 SGRN is unable to perform any analysis due to a complete lack of relevant information. SGRN insists that MS follows the provisions of the DCR.
- 16 The MS states that it will follow all RCM recommendations in its 2008 NP. There is no indication on what was actioned in 2007. Information to be provided by MS.
- 17 The section on SGRN recommendations is missing from the report. To be provided by MS.

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| <i>Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections</i> | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | None |

4.13 COUNTRY: NETHERLANDS

a. General comments

| | |
|--|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-SGRN Guidelines? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-SGRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Mostly |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | Yes |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: No information is provided concerning fishing in CECAF area. See also general comment On fishing outside Community waters.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------|----|-------------|
| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Mostly | | |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Yes | | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | | |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | NA | | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |

1 MS did not explore precision levels for Module I. See also general comments On precision levels.

| <i>Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | Yes | | |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | / | |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 2 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | 3 |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | 2 |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 4 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | No | / | 5 |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | NA | / | 6 |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

- 2 It appears that MS is not catching any species in the CEEAF area while it is mentioned that a fleet is operating in the area. Around 75900 tonnes of fish (EUROSTAT) are landed from the area but the MS declare that there is no landings in the area. See general comment On fisheries outside the Community waters.
- 3 Information that all vessels <10m is collected is given in section 5.1.
- 4 Detailed list of vessels sampled for discards should not be included in the TR. There is no mention on the recommendation from SGRN to sample the brown shrimp fishery (SGRN November 2006 report). SGRN reminds the recommendation for 2008 to enter into multilateral agreements for sampling discards in this fishery.
- 5 No specific mention of <10m vessels is made in the section. However, the shortest sampled trip lasted 3 days, which indicates that no small-scale fishery was part of the sampling plan.
- 6 Sampling of recreational fisheries for cod was not planned by the MS. See also section 5.

| Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort | | SGRN Appreciation | | Sec comment |
|---|--|----------------------|------------|----------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys | | SGRN appreciation | | Sec comment |
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | 7 |
| | IBTS | Mostly | / | |
| | NS Herring Acoustic Survey | Yes | / | |
| | Blue whiting Acoustic Survey | Mostly | / | |
| | SNS (Isis) | Mostly | / | |
| | BTS (Tridens) | Yes | / | |
| | BTS (Isis) | Mostly | / | 8 |
| | DFS (Isis) | Yes | / | |
| | DFS (Stern) | Yes | / | |
| | DFS (Schollebaar) | Yes | / | |
| | Herring larvae survey (Tridens, Q 1) | / | Mostly | |
| | Herring larvae survey (Tridens, Q 3) | / | Mostly | |
| | Herring larvae survey (Tridens, Q 4) | / | Yes | |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

- 7 Fo IBTS, Blue Whiting Acoustic Survey, SNS (Isis), BTS (Isis), Herring larvae survey (Q1 & Q3), less than 90% of planned hauls were carried out. ASH survey is mentioned in the text but not in Table 9.1. Reasons for shortfalls should be provided by MS and Table 9.1 should be updated.
- 8 Only 80 % of the planned survey hauls were completed. No explanation is provided for the shortfall.

| <i>Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|--------|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | Mostly | 9 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | Yes | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | 10 |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| <i>Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 11 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 10 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 10 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |

9 DCR requirements were not reached for 4/20 stocks for length and 2/15 stocks for age. National target were not reached for 1/21 stocks for length and 4/16 stocks for age. None of the stocks under-sampled are being used for tuning series or under a recovery plan.

Fisheries operating in the CECAF area were not sampled. See general comment On fisheries outside the Community waters.

10 No actions planned to avoid shortfalls in length and age sampling in the future.

11 Sea bass and brown shrimp, planned in the NP proposal, have been omitted in the TR.

| Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|----------------------|----|----------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 12 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | | 13 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 14 : Databases | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | Yes | | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| Section 15 : National and International co-ordination | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | | 14 |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | Yes | | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | No | | 15 |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | Mostly | | 16 |

- 12 The table on segment combination is not clear. No information is given on the calculation of FTE. To be clarified by MS.
- The panel for active vessels appears to be reflected in the planned sample number with the exception of dredgers. To be clarified by MS.
- 13 Information on employment is missing for smaller enterprises. SGRN insists that MS follows the provisions of the DCR and that all the population be covered.
- It is not clear which data source covers which part of the sector. To be clarified by MS.
- MS is asked to clarify the reference between data sources, sample rates and precision levels achieved.
- The calculation method for FTE should be clarified by MS.
- 14 There is no mention of coordinated actions for the CECAF area. See general comment On fishing outside Community waters.
- 15 Only 3 RCM recommendations were listed, although in the guidelines it is specified to list all relevant recommendations, when compared to neighboring countries, are much more numerous.

| <i>Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
|---|---|-------------------|-------------|
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | Yes | 17 |

16 See comment 4.

17 MS gives consideration on cost statements. To be evaluated by the Commission.

4.14 COUNTRY: POLAND

a. General comments

| | |
|---|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-GRN Guidelines? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-GRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Mostly |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | Yes |

General GRN comments on MS's technical report: None.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|----|-------------|
| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | GRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Partly | | |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Yes | | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | Yes | | |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | GRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | | |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | NMS | | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities</i> | | GRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |

- 1 Precision level was not calculated for discards and Module I parameters, while for Module H parameters it was calculated only for 2 stocks (<50%). See also general comments On precision levels.

| <i>Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | Mostly | | 2 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | / | 3 |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Partly | / | 4 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | ? | / | 5 |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Mostly | / | 6 |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |

2 See Module J

3 The MS is reminded on the SGRN recommendation (December 2005) on upgrading the effort unit requirements for passive gears from the EP to the MP. SGRN calls the attention on the fact that this information will become mandatory in the future DCR

4 4 out of 7 sampled metiers were under-sampled.

Sprat trawl industrial fishery was proposed in the 2007 NP proposal but this is a mistake in the original report.

MS refers to a pilot study for investigating discards from the sprat trawl (human consumption) fishery, although such a study was not proposed in the 2007 NP proposal. To be clarified by the MS.

Concerning sampling for cod discards, SGRN recalls that in the 2007 evaluation of the discard pilot study the MS was advised to investigate cod discards separately for the pelagic and the demersal trawling activity ; it is expected that this will be followed in the future NPs.

SGRN December 2006 recommended MS to include fisheries outside the Baltic Sea in their programme. SGRN was informed that the follow-up of this recommendation has started in 2008.

5 There is no reference whether this fleet category is included in the discard sampling. To be clarified by MS.

6 No reference is made on shortfall for sampling salmon and sea trout driftnet fishery.

| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
|---|--|----------------------|------------|----------------|
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Derog. | / | |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | NA | / | 7 |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | BITS 1 st quarter | Yes | / | |
| | BITS 4 th quarter | Yes | / | |
| | Herring Acoustic Survey | Yes | / | 8 |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 9 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |

7 As already commented for 2006 TR, MS should mention in the text that no CPUE series are used for tuning purposes in any assessment WG.

8 MS should use the name referenced in the DCR for their surveys in the TR.

9 There was a shortfall in sampling 2 stocks (out of 13) and an excess in sampling for more than 50% of the sampled stocks, with no effects on the cost.

Turbot is proposed to be sampled in the 2007 NP proposal but not referenced at all in 2007 TR (text or table). To be clarified by MS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 10,11 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 12 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 12 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 12 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | 13 |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | NA | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | NA | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

10 See comment 5 on the shortfall in sampling all metiers.

MS refers to a pilot study on discards from salmon and sea trout fishery, which was not mentioned previously in the TR or the 2007 NP Proposal. To be clarified by MS.

11 Table 10.3 contains cod samples from the cod hooks fishery, although according to Table 7.1 no discard sampling was carried out for this fishery. To be clarified by MS.

12 Turbot is proposed to be sampled for growth, sexual maturity and sex ratio in the 2007 NP proposal (Tables 9.1 – 9.3), but not referenced at all in 2007 TR (text or table). To be clarified by MS.

13 Sexual maturity sampling was not performed for two stocks. No actions to avoid these shortfalls are suggested.

| | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|----|----------------|
| Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Mostly | / | 14 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Yes | / | 15 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 14 : Databases | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | | | |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | Yes | | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| Section 15 : National and International co-ordination | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | | | |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | | 16 |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | Yes | | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | Mostly | | 17 |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | No | | 18 |

14 The definition of employment parameters is insufficient. The definition of investment is unusual and does not comply with the DCR. To be clarified by MS.

Certain fleet segments have been excluded from the TR. SGRN insists that all the population of vessels included in the national fleet register be covered.

The naming of the segments in Table 12.1 should conform to Appendix III of the DCR.

Insufficient information is given on how representativeness of the collected data has been assessed. SGRN requests a clear analysis on representativeness in NP proposal 2009-2010 / 2008 TR.

15 MS should clarify the source of information on total fish processing production.

16 National coordination was achieved mostly by correspondence.

17 Not all relevant recommendations are provided.

18 There is no reference to the SGRN recommendations. Section 15.4 should be strictly referred to the SGRN and not to the Commission's recommendations. Information on financial aspects should be avoided in the future.

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| <i>Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections</i> | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | None |

4.15 COUNTRY: PORTUGAL

a. General comments

| | |
|---|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-GRN Guidelines? | Mostly |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-GRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Mostly |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | Yes |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: Modules J and K could not be evaluated because of insufficient information.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|----|-------------|
| Section 3 : Precision level | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Yes | | |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Yes | | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| Section 4 : Data transmission | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | | |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | ? | | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | ? | / | |

- Levels of precision are estimated for all Modules. SGRN indicates that Table 3.1 should report NA (not available) instead of NR (not required) concerning fecundity (e.g. *Scomber scombrus*). See also general comment On precision levels.
- The economic data were not transmitted. See section 7.
- SGRN insists that the MS follows the Guidelines and provides information on the sampling of <10m segment (same comment as last year).

| | | | | |
|---|--|----------------------|----|----------------|
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | ? | | 4 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Mostly | / | 5 |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Mostly | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Partly | / | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 6 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Mostly | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Na | / | |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Na | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |

- 4 Fuel consumption reported to be collected but not provided to the call for data in January 2008. See section 7.
- 5 Data for vessel >10 metres are collected. Data for small scale fishery in IXa and CECAF 34.1.2 were not at all or only partially collected. Information to be provided by MS.
- 6 MS states in the NP proposal that purse seine fishery in IXa was to be sampled for discards, but TR do not mention this fishery in table 7.1. Information to be provided by MS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | Groundfish Survey | Yes | / | |
| | Nephrops survey | Yes | / | |
| | Sardine, anchovy, horse mackerel acoustic survey | Yes | / | |
| | Flemish Cap groundfish survey - NAFO | Yes | / | |
| | Tuna Tagging | Partly | / | 7 |
| | Western IBTS 4th quarter | Yes | / | |
| | Mackere/Horse mackerel eggs survey | Yes | / | |
| | Sardine Acoustic Survey –SAR | / | Partly | 8 |
| | Deep-sea fish survey | / | No | 9 |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | No | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 10 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Mostly | / | 11 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | 12 |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |

- 7 2 tuna tagged out of 5 planned. See section 6.
- 8 No explanation given for only 48% of the planned radials achieved. Information to be provided by MS.
- 9 Deep sea fish survey was planned but not performed. No explanation given. Information to be provided by MS.
- 10 Some important stocks used for tuning series were under-sampled against what was planned (*Lophius spp.* IXa, *Nephrops norvegicus* IXa, ...). Tuning series appear inconsistent with NP proposal (*Conger conger* is referred as a tuning series in TR). There are discrepancies in the number planned for some species in NP proposal (table 8.1) and the number planned for the same species reported in TR (tables 10.1). To be clarified by MS.
- 11 Small scale fishery sampling is missing from table 10.3. There are inconsistencies in the names of fleet segments between table 7.1 and 10.3. MS to clarify this issue.
- 12 No explanation provided for the lack of measurements in small scale fisheries discard sampling.

| Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|----------------------|----|----------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 13 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Na | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Na | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Na | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Na | | |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | No | / | 14 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | ? | / | 15 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |

- 13 Inconsistencies between table 11.1 and tables 11.2/3 E.g. *Molva dypterygia* in area X, length at age is missing in table 11.2. Tables to be resubmitted by MS.
- 14 *Scomber scombrus* (mackerel) was not sampled for fecundity and no explanation is given. To be clarified by MS.
- 15 The information provided by MS is insufficient for SGRN to evaluate the report.

| <i>Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|----------------------|----|----------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | ? | / | 16 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| <i>Section 14 : Databases</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | Yes | | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 15 : National and International co-ordination</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | | |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | Yes | | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | Mostly | | 17 |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | No | | 18 |
| <i>Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | None | | |

-
- 16 The information provided by MS is insufficient for SGRN to evaluate the report.
- 17 SGRN appreciates the initiatives taken by MS with regards RCM recommendations but a list of appropriate recommendations and responsive actions as required in the Guidelines is missing. Information to be provided by MS.
- 18 MS statement that no SGRN recommendation is relevant for Portugal is not right as there are questions and comments from SGRN on MS NP proposal. As in 2006, MS refers only to RCM recommendation. Information to be provided by MS.

4.16 COUNTRY: SLOVENIA

a. General comments

| | |
|---|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-GRN Guidelines? | Mostly |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-GRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Partly |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | NA |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: The major drawback concerns Modules J and K where no action of data collection was performed in 2007.

Generally the Slovenian TR needs to provide more details on their sampling programmes, methodologies for calculating precision levels. Also reports on the pilot surveys (started in 2006) for both discards and recreational fisheries should be submitted for evaluation during the next SGRN meeting.

SGRN appreciates the improvements made by Slovenia in its TR compared to 2006 and encourages the MS to continue with these improvements.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|-------------|
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Partly | 1 |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | No | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | No | |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | 2 |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | NMS | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |

- 1 Precision levels presented for parts of Modules H and I only. No information is given on the methods used to calculate precision in table 3.1, and there is only a brief mention in the text on using standard error. This issue was also highlighted in the Slovenian 2006 TR. See general comment On precision levels.
- 2 In 2007 and 2008, no formal call for data required specific information from Slovenia.

| <i>Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | ? | | 3 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | / | 4 |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | ? | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | ? | | |
| <i>Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 5 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |

- 3 Data on fuel consumption was collected via a questionnaire. See Module J.
- 4 It appears that MS has collected all the relevant information on catches and landings through its logbook system, which covers all vessels regardless of their size. For the purpose of quality checking, MS wanted to implement sales notes and questionnaires but never achieved the sales notes. SGRN agrees with the action taken by MS.
- 5 See footnote 4.

| Discards | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Partly | / | 6 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | NA | / | 7 |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | NA | / | 8 |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | MEDITS Survey | Yes | / | |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Were national targets met ? | Yes | / | |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |

- 6 Planned 18 observer trips and only achieved 5 trips. Information on such deviation and related remedies to be provided by MS.

Also SGRN_07_02 requested that a report on the pilot study for discards be submitted by 31st March 2008, to date no report has been received from Slovenia. There is no information on the progress to date of this pilot survey in the text of the TR. The pilot study report should be submitted for evaluation during the next SGRN meeting.

- 7 In the 2007 TR the MS says that it carried out a pilot study on its recreational fisheries, however no information was provided on the planned sampling programme. As the pilot study is supposed to end in 2008, the report should be made available for evaluation during the next SGRN meeting. See also section 5.

- 8 MS states that they can build CPUE series from 2004 for the fisheries they follow.

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 9 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | NA | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| <i>Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | No | / | 10 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| <i>Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry</i> | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were DCR targets met? | No | / | 11 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |

9 Slovenia did complete some discard sampling at sea under a pilot survey. However no data is presented in Table 10.3. See footnote 6.

10 No survey has been performed in 2007 and only empty tables have been provided.

11 No survey has been performed in 2007 and only empty tables have been provided.

| | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Section 14 : Databases | | SGRN Appreciation | See comment |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | No | 12 |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |
| Section 15 : National and International co-ordination | | SGRN Appreciation | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | No | 13 |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | No | 14 |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | No | 15 |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | No | 16 |
| Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | None | |

-
- 12 No description of the Database was provided in either the NP or the TR 2007. MS states that they did not carry out the planned upgrades in 2007. More information to be provided by the MS.
- 13 No formal National coordination meeting together with the representative of the Commission was held in Slovenia in 2007.
- 14 No information is given in Table 15.1 on international meetings attended.
- 15 MS states that they did not follow any RCM recommendations. SGRN understands that no RCM recommendation was relevant to MS.
- 16 The MS has improved its attendance at important international meetings, however relevant SGRN recommendations were not outlined in the TR. The MS should follow the SGRN guidelines for future submissions.

4.17 COUNTRY: SPAIN

a. General comments

| | |
|---|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-GRN Guidelines? | Partly |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-GRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Mostly |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | Yes |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: the report has greatly improved form past years but still some major drawbacks are present. For instance Modules J and K could not be evaluated because of insufficient information, regardless of translation issue. The report was available to SGRN only in Spanish before the meeting (see section 3.2). The guidelines are not always followed consistently as far as the numeration of chapter is concerned. The discussion, in the TR, on DCR rules cannot be accepted as an explanation for some shortfalls. This should be done in the NP proposal, TR should only report the work done

SGRN appreciates the effort made by MS to formalise and present the bilateral agreements.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|-------------|
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Mostly | 1 |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Yes | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | 2 |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | Yes | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |

- 1 Precision levels are estimated for almost all parameters except age samples. See also general comment On precision levels.
- 2 Inconsistencies between TR and ICES tables. See general comment On the use of ICES tables.

| <i>Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Na | | |
| <i>Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | ? | | 3 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | ? | / | 4 |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | ? | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| <i>Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 5 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Mostly | / | 6 |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |

- 3 See Module J.
- 4 MS states that effort is collected in an exhaustive way but in table 3.1 precision levels are provided. Moreover, MS did not provide effort data to the STECF/SGMED 2008 call for data. To be clarified by MS.
- 5 SGRN appreciates the coverage and the effort in sampling discards from the numerous fleets and regions by MS [377 trips planned and 429 trips sampled, corresponding to 3810 and 3443 days at sea respectively]. In such an extensive programme, it is not surprising to see some of the targets missed.
- 6 Fleets sampled for discards includes vessels <10m. for the Mediterranean. This information is not specified for the Atlantic coast. To be clarified by MS.

| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | IBTS(Cantábrico) | Yes | / | |
| | IBTS (Cadiz) | Yes | / | |
| | PELACUS 0406 | Yes | / | |
| | BIOMAN | Yes | / | |
| | MEDIT'S | Yes | / | |
| | Flemish Cap Groundfish Survey | Yes | / | |
| | ROJOCAN 2007 | Yes | / | |
| | Marcado de juveniles de pez espada (Mediterráneo). | Yes | / | 7 |
| | Campaña pioloto marcas electronicas en SWO. (Mediterráneo) | Partly | / | |
| | Campaña marcado de BFT con Pop-Up satélite en jaulas de engorde. | Yes | / | |
| | Campaña pioloto marcas electronicas en SWO. (Atlántico Este). | No | / | |
| | Marcado de juveniles de pez espada (Atlántico Este). | No | / | |
| | ARSA0306 | Yes | / | |
| | PORCUPINE | Yes | / | |
| | 3LNO Groundfish Survey | / | Yes | |
| | ECOMED | / | Mostly | 8 |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

7 See section 6

8 Full achievement of the survey was not possible due to vessel breakdown and bad weather conditions

| <i>Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | Sec comment |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 9 |
| | Were national targets met ? | Mostly | / | |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Mostly | / | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Partly | | 10 |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Partly | / | 11 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Partly | / | 12 |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | ? | | 13 |

- 9 18/56 stocks were under-sampled for length compared to the plan (1/15 stocks under recovery plan or used as tuning series were under-sampled for length). 8/33 stocks were under-sampled for age compared to the plan (no stock under recovery plan or used as tuning series were under-sampled for age).

Some of the explanations given are questionable. E.g. any changes in the sampling plan, e.g. sampling for recovery plan species (*Reinhardtius hippoglossoides* in NAFO) should be done only on justification based on precision. In case of decreasing landing statistics MS should base the sampling effort on a time period shortened from the 3 years average specified in the Regulation and justified in the NP proposal. Also the opinion that landing statistics are overestimated cannot be considered a valid excuse for lowering the sampling effort (Macrouridae in NAFO).

The specifications of non applicability of age sampling for tuna and tuna-like species is not conform to the provisions of the DCR. SGRN understands that age sampling was not planned in 2007 and expects a sampling plan to be developed in the future submission of NP proposal 2009-2010.

- 10 Suggested actions cover only some cases.
- 11 Figures in table 10.3 for age sampling in discards are very low. The justification that the length range for discards is nearly always the same as that of the commercial landings is difficult to accept for areas and species with minimum landing size and were discard are sampled for length. To be clarified by MS.
- 12 Discard sampling in Mediterranean is described in table 7.1 and results not reported in table 10.3. MS is required to report all data sampled, regardless of exemption rules. To be clarified by MS.
- 13 MS suggestions are sometimes difficult to track in the report and to interpret. MS is encouraged to follow more strictly the guidelines as regards the exact content of each of the sections.

| <i>Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Mostly | / | 14 |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Partly | | 15 |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Mostly | / | 14 |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Partly | | 15 |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Mostly | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Partly | | 15 |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | ? | / | 16 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |

14 In some cases, e.g For *Merluccius polli* in CEECAF areas the MS misinterpreted the regulation to justify lack of data collection: Appendix XIV deals with triannual biological sampling (Module I) and it is not necessarily linked with Module H age sampling. MS should strictly follow the provisions of the DCR. See also general comment On the cycles for Module I sampling.

15 In many cases no real action is suggested. Missing information to be provided by MS.

16 The information provided by MS is insufficient for SGRN to evaluate the report.

| Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | ? | / | 17 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | / | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Section 14 : Databases | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | Yes | | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| Section 15 : National and International co-ordination | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | | |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | Yes | | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | | |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | | |
| Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | None | | |

17 The information provided by MS is insufficient for SGRN to evaluate the report.

4.18 COUNTRY: SWEDEN

a. General comments

| | |
|---|-----|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE / STECF-GRN Guidelines? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG MARE / STECF-GRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Yes |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | Yes |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: None.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| <i>Section 3 : Precision level</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|---|-------------------|----|-------------|
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Yes | | |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Yes | | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 4 : Data transmission</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | | |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | NMS | | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| <i>Section 5 : Module C - Fishing capacities</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

- 1 Estimates of levels of precision are available for all Modules, and work is on-going to complete the precision estimates for all variables. See also general comment On precision levels.

| <i>Section 6 : Module D - Fishing effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|---|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| | | MP | EP | |
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | Mostly | | 2 |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | / | 3 |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | | / | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| <i>Section 7 : Module E - Catches and landings</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | / | 4 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | / | |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 5 |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| <i>Section 8 : Module F – Catches per Unit Effort</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | / | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |

-
- 2 See Module J
- 3 The MS is reminded on the SGRN recommendation (December 2005) on upgrading the effort unit requirements for passive gears from the EP to the MP. SGRN calls the attention on the fact that this information will become mandatory in the future DCR.
- 4 There was a shortfall in the achievement in term of number of trips for 50% of the sampled meters.
- 5 It is reminded that a provisional derogation was agreed to MSs on sampling recreational fisheries for cod, until a standard methodology is developed (see SGRN 2007 July comment).

| <i>Section 9 : Module G – Scientific evaluation surveys</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|---|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | | | |
| | BITS 1 st quarter | Yes | / | |
| | BITS 4 th quarter | Yes | / | |
| | IBTS 1 st quarter | Yes | / | |
| | IBTS 3 rd quarter | Yes | / | |
| | Herring acoustic survey | Yes | / | 6 |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 10 : Module H – Length and Age sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | Mostly | 7 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | NA | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | Mostly | 8 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | NA | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| <i>Section 11 : Module I – Other biological sampling</i> | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | Mostly | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | NA | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |

- 6 MS should use the DCR reference name in the TR.
- 7 **MP** : There was a shortfall in sampling some stocks (<50%) in regards to the national target.
EP : There was a shortfall in sampling some stocks (≥50%) in regards to the national target. Pike-perch, though referenced in the text, has been omitted from Table 10.2. To be clarified by MS.
- 8 2 mètres proposed for sampling were not sampled at all. See footnote 4.
- 9 **E.P** : No sampling was conducted for pike-perch, although it was included in the 2007 NP Proposal. Information to be provided by MS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|--------|-------------|
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | Mostly | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | NA | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | Mostly | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | NA | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Yes | / | 10 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | / | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Section 12 : Module J – Economic data by group of vessels | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | Mostly | 11 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | No | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Section 13 : Module K – Processing industry | | SGRN Appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were Data Collection Requirements met? | Mostly | Mostly | 12 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | Yes | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Partly | | |
| Section 14 : Databases | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |

10 M.P : Although not requested by DCR, salmon is sampled for fecundity, as proposed in the NP proposal.

11 SGRN notes that MS excludes part of the fleet described as « nonactive 0-24 m » from the data collection. SGRN insists that all the population of vessels included in the national fleet register be covered.

A more complete description of the survey conducted including sample size and response rate would be useful. SGRN queries the division between fixed and operational costs and notes that fixed costs as defined under the DCR are listed as capital costs in the TR To be clarified by MS.

Effort and fleet indicator are not appropriately represented in table 12.2.

12 The definition on employment and FTE is missing. To be clarified by MS.

The parameters raw material volume, FTE and income are missing in table 12.2. To be clarified by MS.

More information on parameter definition in the TR would be helpful.

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|-------------|
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described ? | Yes | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |
| <i>Section 15 : National and International co-ordination</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops ? | Yes | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through ? | Yes | |
| <i>Section 17 : Comments, Suggestions and Reflections</i> | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | Yes | 13 |

13 See section 9.1.

5 EVALUATION OF THE PILOT STUDIES


Table 5.1: Overview of the situation regarding the evaluation of pilot studies.

| | Discards | Recreational fisheries for bluefin tuna (all areas) | Recreational fisheries for cod (Areas III, IV, V, VI & VII) | Recreational fisheries for salmon (North Sea and Baltic Sea) | Module J | Module K |
|-----|------------------------|---|---|--|----------|----------|
| BEL | 05/04 👍 | 0 | 07/07 📅🕒 | 0 | 👍 | 12/04 👍 |
| CYP | 12/07 👍 | 0 | | | 👍 | 07/07 👍 |
| DEN | 05/04 👍 | 0 | 07/07 📅🕒 | 05/04 👍 | 👍 | 05/04 👍 |
| EST | NP 2006 | 0 | NP 2006 | NP 2006 | 👍 | 👍 |
| FIN | 12/05 📅 ⁽¹⁾ | 0 | 05/04 (2) | 05/04 👍 | 👍 | 05/04 👍 |
| FRA | 05/04 👍 | 05/04 👍 | 07/07 📅🕒 | 0 | 👍 | 👍 |
| GER | 05/04 👍 | 05/04 📅 | 07/07 📅🕒 | 05/04 📅 | 👍 | 05/04 👍 |
| GRE | 05/04 👍 | 👍 | | | 👍 | 05/04 👍 |
| IRE | 12/05 👍 | 05/04 👍 | NP 2006 | | 👍 | 👍 |
| ITA | 12/05 👍 | 05/04 👍 | | | 👍 | 05/04 👍 |
| LAT | 👍 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 👍 | NP 2006 |
| LIT | 07/07 👍 | 0 | 07/07 📅🕒 | 0 | 👍 | 👍 |
| MLT | 12/06 👍 | 12/06 👍 | | | 12/06 👍 | 12/06 👍 |
| NDL | 05/04 👍 | 0 | 07/07 📅🕒 | 0 | 👍 | 05/04 👍 |
| POL | 12/07 👍 | 0 | 07/07 📅🕒 | 0 | 👍 | 👍 |
| POR | 12/05 👍 | 05/04 👍 | | | 👍 | 05/04 👍 |
| SLV | NP 2008 | NP 2008 | | | 👍 | 👍 |
| SPA | 12/05 👍 | 05/04 👍 | | | 👍 | 👍 |
| SWE | 05/04 👍 | 05/04 👍 | 07/07 📅🕒 | 05/04 👍 | 👍 | 05/04 👍 |
| UK | 05/04 👍 | 0 | NP 2006 | 0 | 👍 | 05/04 👍 |

Legend of the table :

05/04 Analysed by SGRN in May 2004

NP 2006 : The pilot study was planned in 2006, but no report was submitted for evaluation.

 No derogation. MS must carry out a routine sampling programme

0 MS indicates that there is no catch and hence no need for a routine sampling programme.

 Derogation approved.

 Temporarily

(1) Derogation approved for cod, herring and sprat.

(2) No catch of cod recorded in the 2003 pilot study.

Expected reports on pilot studies for the next SGRN meeting

Denmark : Results of the continuation of the pilot study for cod recreational fisheries

Estonia : All issues related to discards estimates. MS referred in the past to a 2005 pilot study and has undertaken a 2007 pilot study on discarding in the skate fishery. Recreational fisheries for cod and salmon pilot study reports are still missing.

Finland : Results of the pilot study for cod and salmon conducted during 2007.

Ireland : Recreational fisheries for cod pilot study report is still missing.

Slovenia : Results of the pilot study for discards and pilot study for recreational fisheries.

UK : Recreational fisheries for cod pilot study report is still missing.

Expected outcomes on pilot studies to be included as an annex of the next NP proposal 2009-2010.

Italy : Results of the pilot study to estimate fishing effort in line with the Metier based sampling approach in the new DCR.

Poland : Investigation on cod discards separately for the pelagic and the demersal trawling activity.

6 BLUEFIN TUNA AND SWORDFISH TAGGING ACTIVITIES IN THE PERIOD 2005-2007: SUMMARY OF ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN BY MS AND EVALUATION

SGRN was requested to evaluate the results obtained by all MS in the period 2005-2007 concerning specifically the tagging activities on bluefin tuna (*Thunnus thynnus*) and swordfish (*Xiphias gladius*), carried out within the DCR framework.

This analysis was carried out on all the MS reports in the above mentioned period, cross-checking the relevant parts with the Planning Group on Tuna Tagging (PGTT) reports in 2005, 2006 and 2007.

One major issue is the relevance of tagging activities for stock assessment purposes, together with the assessment of the practical results obtained by those tagging programmes.

6.1 BACKGROUND

Since the beginning of the DCR, tagging activities on bluefin tuna and other large pelagic species have been questioned either by STECF/SGRN or directly by STECF. The reason for questioning this research activity was because the objectives were not clearly defined, as well as their relevance for the DCR goals. At the same time, it was unclear in which way MS were going to report the achievements of this part of NPs, due to the time required to recover the various types of tags and the data treatment.

The July 2004 STECF/SGRN report (Evaluation of 2003 TR) addressed a list of questions to the tagging experts, in order to better evaluate the targets and achievements of tuna tagging experiments for stock assessment purposes. Then, the EC decided to set-up a Planning Group on Tuna Tagging (PGTT) and the first meeting was held in Bari on 2-4 April 2005. Within the final report of the first PGTT meeting, there were the following responses to the question raised by the STECF/SGRN:

a) The goals of tuna tagging experiments (with either spaghetti or electronic tags):

The better understanding of tuna ecology and the reinforcement of fisheries management advice with scientific data leading to the sustainable exploitation of tuna resources. Specifically, the goals of the suggested experiments are to address problems in the assessment of the stocks.

These problems include uncertainties on: (a) CPUE series, (b) spatio-temporal variability in growth patterns, (c) estimates of mortality parameters and (d) rate of mixing among different stocks.

b) The methodology of tuna tagging experiments:

Pop-up satellite tags provide data without the animal being recaptured and offer a fisheries-independent means of tracking target species. In addition, a full archival record is maintained in non-volatile memory. Thus, should the tag be recovered, all the detailed data stored in the memory can be retrieved. [...] At a user-specified date and time, the tag pin to which the tether is attached actively corrodes and releases the tag from the animal. The tag then floats to the surface and transmits summarised information via the Argos satellite system. Argos also uses the transmitted messages to provide the position of the tag at the time of release. The transmitted data are then released to the researcher by Service Argos where they can be analysed using PC-based software. [...] In addition data from pop-up satellite tags can be overlaid on satellite and telemetry images of environmental parameters such as sea surface temperature and primary productivity. In this way tagging data can expand our knowledge of how the availability, distribution and migration of bluefin tuna are influenced by environmental variability. All aspects of the pop-up satellite tag's data collection, jettisoning and transmission are user-programmable and this introduces a valuable measure of flexibility into the logistics of the experimental design.

Due to their large size pop-up tags are not suitable for juveniles. However sonic and archival tags¹ could be used to obtain data sets for these small fish. Sonic tag transmits depth, positional and temperature data to a receiver mounted on a boat and can be either attached or implanted. These tags provide the most precise data on vertical migration of all the available technologies. They do not however provide extensive data sets on horizontal movement and only work as long as they are within range of the receiver which is currently around .5nm. This condition can make it difficult to get high sample sizes and extensive data sets.

- c) The minimum set of parameters to be recorded as part of such tagging experiments, to be useful for stock assessment purposes:

This depends on the stock assessment approach. Usually the following information is collected from electronic and conventional tags:

- *Data on the movement of the fish between capture and recovery illustrates migration patterns and can lead to conclusions on stock structure. This is available from both conventional and electronic tags.*
- *Electronic tags can describe the vertical movements of the fish in the water column. From this inferences can be made about the availability of the fish to different fishing gears, which in turn can be used to refine CPUE and abundance indices.*
- *With electronic and conventional tags, data on the size of the fish size at tagging and recapture improves understanding of age and growth.*
- *Conventional tagging can be used to refine estimates of natural and fishing mortality.*

Environmental parameters such as the temperature profile of the water column inhabited by the fish during the tagged period have implications for the availability of fish to the different fisheries which is relevant to stock assessment. The horizontal distribution of the fish during the tagged period is also recorded. These data are available from electronic tags.

- d) The minimum time pop-up electronic tags should remain on the tagged fish to produce useful data:

This depends on the objective of the experiment but usually a minimum period of three month is required to produce useful data.

- e) An estimation of the minimum number of electronic tag recoveries that would be required to produce useful data for stock assessment purposes:

There are no relevant studies to justify a fixed number so this will depend on the programme's objectives. However, taking into account previous studies it is expected that about 100 recoveries per year would provide sufficient information to assist stock assessment.

- f) Indicators of how to evaluate the success of tuna tagging experiments:

The achievements of the goals (improvement of CPUE series, stock structure, growth, F, etc.) would indicate the success of the tagging experiments.

¹ The internal archival tag is designed to record depth, water temperature, heart rate, internal temperature, and light level. Because time and date values are implicitly encoded with the stored data light level can then be used for determining approximate geographic locations. Internal archival tags are able to store several years of information and so can provide data on inter-annual migration variability. The value of the experiments carried out by using this kind of tag depends on the recovery rate. Recent North American experiments on large mature bluefin have posted recovery rates of 24% (internal archival tags) for mature bluefin tuna while Spanish workers report 4.5% (conventional tags) for juvenile fish.

- g) The use that can be made of the outcome of tuna tagging experiments for stock assessment purposes

All the information obtained from tagging-recapture should be placed at the disposal of the International working groups and the appropriate international organizations dealing with evaluation, conservation and management of tuna resources. Stock assessment groups would use all the information obtained from tagging. These groups analyse the data on biology, fishery statistics, and population parameters of tuna stocks in order to formulate advice for managers. Tuna tagging can underpin this advice with strong scientific findings on the availability of tuna to fisheries in terms of their horizontal, vertical and temporal distribution. Tagging data can also identify the migration patterns and the degree of mixing that occurs between stocks. Overlaid on satellite imagery it can relate tuna distribution to environmental parameters that display seasonal and inter-annual variability. These data that describe all these aspects of tuna distribution and biology can be used to reduce uncertainties in the assessment of tuna stocks and are therefore required by the scientists charged with stock assessment. New generation population dynamic models have the capacity to integrate data obtained from tagging-recapture experiments into stock assessments and estimate abundance and fishing mortality from intermixing populations. These include simulations that produce estimates of mixing of different tuna populations and stocks. With respect to conventional or spaghetti tagging, experiments can be designed to produce estimates of fishing and natural mortality if other important parameters such as reporting or shedding rates are known. To obtain the best use from conventional tagging data it is necessary that a proper coordinated experimental design is followed, and simultaneous accurate monitoring of fishery statistics (catch, effort, etc.) be carried out. The shortfalls in the provision of accurate fishery data have been described in the report of the stock assessment group.

- h) How the information collected so far has been used in stock assessments:

With respect to bluefin tuna from the West Atlantic, the East Atlantic and Mediterranean Sea, all the information obtained from tagging is used at the stock assessment group meeting. In the case of bluefin tuna, tagging experiments have been conducted for more than sixty years. These tagging programmes have contributed enormously to the present state of knowledge of the biology and dynamics of bluefin tuna populations in the Atlantic Ocean and Mediterranean Sea. Data from conventional tagging programmes have been incorporated into the VPA models used in the bluefin tuna working group. New experiments, using the new technologies, such as “internal archival” and “pop-up satellite tags”, are now required. The new information provided by these tags will greatly contribute to a better understanding, evaluation and management of this natural resource.

The following meetings of PGTI (Sliema, 20-27 March 2006 and Heraklion, 23-25 January 2007) provided extensive but not exhaustive reports. Data on recovered tags (either traditional spaghetti tags or internal archival tags), percentage of non-functioning pop-up satellite tags, number of functioning pop-up tags are all very partially reported, while related maps on tagging results are always missing.

Besides these responses, the 2007 STECF/SGRN evaluation report on 2006 TR was concerned about the effectiveness of the bluefin tuna pop-up tagging programmes carried out by several MS. SGRN underlined that only in a few cases the planned number of tuna taggings had been achieved. The most important constraining factor remains that cost of purchasing the tunas is not covered by the DCR. The consequence being that scientists have to ask tuna farms or tuna traps to provide the fish for free, and that the tagging experiments become heavily dependent on the goodwill of the fishing industry. Reiterating what was stated in previous reports, SGRN recommended that the methodology and the results of the tuna tagging activities carried out so far within the DCR, including all the data (total tags planned, total tags implanted, total tags functioning and releasing data, maps) should be evaluated in the forthcoming meeting of tuna experts on this issue scheduled for 2008. The outcomes of this meeting should allow SGRN to better assess the pop-up tuna tagging activity and to provide a more focused opinion to the EC about the cost/efficiency of this particular aspect of the DCR.

6.2 DISCUSSION ON BLUEFIN TUNA AND SWORDFISH TAGGING PROGRAMMES 2005-2007.

SGRN revised all the available information related only to the bluefin tuna and swordfish tagging programmes carried out by all the MS concerned in 2005, 2006 and 2007.

The first source of data were the NP proposals and the TRs for these years, related to Cyprus, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Malta, Portugal and Malta. Then, these data were integrated with those included in the three PGTT reports. The result of this exercise are reported on table 6.1 and table 6.2.

It was not clear from the PGTT reports if all the tagging programmes were carried out only within the DCR and how many tags were otherwise related to other projects, while opportunistic tagging programmes were certainly carried out by some MS without specific funding from DCR.

According to the data obtained from the various sources listed *supra*, over a total of 8,420 tags planned² in the NP proposals for **bluefin tuna** (*Thunnus thynnus*), 4,727 tags were implanted reaching 56% of achievement (Table 6.2). Among these, 4,437 were **traditional spaghetti tags**, with **56% of achievement** while 290 (over a total planned of 420) were **pop-up satellite tags, archival tags or sonic tags**, with **69% of achievement**.

Over a total of 1,575 tags planned¹ in the NPs for **swordfish** (*Xiphias gladius*), 1,132 tags were implanted, reaching 72% of achievement (Table 6.2). Among these, 1,110 were **traditional spaghetti tags**, with **73% of achievement**, while 2 (over a total planned of 25³) were **pop-up satellite tags**, with **8% of achievement**.

Considering both species, over a total of 9,995 tags planned¹ in the NPs, 5,859 tags were implanted reaching 58% of achievement. Among these, 5,545 were traditional spaghetti tags, with 59% of achievement while 292 (over a total planned of 445) were pop-up satellite tags, archival tags or sonic tags, with 66% of achievement.

From a quantitative perspective, the last three years of tagging have been partially successful, because the achievement was slightly above 50% of the planned figure.

These achievements have to be seen at the light of the difficulty of tagging bluefin tuna and swordfish, particularly due to the absence of specific vessel properly equipped, the danger of the tagging operation, the dependence on the good environmental conditions, and the lack of budget to pay for the fish. As a matter of fact, scientists concerned usually ask for free bluefin tuna specimens to fattening industries and this attitude, based on personal agreements and not on a specific regulation or provision, is able to potentially undermine credibility regarding the credibility of some assumptions, particularly when these have effects on the stock analysis with side economic effects.

One of the most important issue raised from the analysis of the last three year reports concerns the difficulty in understanding how many tags have been recovered, how many pop-up satellite tags failed to work, how many of them detached prematurely, how many pop-up tags worked properly and which results were provided, and how many internal archival tags have been recovered, regularly providing the data collected.

According to the information available on NP proposals, TRs or PGTT reports, which appeared to be incomplete, 44 over 156 pop-up tags (28,2%) were able to provide some data, but 46 over 156 (28,5%) were detached prematurely, sometimes after less than one week. Reading the PGTT reports, it is clear that

² It is not clear how many tags were planned, because some NP proposals report “opportunistic” without any planned number.

³ It is not clear how many pop-up tags for swordfish were planned for 2007 within the DCR.

several of the 156 pop-up tags installed should be able to transmit the data in a following period and certainly some of them had been working properly, but this information was not available in the reports or in any other document transmitted to the EC within the DCR framework by MS. According to the available knowledge, the rate of failing tags after the implantation is around 50%. This is an important factor to take into consideration when assessing the actual price of a tag recovered. The final cost of each satellite pop-up tag, without including the work to set-up the final report and the general costs, is about 7,343 Euro in average (2007 values). After considering the recovery rate and the price of non-used tags, **the final cost of each recovered pop-up tag is approximately 20,000 euros** (the price of the fish is not included).

The average comprehensive cost for each archival tag is about 2,030 euro (value 2007) but it should be considered the award provided to fishermen for each recovery (2,000 euro) and the fact that the recovery rate is actually very low in European waters, apparently around 5%. Then, taking into account all these factors, **the final cost of each recovered archival tag can be assessed around 40,000 euros** (the price of the fish is not included).

The average comprehensive cost for each traditional spaghetti tag is about 720 euro (2007 value). Besides the fact the spaghetti tags are provided for free to scientists by ICCAT, the final effective cost will be very high, because the recovery rate is optimistically around 2% of the implanted tags. According to this figure and including the small award for the fishermen (usually 30 euro per tag), **the final cost should reach about 36,000 euros for each recovered spaghetti tag**. This figure becomes much lower when traditional tagging experiments are conducted only on juvenile bluefin tunas in the western European area (either Mediterranean or Atlantic), because then the recovery rate apparently reach 4,8% (PGTT, 2007), keeping the final figure around 15,000 euro for each recovered tag.

Average comprehensive cost for each sonic tag is about 805 euros (2007 value) and the functionality appears to be 100%.

These figures of final cost by each different type of tag used for large pelagic species were not available in any previous analysis and are roughly estimated here for a better assessment of the future proposals in this field.

6.3 THE USE OF TAGGING RESULTS IN STOCK ASSESSMENT

As concerns the practical results of the tagging efforts on these two species, SGRN is informally aware that several analyses were presented in meetings and congresses. No comprehensive summary of such analysis was included in the PGTT reports, which includes only very partial information and very few data, without any maps for better understanding the results.

As concerns the value of tagging data for the stock assessment or for stock definition, it seems that the indicators listed in point f) of PGTT Report 2005 (see section 6.1), were mostly used by PGTT in 2007 to assess the success of tuna tagging operations carried out under the DCR, even if result from previous tagging programmes since the '70s have been mixed-up in some parts of the report. According to the latest PGTT report (2007), data from pop-up tags have been used to assess the time of residency and mixing rates for bluefin tuna.

Some trials have been carried out using a few electronic tags (4 sonic and 1 internal archival) in experimental habitat based models for standardisation of CPUEs for bluefin tuna, including some analysis on catchability. The results were considered very preliminary and need to be much more improved in the future.

The utility of conventional (spaghetti) tag data for stock assessment was also analysed, particularly to assess the migration of bluefin tuna of age 0 and 1 from the W. Mediterranean to the Gulf of Biscay. Conventional tags were used also to estimate the mixing rates between West and East Atlantic bluefin tuna stocks in the last decades. SGRN notes that it is difficult to understand if tagging carried out under DCR provided results, because the recovery rate of tags implanted during these last years is not specified. Evaluation of growth parameters was also carried out and it appeared to be consistent with previous

studies. Even the mortality was studied, but PGTT reports that the recovery rate was very low, particularly from the Mediterranean. SGRN notes that both these last two analysis were carried out on data collected before the DCR.

A preliminary analysis of conventional (spaghetti) tagging data for swordfish was also included in PGTT, and the results were used to support the distinction between the Mediterranean and Atlantic stocks. The total recovery rate in the Atlantic was 5%, but the rate in the Mediterranean is reported to be “much lower”. SGRN notes that it is not reported how many tags have been recovered related to tagging activities carried out within the DCR.

Section C of the PGTT 2007 report presents a discussion about the future of the tagging activities for tuna and tuna-like species within the framework of the DCR. The validity of these activities is strongly supported by PGTT, stating that tagging is able to provide fishery-independent data at a cost much lower than other scientific surveys carried out for other halieutic resources and providing a long list of possible use of the data. PGTT also remarks that sampling design and scientific objectives should be evaluated through a peer-review process. SGRN notes that also the results and the usefulness for stock assessment need to be properly evaluated.

Besides the PGTT reports, SGRN found in the literature that recent research using electronic tags to study the movements and population structure of Atlantic bluefin tuna supports the two-stock hypothesis and provides evidence for distinct spawning areas that overlap on North Atlantic foraging grounds. Results also reveal hot spots for spawning bluefin tuna in the northern slope waters of the Gulf of Mexico (Block et al., 2005).

The last ICCAT assessment of the Bluefin tuna stock had also used tagging data. Even if the report is still not publicly available, SGRN could recover some relevant parts of the text:

“Two types of data were used to estimate the movement coefficients (overlap fractions) in the two-box VPA: the mixing proportion estimates described in section 4.1, based on microconstituents and conventional tagging data. The mixing proportions were fit by the two-box model assuming they were approximately lognormal distributed with standard deviations equal to the values given in Table 2.xxxx. Several of the proportion estimates were based on samples collected over several years.[...].

Additional runs were made using the conventional tagging data described in Appendix 8. The tagging data were assumed to be approximately multinomial distributed. Tags at liberty less than 30 days were ignored. The use of tagging data necessitates specifying a number of additional parameters such as mis-reporting, tag shedding, and incomplete mixing of tags. The specifications used here were similar to those outlined in SCRS/00/98, but were modified by a subgroup of scientists familiar with eastern and western BFT tagging programs to better account for recent and historical changes in tagging activities.”

From this excerpt, it seems that there is ongoing development to include tagging information into stock assessment, particularly with the two-box VPA approach, which runs a tuned VPA for each stock area including exchange rate parameters to account for migratory effects.

6.4 CONCLUSIONS ON BLUEFIN TUNA AND SWORDFISH TAGGING PROGRAMMES 2005-2007.

STECF/SGRN 08-02 considers that the tagging activities for bluefin tuna and swordfish conducted so far within the framework of the DRC did only partly achieve the target.

The achievement in tagging reached 58% of the planned objective, but SGRN has to remark that it is not easy to properly identify the number that was planned, because of the non-precise data reporting, included in PGTT reports. This is even less precise when an assessment of the recovery rate is conducted, because this information is rarely reported.

SGRN, taking into account the remarks about some stocks made by ICCAT/SCRS, notes that no tagging was never planned or carried out on the Mediterranean stock of albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*), besides of the reiterated request to better define this stock and to increase the knowledge about the related fisheries.

SGRN also notes that the recent technical development of smaller pop-up tags will be able to help in this task.

SGRN remarks that the PGTT experience is going in the right direction, but it needs some adjustments to more precisely focus on DCR objectives and results, according to the comments made by SGRN in 2005 and 2007. A complete report about the tagging activities carried out by all MS concerned within the DCR framework and the subsequent results was never presented to DG-MARE or to STECF for the evaluation, besides of the specific request by SGRN. Moreover, SGRN notes that the tagging programmes have not been included in the discussion on eligibility of surveys for the future DCR (SGRN-07-01 report). This point must be clearly addressed, otherwise tuna tagging will be *de facto* out of the DCR from 2009 onward.

Due to the high relevance of all fisheries concerned for the EU fleets and for the ICCAT request to continue tagging activities because results could be available only after a higher number of tags, SGRN recommends that future tagging activities for tuna and tuna-like species should be carried out within the DCR framework only after the approval of an agreed project, with precise targets and quality checks and demonstrate that the results are essential for stock assessment and management purpose.

SGRN also notes that future tagging activities should be more precisely budgeted, clearly stating if the tagging activity will be carried out by hired vessels or buying the fish; as a consequence, the budgets should be much more realistic, to avoid scientists to depend upon the good will of donors.

SGRN notes that a meeting is planned in the 2nd half of 2008 to synthesise the results of the tagging experiments and should address the questions raised by SGRN.

6.5 EXTENSION OF THE ANALYSIS TO SAMPLING FOR LARGE PELAGIC SPECIES BETWEEN 2005-2007 IN THE DCR.

SGRN made a review of the activities on all large pelagic/high migratory species carried out by all MS within the framework of the DCR in the last three years (2005-2007). The reason for carrying out this review was the fact that this particular segment often shows problems for the evaluation, because derogations are frequently mentioned in the reports, while the data collection on several species is mandatory according to ICCAT, IOTC, GFCM and other RFMOs, and then, as a consequence, to DCR general rules. The list of species includes stocks having TACs and species for which TACs are not applied, but all these are listed as “priority species” by the RFMOs concerned.

Tables A.1, A.2 and A.3 in Annex A provides an overview of the general situation coming out from the TRs. SGRN remarks that under-sampling problems for length are quite evident for various fisheries and species in last three years. Most of the pelagic shark species, for which data are required, are not sampled by most MS, and several serious inconsistencies have been noted in comparing ICCAT statistics and DCR outcomes for these species.

The comparison between the reported catches to ICCAT in some areas and the planned sampling for some species by MS are not always matching and some areas (CECAF and sometimes Mediterranean) show inconsistencies, while the situation is much more confused for the IOTC area, where some MS concerned are not usually planning samplings for some species. SGRN would like to recall the attention of both STECF and the EC about this segment of the DCR, because better clarity and planning seem urgently necessary.

Table 6.1 : Detailed review of the tagging activity by country between 2005-2007, according to data provided by NP proposal, TR and PGTT reports

| Year | Area | Country | species | type of tag | number of tags | number of tags | % | recovered data | | notes |
|------|----------------------|----------|---------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------|----------------|-------------|---------|
| | | | | | planned | achieved | achieved | or tags | % recovered | |
| 2005 | E. Mediterranean | Greece | SWO | spaghetti | 150 | 183 | 122 | | | |
| 2005 | C. Mediterranean | Italy | SWO | spaghetti | 150 | 37 | 25 | | | |
| 2005 | W. Mediterranean | Spain | SWO | spaghetti | 150 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 2005 | C. Atlantic | Spain | SWO | spaghetti | opportunistic | 0 | | | | |
| 2005 | E. Atlantic | Portugal | SWO | spaghetti | opportunistic | 6 | | | | |
| 2005 | Bay of Biscay | Spain | BFT | sonic | 10 | 3 | 30 | 3 | 100 | |
| 2005 | E. Atlantic | Spain | BFT | archival | | | | 1 (**) | | (a) |
| 2005 | E. Atlantic | Ireland | BFT | pop-up satellite | 5 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 2005 | E. Atlantic | Portugal | BFT | pop-up satellite | 5 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 2005 | E. Atlantic | Spain | BFT | pop-up satellite | 20 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 2005 | E. Mediterranean | Italy | BFT | pop-up satellite | 40 | 24 | 60 | | | |
| 2005 | C. Mediterranean | Malta | BFT | pop-up satellite | 10 | 9 | 90 | | | |
| 2005 | W. Mediterranean | Cyprus | BFT | pop-up satellite | 10 | 10 | 100 | 6 | 60 | (b) |
| 2005 | W. Mediterranean | Spain | BFT | spaghetti | 2000 | 1834 | 92 | 80 | 4 | |
| 2005 | E. Mediterranean | Greece | BFT | spaghetti | 0 | 2 | 200 | | | |
| 2005 | E. Atlantic | Portugal | BFT | spaghetti | opportunistic | 0 | | | | |
| 2005 | E. Atlantic | Spain | BFT | spaghetti | 2000 | 1696 | 85 | 51 | 3 | |
| 2005 | Bay of Biscay (SPOR) | Spain | BFT | spaghetti | | 140 (**) | | | | (c) |
| 2006 | C. Mediterranean | Italy | SWO | pop-up satellite | nd | 9 (**) | | | | (d) |
| 2006 | E. Mediterranean | Greece | SWO | spaghetti | 150 | 260 (*) | 173 | | | (e) |
| 2006 | C. Mediterranean | Italy | SWO | spaghetti | 150 | 256 (*) | 171 | 0 | 0 | (f) |
| 2006 | W. Mediterranean | Spain | SWO | spaghetti | 150 | 158 | 105 | | | |
| 2006 | C. Atlantic | Spain | SWO | spaghetti | opportunistic | 260 | | | | |
| 2006 | E. Atlantic | Portugal | SWO | spaghetti | opportunistic | 2 | | | | |
| 2006 | Bay of Biscay | Spain | BFT | sonic | 10 | 1 | 10 | | | |
| 2006 | E. Atlantic | Spain | BFT | archival | | 11 (**) | | 1 (**) | 9 | (g) |
| 2006 | E. Atlantic | Ireland | BFT | pop-up satellite | 5 | nd | | | | |
| 2006 | E. Atlantic | Portugal | BFT | pop-up satellite | 5 | 8 (*) | 160 | | | (h) |
| 2006 | W. Mediterranean | Spain | BFT | pop-up satellite | 40 | 20 (*) | 50 | 9 | 45 | (i) (k) |
| 2006 | C. Mediterranean | France | BFT | pop-up satellite | 10 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 2006 | C. Mediterranean | Malta | BFT | pop-up satellite | 10 | nd | | | | |
| 2006 | E. Mediterranean | Italy | BFT | pop-up satellite | 40 | 33 | 83 | 18 | | (j) |
| 2006 | E. Mediterranean | Cyprus | BFT | pop-up satellite | 15 | 10 (*) | 67 | | | (l) |
| 2006 | E. Mediterranean | Greece | BFT | spaghetti | opportunistic | 9 (**) | | | | (m) |
| 2006 | E. Atlantic | Portugal | BFT | spaghetti | opportunistic | nd | | | | |
| 2006 | E. Atlantic | Spain | BFT | spaghetti | opportunistic | 380 | | 19 | 5 | |
| 2006 | E. Atlantic | Spain | BFT | spaghetti | 2000 | 42 | 2 | | | |
| 2006 | W. Mediterranean | Spain | BFT | spaghetti | 2000 | 308 | 15 | | | |
| 2006 | Bay of Biscay (SPOR) | Spain | BFT | spaghetti | | 24 (**) | | | | (n) |
| 2007 | E. Mediterranean | Greece | SWO | spaghetti | 150 | nd | | | | |
| 2007 | C. Mediterranean | Italy | SWO | spaghetti | 150 | 79 | 53 | | | |
| 2007 | W. Mediterranean | Spain | SWO | spaghetti | 150 | 137 | 91 | | | |
| 2007 | C. Atlantic | Spain | SWO | spaghetti | 200 | nd | | | | |
| 2007 | E. Atlantic | Portugal | SWO | spaghetti | opportunistic | 20 | | | | |
| 2007 | E. Atlantic | Portugal | SWO | pop-up satellite | 3 (**) | nd | | | | (o) |
| 2007 | Canary Islands | Spain | SWO | pop-up satellite | 10 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 2007 | Balearic Islands | Spain | SWO | pop-up satellite | 5 | 2 | 40 | | | |
| 2007 | C. Mediterranean | Italy | SWO | pop-up satellite | 5 (**) | na | | | | (p) |
| 2007 | E. Mediterranean | Greece | SWO | pop-up satellite | 5 | nd | | | | |
| 2007 | Bay of Biscay | Spain | BFT | archival | 120 | 120 | 100 | | | (q) |
| 2007 | E. Atlantic | Ireland | BFT | pop-up satellite | 5 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 2007 | E. Atlantic | Portugal | BFT | pop-up satellite | 5 (*) | nd | | | | (o) |
| 2007 | W. Mediterranean | Spain | BFT | pop-up satellite | 10 | 9 | 90 | | | |
| 2007 | C. Mediterranean | France | BFT | pop-up satellite | 10 | 11 | 110 | 11 | | (r) |
| 2007 | C. Mediterranean | Malta | BFT | pop-up satellite | 5 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 2007 | E. Mediterranean | Italy | BFT | pop-up satellite | 20 | 10 | 50 | | | |
| 2007 | E. Mediterranean | Cyprus | BFT | pop-up satellite | 10 | 10 | 100 | | | |
| 2007 | E. Atlantic | Portugal | BFT | spaghetti | opportunistic | 2 | | | | |
| 2007 | E. Atlantic | Spain | BFT | spaghetti | opportunistic | 10 | | | | |

NOTES:

- (a) according to the PGTT 2007 report, some archival tags were implanted in bluefin tunas by Spain; nothing is said in the Spanish NP proposal or in the TR.
 (b) a total of 6 pop-up tags were detached prematurely (2 after only one week); the remaining 4 are expected to detach in 2007.
 (c) according to PGTT 2007 report, 140 tags were implanted in bluefin tuna caught by sport fishermen in 2005; nothing is said in NP proposal or TR.
 (d) Italy reported 9 pop-up tags implanted in 2006 under a specific project (non DCR); these tags were not included in the total (lack of information).
 (e) the Greek TR reports only 159 tagged swordfish, while 260 are reported by the coordination meeting report.
 (f) the Italian TR reports only 246 tagged swordfish, while 256 are reported by the PGTT 2007 report.
 (g) according to the PGTT 2007 report, 11 archival tags were implanted in bluefin tunas by Spain; nothing is said in the Spanish NP proposal or in the TR.
 (h) according to PGTT 2007 report, 8 pop-up tags were implanted, but only 5 were included in the NP proposal.
 (i) the PGTT 2006 report stated that Spain tagged 22 tunas, while the TR stated that the tagged tunas were 20.
 (k) 2 tagged bluefin tunas were fished after a short period, while 11 pop-up tags detached prematurely; the remaining 7 (9?) were expected to detach in 2007.
 (l) 18 pop-up tags were detached well in advance from the set date; no data are available for the tags to be detached in 2007.
 (m) the Cyprus TR reported 10 fish to be tagged, but 15 were reported by the coordination meeting report.
 (n) according to PGTT 2007 report, 9 tags were implanted in bluefin tuna caught by Greece in 2006; nothing is said in NP proposal or TR.
 (o) according to PGTT 2007 report, 24 tags were implanted in bluefin tuna caught by sport fishermen in 2006; nothing is said in NP proposal or TR.
 (p) the PGTT 2007 report stated that Portugal should tag 3 bluefin tunas and 5 swordfish with pop-up satellite tags, while the TR reported 5 bluefin tunas.
 (q) the 5 pop-up tags were listed in the coordination meeting report, but they were not in the Italian NP proposal; nothing is said in the TR.
 (r) the pop-up tags were not used and then only internal archival tags were used.
 (s) all tags were detached well in advance from the set date, with an average of only 72 days (11-142) of attachment.
 (general 1) no costs were budgetted and requested for opportunistic tagging
 (general 2) the recovery of all types of tags may happen in future years

(*) Information presenting discrepancy or uncertainties

(**) Data not included in NP proposal or TR

Table 6.2 : Summary of tagging activities by country between 2005-2007.

| years | country | species | type of tag | number of tags planned | number of tags achieved | % achieved |
|-----------|----------|---------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------|
| 2005-2007 | Cyprus | BFT | all | 35 | 30 | 86 |
| 2005-2007 | France | BFT | all | 20 | 11 | 55 |
| 2005-2008 | Greece | BFT | all | 0 | 11 | - |
| 2005-2007 | Ireland | BFT | all | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| 2005-2007 | Italy | BFT | all | 100 | 67 | 67 |
| 2005-2007 | Malta | BFT | all | 25 | 9 | 36 |
| 2005-2007 | Portugal | BFT | all | 15 | 11 | 73 |
| 2005-2007 | Spain | BFT | all | 8210 | 4588 | 56 |
| 2005-2007 | all | BFT | pop-up satellite + archival + sonic | 420 | 290 | 69 |
| 2005-2007 | all | BFT | spaghetti | 8000 | 4437 | 55 |
| 2005-2007 | all | BFT | all | 8420 | 4727 | 56 |
| 2005-2007 | Greece | SWO | all | 455 | 443 | 97 |
| 2005-2007 | Italy | SWO | all | 455 | 372 | 82 |
| 2005-2007 | Portugal | SWO | all | 0 | 22 | - |
| 2005-2007 | Spain | SWO | all | 665 | 557 | 84 |
| 2005-2007 | all | SWO | pop-up satellite | 25 | 2 | 8 |
| 2005-2007 | all | SWO | spaghetti | 1550 | 1130 | 73 |
| 2005-2007 | all | SWO | all | 1575 | 1132 | 72 |
| 2005-2007 | all | BFT+SWO | pop-up satellite + archival + sonic | 445 | 292 | 66 |
| 2005-2007 | all | BFT+SWO | spaghetti | 9550 | 5567 | 58 |
| 2005-2007 | all | BFT+SWO | all | 9995 | 5859 | 59 |

7 RESPONSE BY MS TO THE CALL FOR ECONOMIC DATA

SGRN evaluated the response by MS to the call for economic and effort data collected within the framework of the DCR issued by the Commission in January 2008.

JRC provided a summary of the data provided by the MS in response to the call (Table 7.1). SGRN evaluated individual MS' data submissions against their 2007 Technical Reports which (for the most part) refer to data collected for 2006. SGRN's specific comments are given below.

As a general comment, SGRN points out that these data are essential for estimating the economic performance of European fishing fleets. In particular, estimates of gross value added cannot be made without data on revenues and operating costs, while for estimates of economic profitability, data on capital values and costs are also required. SGRN urges MS to respond fully to data calls from the Commission.

SGRN also reminds MS to pay careful attention to the classification of costs according to the JRC data collection website and to follow strictly these specifications. Here "fixed costs" (FIXEDCOST) are defined as operational costs not related to fishing effort, and not the costs of capital (in contrast to the definition in the DCR). Capital costs (CAPCOST) are defined as the sum of depreciation and the opportunity cost of capital (i.e., an estimate of capital value multiplied by an appropriate interest rate). Note that on the JRC data collection website capital value is called INVESTMENT as in the DCR.

For the following countries, the data submitted (or not, see also Table 7.1) in response to the call reflect the information given in the 2007 TR: **Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Sweden** (i.e. shortfalls in the data submission, if any, are consistent with shortfalls identified in the TR).

SGRN identified the following discrepancies between the data submitted and the TR:

Cyprus

TR indicated that capital value ("investment") and capital costs were collected but not provided in the call.

Finland

It is not clear why fuel consumption, fixed costs and repair costs should be missing, since they apparently have been collected according to the TR

Greece

No Technical Report submitted

Ireland

It is not clear why the missing parameters have not been submitted, since they apparently have been collected according to the TR.

Latvia

All parameters for 2006, except for FTE, have been collected according to the 2007 TR and were not submitted.

Lithuania

Fixed costs have been collected for 2006 according to the 2007 TR. However, the JRC call referred to "capital costs", which might have been confusing.

Data for DFN VL2440 were apparently not submitted due to confidentiality reasons (segment with less than 10 vessels).

Malta

According to the TR 2007, data on the missing parameters were collected for 2006.

Portugal

According to the TR 2007, data on the missing parameters were collected for 2006.

Spain

Table 12.2 of the TR 2007 indicates that data were collected for 2006, although little detail is provided in the text of the TR and only one parameter was supplied to the call.

United Kingdom

TR not evaluated.

Table 7.1. Coverage report of the call for economic data in January 2008. Source JRC.

| Country | No vessels reported / No vessels in CFR. | Summary of missing data |
|-----------|--|---|
| Belgium | 107 / 121 | |
| Cyprus | 499 / 890 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Capital costs all years• Investment 2006• Parts of the population missing |
| Denmark | 2160 / 3320 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Data from vessels with low activity (2160 out of 3320) |
| Estonia | 1036 / 1048 | |
| Finland | 255 / 3311 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Data from vessels with low activity (255 out of 3311)• Fuel consumption• Fixed costs• Repair costs |
| France | 4741 / 7871 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Data from vessels from Corsica and overseas vessels.• Fixed costs. Have been included in Rep costs. |
| Germany | 2154 / 2142 | |
| Greece | 18359 / 18246 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Value of landings by species |
| Ireland | 1414 / 1374 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Revenue/cost data for some segments. 2006 |
| Italy | 14390 / 14501 | |
| Latvia | 201 / 929 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Capital costs• Fuel consumption• All parameters of 2006 |
| Lithuania | 246 / 212 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fixed costs• See comment 1 below. |

| Country | No vessels reported / No vessels in CFR. | Summary of missing data |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Malta | 1411 / 1410 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue_costs 2006 • Employment 2006 • Financial 2006 • Price 2006 |
| Netherlands | 762 / 852 | |
| Poland | 919 / 1081 | |
| Portugal –mainland | 5080 / 9968 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large number of vessels from the VR is missing • Capital costs • Fuel consumption • Fixed consumption • Economic data for 4 important segments. |
| Portugal –Azores | 641 / | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital costs • Fuel consumption • Price • Financial position • Rev and cost 2006 • Employment 2006 |
| Portugal –Madeira | 127 / | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rev_cost • Employment 2006 |
| Slovenia | 184 / 167 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All rev_costs except var_cost |
| Spain | 13504 / 13877 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fuel consumption • Value of landings • Borrowing • Investment 2006 • Revenue and costs 2006 • Price • Large part of the effort |
| Sweden | 1564 / 1597 | |
| UK | 6868 / 6961 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rev_cost for some segments |

8 IMPROVEMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

SGRN discussed how do deal with the evaluation of the future NPs and TRs under the renewed DCR. As concerns the evaluation of the MS-NPs performance at the start of the renewed DCR, SGRN feels that a historical overview regarding the collected data over the reference period 2002 – 2008, should be compiled to ensure a sound basis for the evaluation of the future NPs. To avoid falling short under the renewed DCR, this historical overview can demonstrate the achieved level under the current DCR, enabling the SGRN to better evaluate the instalment of MS'actions in their first NP proposal under the renewed DCR. New templates for the evaluation of the 2009-2010 NP proposal, based on the guidelines proposed by SGRN-08-01, will also have to be prepared before the next SGRN meeting.

As concerns the organization and work scheme, it is evident that the increasing number of MS and number of fields to evaluate (aquaculture, ecosystem, ...) requires a redefinition of the SGRN way of doing during the meeting. SGRN is of the opinion that co-chairing within a biological and an economical subgroup is advisable, although the new section on transversal variables will need to be evaluated jointly. SGRN was informed that the evaluation of the NPs and TRs should be debated through or in the presence of external experts (in the sense of independent and not involved in the DCR implementation or management). SGRN welcomes the inclusion of additional force to the group, but has concerns regarding an approach involving only external evaluators, due to the past experience of such experts evaluating the NP proposals prior to SGRN meeting (see section 1.4 of SGRN December 2007 report, evaluation of 2008 NP proposals).

The idea that the workload would decrease, because of multi-annual programmes, especially in the intermediate years, seems highly unlikely. The first year of the multi-annual programme 2009-2010 will require extensive evaluation. This could be lesser in the second year but will be counteracted with the preparation of the next NP proposal for the years 2011-2013.

SGRN has always checked the achievements of the MS without requesting the actual data collected. The formal calls for data, beyond the real need for scientific analysis, is a natural candidate for an objective checking procedure (see section 7). The feedback procedure initiated with RFMOs like ICES (see section 3.5) is also another objective information for SGRN to recommend appropriate actions in order to improve the quality of the data collection and thus the quality of the stock assessments. The quality assurance initiated by ICES PGCCDBS (ICES, 2007) and promoted by SGRN (July 2007 report, evaluation of 2006 TR) has been subsequently discussed in the 2007 RCMs and summarised in the 4th Liaison Meeting report. This quality assurance is a keyword of the new DCR (Reg. 199/2008, Article 14) and all initiatives following the path detailed in the 4th LM report should be encouraged. In the new DCR, provisions have also been installed for the Commission to access the national databases (Reg. 199/2008, Article 16). This possibility should also serve the evaluation process and the outcome, on a format to be defined, should be available to SGRN for appropriate comments. SGRN was informed that the revised version of the NP proposals, following SGRN comments and bilateral agreements between the Commission and MSs, will be available on the JRC website, in the future, as the final agreed version. This was a former recommendation by SGRN in order to contrast the TR to the final agreed version of the NP proposal. In the future and for biological variables only in a first stage, regional databases can provide tremendous opportunities in reducing the workload for both checking and reporting the collected data. In summary, quality assurance developed by MS should help optimising the data collection; calls for data, feedback from RFMOs and access to national databases by the Commission should provide objective ways of assessing the quality of the data collected; Availability of the revised version of NP proposals will improve the evaluation of TR, and regional databases will improve the overall transparency of the data collection, at least for the biological variables.

The database-like approach for the tables annexed to the NP proposals and TRs proposed by the new guidelines (report of SGRN-08-01 meeting) is expected to ease the work in preparation of the SGRN evaluation meeting. Nevertheless, SGRN foresees difficulties when revising the future multi-annual programmes within the present time frame and preparatory work in advance of the SGRN meeting seems unavoidable. The first step could be done by RCMs receiving the NP proposals first, so that the regional co-ordination could be incorporated before the evaluation by the SGRN.. A small group of experts could also proceed to all objective and quantitative evaluation (cross-checks, historical performance, actual derogations, percentage of fulfilment, matching between TR and NP proposal) so that SGRN could devote more time during the meeting to plenary discussions and harmonisation of the comments between MS.

9 SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS BY MS IN THEIR TR

This section summarises the suggestions made by MS in section 17 of their TR. SGRN does not make any judgement on them but simply wishes to list these comments and direct the ideas to the relevant forum. The ideas are summarised, together with a reference to the MS who proposed them, in order to enable the reader to find the full text and explanation. In this manner, SGRN wishes to give the signal that the suggestions elaborated by MS should be considered in the relevant forum and that this section is a useful space for MS to provide their own feedback on the complex Data Collection machinery.

In section 17 some MS have addressed issues that are only of concern between the MS and the Commission. SGRN reiterates that only suggestions relevant to SGRN should be made in this section. Financing is clearly out with the competence of SGRN.

A certain number of suggestions were addressing the technicalities of the new DCR, which are fixed now. It is the case of

- the “vessels without license” and non-active vessels (Germany),
- the units defined for static gears (Germany),
- the timing of the submission of TR and NP proposal (Latvia),
- the need to review the technical tables and finforms (France),
- the request to modify the calculation of the number of individuals to sample based on the landings (Spain),
- the non-mandatory status in the current DCR of ageing highly migratory species and *Merluccius spp* in CECAF FAO 34 (Spain),
- the need to create a European obligation to accept on-board observers (Spain).

9.1 TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION

The German version of Reg. 1639/2001 is incorrectly translated in section chapter III Module H 1.d). in relation to ages. (1) i and ii says derogation for sampling if quota is less than 5%, whereas the English version says 10%.

France wishes the JRC to improve the STECF website in general and the uploading page in particular. France also suggests the creation of a mailing alert for the National correspondents so that they are systematically informed of all DCR relevant issues.

9.2 TO BE CONSIDERED BY SGRN

Spain suggests to add a column “N° of days” for quantifying the achievements of the observer-at-sea sampling trips in the relevant table of the new guidelines for TR. This would be consistent with the information actually contained in table 5.3 of the NP proposal.

10 REFERENCES CITED IN THE REPORT

- Anon. 2004. Commission Staff Working Paper: STECF Sub-group on Research Needs (SGRN) – Evaluation of 2003 data collection national projects undertaken under the Commission Regulation (EC) No 1639/2001. Brussels, 21 – 25 June 2004. SEC(2004) 1312. 116 pp.
- Anon. 2005a. First meeting of the Planning Group on Tuna tagging in the East Atlantic and Mediterranean Sea (PGTT). Bari, 4-6 April 2005. 22 pp.
- Anon. 2005b. Commission Staff Working Paper: STECF Sub-group on Research Needs (SGRN) – Evaluation of 2004 data collection national projects undertaken under the Commission Regulation (EC) No 1639/2001. Brussels, June 27th - July 2nd, 2005. SEC(2007) 463. 80 pp.
- Anon. 2006a. Training Workshop on Fleet-based Approach. Nantes, 13 – 17 March 2006. 34 pp.
- Anon. 2006b. Second meeting of the Planning Group on Tuna tagging in the East Atlantic and Mediterranean Sea (PGTT). Sliema, Malta 27-29th March 2006. 27 pp.
- Anon. 2006b Commission Staff Working Paper: STECF Sub-group on Research Needs (SGRN) – Evaluation of 2006 data collection national projects undertaken under the Commission Regulation (EC) No 1639/2001. Ispra 3 -7 July 2006. 125 pp.
- Anon. 2006c. Commission Staff Working Paper: STECF Sub-group on Research Needs (SGRN) – Revision of the Biological Data Requirements under the Data Collection Regulation. GRN-06-03. Brussels, 27 November.– 1 December 2006. 95 pp.
- Anon. 2007a. Third meeting of the Planning Group on Tuna tagging in the East Atlantic and Mediterranean Sea (PGTT). Heraklion, Crete, Greece 23-25th January 2007. 19 pp.
- Anon. 2007b. Commission Staff Working Paper: STECF Sub-group on Research Needs (SGRN) – Review of list of surveys at sea (Appendix XIV of EU Commission Regulation N°1581/2004) with their priorities (SGRN 07-01). Brussels, 12-16 February 2007. 23 pp.
- Anon. 2007c. Commission Staff Working Paper: STECF Sub-group on Research Needs (SGRN) – Evaluation of 2006 data collection national projects undertaken under the Commission Regulation (EC) No 1639/2001. Ispra 2 -7 July, 2007. 143 pp.
- Anon. 2007d. Commission Staff Working Paper: STECF – 26th Plenary Meeting Report of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (PLEN-07-03) 5-9 November 2007, Ispra. 215 pp.
- Anon. 2007e. Commission Staff Working Paper: STECF Sub-group on Research Needs (SGRN) – Analysis of derogations and non-conformities of Member States data collection National Programme proposals for 2008. Gazzada, 3 – 7 December 2007. 101 pp.
- Anon. 2008. Commission Staff Working Paper: STECF SGRN-SGECA – Implementation of the collection of indicators for the fleet-based approach and establishment of regional sampling designs for the new data collection framework (SGRN-SGECA 08-01). Nantes, 04-08 February 2008. 66 pp.
- Block B.A., S.L.H. Teo, A. Walli, A. Boustany, M.J.W. Stokesbury, C.J. Farwell, K.C. Weng, H. Dewar and T.D. Williams. 2005. Electronic tagging and population structure of Atlantic bluefin tuna, *Nature* 434 (2005), pp. 1121–1127.
- Council Regulation (EC) N° 1543/2000 of 29 June 2000 establishing a Community Framework for the collection and management of the data needed to conduct the common fisheries policy – OJ L 176, 15.7.2000, p.1-16.

Commission Regulation (EC) N° 1639/2001 of 25 July 2001 establishing the minimum and extended Community programmes for the collection of data in the fisheries sector and laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) N° 1543/2000 – OJ L 222, 17.8.2001, p.53.

Commission Regulation (EC) N° 1581/2004 of 27 August 2004 Amending Regulation (EC) N°1639/2001 establishing the minimum and extended Community programmes for the collection of data in the fisheries sector and laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) N° 1543/2000 – OJ L289 27.8.2004, p 6.

Commission Regulation (EC) N° 199/2008 of of 25 February 2008 concerning the establishment of a Community framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the Common Fisheries Policy – OJ L 60 5.3.2008, p. 1-12.

ICES, 2007. Report of the Planning Group on Commercial Catch, Discards and Biological Sampling (PGCCDBS). ICES CM 2007/ACFM:09,112 pp. + annexes.

ANNEX A. PARTICIPANTS CONTACT DETAILS

| Name | Address | Telephone no. | Email |
|------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| STECF members | | | |
| Massimiliano Cardinale | Swedish Board of Fisheries, Institute of Marine Research, Föreningsgatan 45 330, Lysekil, Sweden | Phone: +46 523 18750 | massimiliano.cardinale@fiskeriverket.se |
| Di Natale, Antonio | AQUASTUDIO Research Institute, Via Trapani 98121, Messina, Italy | Phone: 0039 090 346408 | adinatale@acquariodigenova.it |
| Gustavsson, Tore | Swedish Board of Fisheries, Ekelundsgatan 1, 413 20, Göteborg, Sweden | Phone: 46317430309 | tore.gustavsson@fiskeriverket.se |
| Aaron Hatcher | University of Portsmouth, Winston Churchill Avenue PO1 2UP, Portsmouth, United Kingdom | Phone: 023 9284 4230 | aaron.hatcher@port.ac.uk |
| Invited experts | | | |
| Enrico Arneri | CNR – ISMAR, Largo Fiera della Pesca 60125 Ancona, Italy | Phone: 390712078849 | e.arneri@ismar.cnr.it |
| Charis Charilaou | Department of Fisheries and Marine Research Bethleem 101, 1416, Nicosia Cyprus | Phone: 35722807842 | ccharilaou@dfmr.moa.gov.cy |
| Ryszard Grzebielec | Sea Fisheries Institute in Gdynia, 1 Kollataja 81-332, Gdynia, Poland | Phone: 0048 58 73 56 226 | rysiek@mir.gdynia.pl |
| Michael Ebeling | Federal Research Centre for Fisheries Palmaille 9, 22767, Hamburg, Germany | Phone: 040-38905212 | Michael.Ebeling@ish.bfa-fisch.de |

| | | | |
|------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Olga Moura | IPIMAR Av Brasília, 1449-006 Lisboa, Portugal | Phone: 213027132 | olgmoura@ipimar.pt |
| Romas Statkus | Fishery research laboratory P. O. Box 108, 91001 Klaipeda, Lithuania | Phone: 37046391122 | statrom@gmail.com |
| Georgs Kornilovs | Latvian Fish Resources Agency, Daugavgrivas 8, LV-1048 Riga, Latvia | Phone: 3717676027 | Georgs.Kornilovs@lzra.gov.lv |
| Angeliki Adamidou | NAGREF-Fisheries Research Institute, Nea Peramos 64007, Kavala, Greece | Phone: 30-25940-21273 | adamidou@inale.gr |
| Maria Cristina Morgado | ICES H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46, 1553 Copenhagen, Denmark | Phone: +45 33386721 | cristina@ices.dk |
| Jens Ulleweit | Federal Reseach Centre for Fisheries, Palmaille 9, 22767, Hamburg, Germany | Phone: 0049 40 38905217 | jens.ulleweit@ish.bfa-fisch.de |
| Joerg Berkenhagen | Bundesforschungsanstalt für Fischerei, Palmaille 9, 22767, Hamburg, Germany | Phone: +49 (0)40 38905 206 | joerg.berkenhagen@ifh.bfa-fisch.de |
| Gráinne Ní Chonchúir | The Marine Institute, Rinville, Oranmore 0 Co. Galway, Ireland | Phone: 35391387200 | grainne.nichonchuir@marine.ie |
| Isabelle Collet | DPMA, 3 Place FONTENOY, 75007 Paris, France | Phone: 01.49.55.82.12 | isabelle-m.collet@agriculture.gouv.fr |
| Henrik Degel | Danish Fisheries Research Institute Charlottenlund Slot, 2920 Charlottenlund, Denmark | Phone: 4533963386 | hd@difres.dk |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|
| Margaret Bell | FRS, Marine Lab 375 Victoria Rd AB11 9DB, Aberdeen, United Kingdom | Phone: +44 1224 876544 | bellma@marlab.ac.uk |
| Bart Maertens | ILVO-Fisheries Ankerstraat, 8400, Oostende Belgium | Phone: +32 (0)59 56 98 34 | bart.maertens@ilvo.vlaanderen.be |
| Angeles Armesto | Instituto Español de Oceanografía Cabo Estay-Canido,36200 Vigo, Spain | Phone: 34986492111 | angeles.armesto@vi.icio.es |
| Henk Heessen | IMARES PO Box 68, 1970 AB, Ijmuiden, Netherlands | Phone: 31255564692 | henk.heessen@wur.nl |
| Vigneau, Joel (chair) | IFREMER, Avenue du General de Gaulle 14520, Port-en-Bessin, France | Phone: (33)2 31 51 56 00 | Joel.Vigneau@ifremer.fr |
| European Commission | | | |
| Sarunas Zableckis | JRC, STECF secretariat | | Stecf-secretariat@jrc.it |
| Antonio Cervantes | DG MARE | Tel. 0332 229 65126 | Antonio.cervantes@ec.europa.eu |

Table A.1. Summary of data collected on large pelagic species within DCR by all EU countries in 2005.

| | Frigate <i>Auxis spp</i> | Atlantic back skipjack <i>Euthynnus alleteratus</i> | Skipjack tuna <i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i> | Atlantic bonito <i>Sarda sarda</i> | Deep sea shark <i>Centroscymnus coelolepis</i> | Shark <i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i> | Shark <i>Prionace glauca</i> | Albacore <i>Thunnus alalunga</i> | Yellowfin tuna <i>Thunnus albacares</i> | Bigeye tuna <i>Thunnus obesus</i> | Bluefin tuna <i>Thunnus tynnus</i> | Swordfish <i>Xiphias gladius</i> | NOTES |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| LENGTH Required / Planned / Achieved | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyprus | | | | | | | | | | | 90 / 100 / 125 | | Mediterranean |
| France | x - / - / 507 x - / - / 4149 | x - / - / 2 x - / - / 647 | x - / 13250 / 39210 x - / 12100 / 11589 | | | | | x - / - / 512 3100 / 3100 / 854 - / - / 31 | x - / 36800 / 77198 x - / 29700 / 37315 | x - / 10850 / 10217 x - / 15900 / 6701 | 6440 / 0 / derog x x | x 1500 / 1500 / 958 x x | Mediterranean Indian Atlantic NE ICCAT |
| Greece | | | | | | | | 323 / 400 / 348 | | | 319 / 359 / 309 | 1311 / 1600 / 2577 | Mediterranean |
| Ireland | | | | | 50 / 50 / 0 | | | 3800 / 3800 / 986 | | | | | Atlantic NE |
| Italy | | | | 200 / 200 / 1029 | | | | 1000 / 1000 / 1785 | | | 6000 / 6000 / 4245 | 5000 / 5000 / 6892 | Mediterranean |
| Malta | | | | | | | | | | | 230 / 230 / 190 | 200 / 200 / 367 | Mediterranean |
| Portugal | | | 1094 / 913 / 2034 2030 / 1500 / 1765 x | | | | | 167 / 639 / 188 100 / 300 / 220 x | | 1029 / 956 / 1532 1000 / 1200 / 1130 x | 4 / 5 / 5 x x | 10 / 7 / 223 125 / 600 / 605 200 / 200 / 429 | CECAF ICES x Mainland |
| Spain | | | 19970 / 19970 / 145690 x 89111 / 89111 / 309005 | | | 285 / 285 / 460 x 131 / 131 / 200 | 4208 / 4208 / 4460 x 804 / 804 / 780 | 9731 / 9731 / 10120 207 / 207 / 285 492 / 492 / 125 | 30930 / 30930 / 31705 x 57406 / 57406 / 108895 | 10317 / 10317 / 25080 x 17096 / 17096 / 46285 | 3982 / 3983 / 4165 2157 / 2157 / 1055 x | 8279 / 8279 / 8480 1279 / 1279 / 1400 7796 / 7796 / 7810 | Atlantic Mediterranean Other |
| AGE Required / Planned / Achieved | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyprus | | | | | | | | | | | 90 / 100 / 125 | | Mediterranean |
| France | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greece | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ireland | | | | | | | | 954 growth | | | | | Atlantic NE |
| Italy | | | | NP | | | | NP | | | NP | NP | |
| Malta | | | | | | | | | | | 230 / 230 / 93 | 200 / 200 / 85 | Mediterranean |
| Portugal | | | NR | NR | | | | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | |
| SEX RATIO Achieved | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyprus | | | | | | | | x 210 | | | x 8 | x 75 | Medit (farmed) Medit (landings) |
| France | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greece | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ireland | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Italy | | | | NP | | | | NP | | | NP | NP | |
| Malta | | | | | | | | | | | 80 | 0 | Mediterranean |
| Portugal | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spain | 28 37 x | 15 20 x | | x 44 x | | 380 2 50 | 697 148 100 | 0 183 x | x x 1366 | | 2053 119 x | 19 350 220 | Atlantic Mediterranean Other |
| MATURITY Achieved | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyprus | | | | | | | | x 210 | | | x 8 | x 75 | Medit (farmed) Medit (landings) |
| France | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greece | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ireland | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Italy | | | | NP | | | | NP | | | NP | NP | |
| Malta | | | | | | | | | | | 78 | 0 | Mediterranean |
| Portugal | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spain | 28 37 x | 15 20 x | | x 44 x | | 0 175 x | | x x 340 | | | 26 114 x | 626 1293 500 | Atlantic NE Mediterranean Other |

Table A.2. Summary of data collected on large pelagic species within DCR by all EU countries in 2006.

| | Frigate <i>Auxis spp</i> | Atlantic back skipjack <i>Euthynnus alleteratus</i> | Skipjack tuna <i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i> | Atlantic bonito <i>Sarda sarda</i> | Deep sea shark <i>Centroscymnus coeleolepsis</i> | Shark <i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i> | Shark <i>Prionace glauca</i> | Albacore <i>Thunnus alalunga</i> | Yellowfin tuna <i>Thunnus albacares</i> | Bigeye tuna <i>Thunnus obesus</i> | Bluefin tuna <i>Thunnus thynnus</i> | Swordfish <i>Xiphias gladius</i> | NOTES |
|---|-----------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| LENGTH Required / Planned / Achieved | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyprus | | | | | | | | | | | 90 / 100 / 125 | | Mediterranean |
| France | x - / - / 1480 | x - / - / 10 | x - / 13200 / 34000 | | | | | x - / - / 1000 3100 / 3100 / 854 | x - / 46800 / 75050 | x - / 10900 / 8500 | 6440 / 0 / derog x x x | x 1500 / 1500 / 958 x x | Mediterranean Indian Atlantic NE ICCAT |
| Greece | | x - / - / 200 | x - / 10000 / 8000 | | | | | x - / 7500 / 6400 | | | | | |
| Ireland | | | | | 50 / 50 / 0 | | | 150 / 500 / 549 3800 / 3800 / 1422 | | | 380 / 500 / 519 | 1350 / 1500 / 1384 | Mediterranean Atlantic NE |
| Italy | | | | 75 / 200 / 260 | | | | 4348 / 1000 / 819 | | | 3802 / 6000 / 5201 | 7631 / 5000 / 7259 | Mediterranean |
| Malta | | | | | | | | | | | 230 / 1000 / 1057 | 200 / 1000 / 1744 | Mediterranean |
| Portugal | | | 1094 / 1094 / 1488 6300 / 4800 / 3204 x | | | | | 167 / - / 0 100 / 300 / 195 x | 6 / 6 / 12 x x | 1029 / - / 1841 400 / 1200 / 658 x | 4 / 4 / 0 x x | 10 / 10 / 280 200 / 600 / 237 200 / 200 / 1137 | CECAF ICES Mainland |
| Spain | | | 36339 / 36339 / 37250 x 81295 / 81295 / 60955 | x - / - / 125 x | | 739 / 739 / 550 x 372 / 372 / 200 | 11385 / 11385 / 4455 x 2601 / 2601 / 600 | 25864 / 25864 / 36245 x 71381 / 71381 / 131450 | 9914 / 9914 / 34330 x 9840 / 9840 / 16950 | | | x 816 / 816 / 890 10110 / 10110 / 9255 | Atlantic Mediterranean Other |
| AGE Required / Planned / Achieved | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyprus | | | | | | | | | | | 230 / 230 / 129 | 200 / 200 / 0 | Mediterranean |
| France | | | | | | | | x 1974 | | 25 14 | | | Atlantic Indian |
| Greece | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ireland | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Italy | | | | NP | | | | NP | | | NP | NP | |
| Malta | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Portugal | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spain | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEX RATIO Achieved | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyprus | | | | | | | | | | | 67 | 0 | Mediterranean |
| France | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greece | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ireland | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Italy | | | | NP | | | | NP | | | NP | NP | |
| Malta | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Portugal | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spain | x 22 x | x 59 x | | x 62 x | | 343 14 50 | 1094 90 100 | 620 243 x | x x 17154 | x x 376 | 146 415 x | 673 243 500 | Atlantic Mediterranean Other |
| MATURITY Achieved | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyprus | | | | | | | | | | | 69 | | Mediterranean |
| France | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greece | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ireland | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Italy | | | | NP | | | | NP | | | NP | NP | |
| Malta | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Portugal | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spain | x 22 x | x 59 x | | x 62 x | | | | 1 236 x | | | x 258 x | 37 242 220 | Atlantic Mediterranean Other |

Table A.3. Summary of data collected on large pelagic species within DCR by all EU countries in 2007.

| | Frigate <i>Auxis spp</i> | Atlantic back skipjack <i>Euthynnus alletteratus</i> | Skipjack tuna <i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i> | Atlantic bonito <i>Sarda sarda</i> | Deep sea shark <i>Centroscymsus coelelepis</i> | Shark <i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i> | Shark <i>Prionace glauca</i> | Albacore <i>Thunnus alalunga</i> | Yellowfin tuna <i>Thunnus albacares</i> | Bigeys tuna <i>Thunnus obesus</i> | Bluefin tuna <i>Thunnus thynnus</i> | Swordfish <i>Xiphias gladius</i> | NOTES |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| LENGTH | Required / | Planned / | Achieved | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyprus | | | | | | | | x 215 / 215 / 400 | | | 760 / 760 / 1090 115 / 115 / 10 | x 50 / 100 / 315 | Medit (farmed) Medit (landings) |
| France | x - / - / 3718 x - / - / 792 | x - / - / 2 x - / - / 516 | x - / 17000 / 75416 x - / 7500 / 5977 | | | | | x - / - / 1022 3100 / 3100 / 1759 - / - / 4 | x - / 38000 / 111784 x - / 12800 / 17529 | x - / 13000 / 34538 x - / 5700 / 7073 | 6440 / 0 / derog x x x | x 1500 / 1500 / 1427 x x | Mediterranean Indian AtlanticNE ICCAT |
| Greece | | | | | | | | | | | | | Mediterranean |
| Ireland | | | | | 300 / 300 / 30 | | | 420 / 1000 / 1057 | | | | | Atlantic NE |
| Italy | | | | 82 / 160 / 108 | | | | 4348 / 1600 / 278 | | | 3802 / 3800 / 2615 | 7631 / 4000 / 4994 | Mediterranean |
| Malta | | | | | | | | | | | 250 / 1000 / 77 | 250 / 1000 / 665 | Mediterranean |
| Portugal | | | 1115 / 1094 / 198 45 / 15 / 30 x | - / 240 / 107 x x | | | | 30 / 167 / 1 100 / 240 / 132 x | 7 / 6 / 0 x x | 1783 / 1029 / 2460 840 / 1200 / 1664 x | 4 / 4 / 0 x x | 10 / 10 / 96 90 / 600 / 155 200 / 200 / 5728 | CECAF ICES Mainland |
| Spain | x 25 / 50 / 62 x | x <100 / 50 / 83 x | 36339 / 36340 / 158353 x 81295 / 81295 / 182672 | x 25 / 50 / 110 x | 295 / 295 / 300 x 149 / 150 / 158 | 5693 / 5695 / 2599 x 1300 / 1300 / 677 | | 25864 / 25865 / 26536 x 71381 / 71380 / 51024 | 9917 / 9915 / 44320 x 9840 / 9840 / 16293 | 2718 / 2720 / 2748 2650 / 2650 / 3239 193 / 195 / 67 | 9889 / 9890 / 10090 816 / 815 / 1131 10110 / 10110 / 10255 | Atlantic NE Mediterranean Other | |
| AGE | Required / | Planned / | Achieved | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyprus | | | | | | | | x 215 / 215 / 250 | | | - / 150 / 215 115 / 115 / 10 | x 50 / 100 / 100 | Medit (farmed) Medit (landings) |
| France | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greece | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ireland | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Italy | | | | 60 / 100 / 108 | | | | 4348 / 1000 / 188 | | | 3802 / 1000 / 261 | 7631 / 1500 / 363 | Mediterranean |
| Malta | | | | | | | | | | | 84 / 250 / 60 | 84 / 250 / 215 | Mediterranean |
| Portugal | | | NR | NR | | | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | NR | |
| Spain | NA | NA | NA | NA | | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | |
| SEX RATIO | Achieved | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyprus | | | | | | | | x 210 | | | x 8 | x 75 | Medit (farmed) Medit (landings) |
| France | | | | | | | | | x 788 x x | x 56 x x | | | Mediterranean Indian Atlantic NE ICCAT |
| Greece | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ireland | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Italy | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Malta | | | | | | | | | | | 52 | 105 | Mediterranean |
| Portugal | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spain | | | | | | | | x 110 x | | | 24 226 x | 601 431 500 | Atlantic Mediterranean Other |
| MATURITY | Achieved | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyprus | | | | | | | | x 210 | | | x 8 | x 75 | Medit (farmed) Medit (landings) |
| France | | | | | | | | | x 788 x x | x 56 x x | | | Mediterranean Indian Atlantic NE ICCAT |
| Greece | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ireland | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Italy | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Malta | | | | | | | | | | | 52 | 105 | Mediterranean |
| Portugal | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spain | | | | | | | | x 110 x | | | x 218 x | 603 300 500 | Atlantic Mediterranean Other |

**ANNEX B. ADDENDUM EVALUATION OF UK TECHNICAL
REPORT 2007**

**ADDENDUM TO THE
REPORT OF
THE SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC
COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF)
WORKING GROUP ON RESEARCH NEEDS (SGRN)
EVALUATION OF 2007 NATIONAL DATA COLLECTION PROGRAMS
UNDERTAKEN UNDER COMMISSION REGULATION
(EC) NO 1639/2001**

Brussels 3 -7 November, 2008

BACKGROUND

The **Technical Report 2007 for UK** was sent out of delay and could not be assessed during the SGRN 08-02 meeting. The STECF plenary meeting held in Brussels from 3 to 7 November 2008 allocated time and expertise to analyse the report and the outcome (section 2) was reviewed and accepted in plenary session.

Terms of Reference:

The STECF is requested to deliver its opinion on this report.

1. Evaluation of 2007 TR's. The advice should consider at least the measures taken by each MS, the appropriateness of the methods used and the results achieved as regards data collection and data uses. The aim is to deliver a critique scientific review of the situation by evaluating what MSs had proposed in their National Programmes for 2007 and what they have finally achieved. Evaluation of the achievements should consider the international obligations of the EU in regards to the Regional Fisheries Organizations, the transmission and the uses of the data and the quality aspects. ICES will provide tables on data flow to illustrate the discussion. (These tables have been provided to SGRN group and are available in DG MARE in case of need).
2. Pilot studies: State of play and missing reports

For the 19 MS having provided a TR 2007, the update of the overview table on the overall quality of the technical reports is as follows :

| | NA | Yes | Mostly | Partly | No |
|---|----|-----------|-----------|--------|----|
| Compliance with the Guidelines | | 11 | 7 | 1 | |
| All necessary tables present in the report | | 18 | | 1 | |
| All necessary information present in the report | | 4 | 13 | 2 | |
| Individualisation of RCM regions | 6 | 11 | | 1 | 1 |

Country: UK

a. General comments

| | |
|---|--------|
| Did Technical Report comply with DG MARE/ STECF-GRN Guidelines? | Mostly |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary standard tables? | Yes |
| Did Technical Report have <u>all</u> the necessary information to allow DG Fish / STECF-GRN to evaluate the achievements of the MS 2007 National Program? | Mostly |
| Are actions by RCM regions sufficiently well individualised ? | No |

General SGRN comments on MS's technical report: MS does not identify the RCM regions neither in the text nor in the tables, except for the surveys. STECF urges MS to conform with the naming of the surveys given in the DCR, and also make sure that the naming used for the fishing activities sampled on-board in the NP proposal matches the naming in the TR.

Information on number of samples achieved for sex-ratio and fecundity were missing.

b. Comments by section of the Technical report

| SECTION 3 : PRECISION LEVEL | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|---|---|-------------------|-----|-------------|
| 3.1 | Are precision levels provided for <u>all</u> parameters ? | Yes | | 279 |
| 3.2 | Are methods sufficiently well explained or referenced? | Mostly | | |
| 3.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| SECTION 4 : DATA TRANSMISSION | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| 4.1 | Were <u>all</u> data transmitted to international expert groups ? | Yes | | |
| 4.2 | Are reasons for non transmitting the data acceptable ? | NA | | |
| 4.3 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | | |
| SECTION 5 : MODULE C - FISHING CAPACITIES | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 5.1, 5.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Yes | Yes | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | Yes | |
| 5.2, 5.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NMS | NMS | |
| 5.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | NMS |
| SECTION 6 : MODULE D - FISHING EFFORT | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |

²⁷⁹ Precision levels 2 and 3 are given for the modules C and D, where data is collected exhaustively. This potential error, added to precision levels stated as achieved with no or very poor sampling intensity in Module H (see footnote 16), question the validity of all the precision provided. MS should resubmit appropriate precision levels given in the different tables of the TR.

| | | MP | EP | |
|---|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| 6.1, 6.3 | Were DCR targets met | | | |
| | (i) for fuel consumption ? | Yes | | |
| | (ii) for fishing effort by type of technique ? | Yes | \ | 280 |
| | (iii) for specific fishing effort ? | Yes | \ | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | \ | |
| 6.2, 6.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | \ | |
| 6.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| SECTION 7 : MODULE E - CATCHES AND LANDINGS | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 7.1, 7.3 | Were DCR targets met ? | Yes | \ | |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Yes | \ | |
| 7.2, 7.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | \ | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NMS | | |
| Discards | | | | |
| 7.5 | Were DCR targets met ? | Mostly | \ | 281 |
| | Did data collection include vessels < 10 m? | Partly | \ | 282 |
| 7.6 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Mostly | \ | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | 283 |
| Recreational and game fisheries | | | | |
| 7.7, 7.9 | Were DCR targets met ? | No | \ | 284 |
| 7.8, 7.10 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | \ | |
| 7.11 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | | | |
| SECTION 8 : MODULE F – CATCHES PER UNIT EFFORT | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 8.1, 8.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Mostly | \ | 285 |
| 8.2, 8.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | \ | |
| 8.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |

²⁸⁰ Information on vessels activity is exhaustive for > 10 m vessels, apart from "the known problems of assessing the fishing effort related to fixed gear modes of activity"; More clarification is needed to evaluate the potential shortfall.

²⁸¹ There is no matching between the name of "fleet segment métier" in Table 5.3 of the UK NP Proposal and Table 7.1 of the Technical Report. In the NP proposal a total of 22 fleet segments were considered in the discards sampling planning, while the Technical Report includes only 18. To be clarified by MS.

²⁸² There was sampling of <10m vessels only by Scotland in 2007.

²⁸³ STECF acknowledges the effort made by MS in restoring full cooperation with fishing industry for on-board observation and improving access to Northern Ireland ports for sampling.

²⁸⁴ Countryside Commission for Wales (CCW) initiated a pilot project in 2007/2008 to determine angling activity and cod catch around the coast of Wales (Irish Sea). As the CCW study commenced after the March 2007 DCR deadline it was not possible to provide the Commission with any results by this date. STECF recalls MS that the report on the 2006 cod pilot study is still missing.

²⁸⁵ Three fleets for collection of CPUE (English seiners, North Sea for cod, haddock and whiting) are listed in the NP proposal but omitted in the TR without any explanation. To be clarified by MS.

| SECTION 9 : MODULE G – SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION SURVEYS | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
|--|--|-------------------|------------|-------------|
| | | Priority 1 | Priority 2 | |
| 9.1, 9.3 | Were DCR targets met ? | | | 286 |
| | North Sea area - MP | | | |
| | IBTS 1st quarter (English International Bottom Trawl) | Yes | \ | |
| | IBTS 1st quarter (Scottish International Bottom Trawl) | Yes | \ | |
| | IBTS 3rd quarter (English International Bottom Trawl) | Yes | \ | |
| | IBTS 3rd quarter (Scottish International Bottom Trawl) | Yes | \ | |
| | Atlanto-Scandian Herring Survey | Yes | \ | |
| | NS Herring Acoustic Survey | Yes | \ | |
| | BTS IVb; IVc; VIId; 3rd Q (English Beam Trawl Survey) | Yes | \ | |
| | Demersal Young Fish Survey | Yes | \ | 287 |
| | North-East Atlantic - MP | | | |
| | Western IBTS 4th quarter (English Western IBTS) | Mostly | \ | 288 |
| | ISBCBTS 3rd quarter | Yes | \ | |
| | Western IBTS 4th quarter (Scottish Western IBTS) | Yes | \ | |
| | Spawning/pre-spawning Herring Acoustic Survey VIa | Yes | \ | |
| | Spawning/pre-spawning Herring Acoustic Survey VIIa | Yes | \ | |
| | Scottish West Coast Young Fish Survey | Yes | \ | |
| | International Blue Whiting Survey | Yes | \ | |
| | North Sea - EP | | | |
| | Nephrops TV Survey (Inshore) | \ | Yes | |
| | Nephrops TV Survey (Offshore) | \ | Yes | |
| | North East Atlantic - EP | | | |
| | Nephrops TV Survey (Offshore) | \ | Yes | 289 |
| | Nephrops TV Survey Sea Lochs | \ | Yes | |
| | WCBTS; VIIe; 4th Q (Western Channel Beam Trawl) | \ | Yes | |
| | Dard Groundfish 1 st Quarter | \ | Mostly | 290 |
| | Dard Groundfish 4 th Quarter | \ | Mostly | |
| | Dard Herring Larvae | \ | Yes | 291 |
| | Dard Mik-net | \ | Yes | 292 |
| | Dard Nephrops | \ | Yes | 293 |

²⁸⁶. The name of the surveys should be consistent with the official name in the DCR and consistent between NP proposal and TR. Moreover, surveys should be listed in the same order in the NP and in TR. This recommendation has already been made by SGRN in July 2007.

Spawning/pre-spawning herring acoustic survey (DARD) had 150 hauls planned in the NP but 119 in the TR.

²⁸⁷ Demersal Young Fish Survey (English Demersal Young Fish Survey): in the NP, 82 hauls were planned while 161 were reported as planned in the TR.

²⁸⁸ Poor weather conditions prevented the survey to be conducted as planned.

²⁸⁹ Nephrops TV survey (Offshore) was planned in the 2th Quarter but it has been conducted in the 3th Quarter. This is maybe an error and should be clarified by MS.

²⁹⁰ Poor weather conditions prevented both surveys to be conducted as planned. Dard groundfish had 61 hauls planned in the NP but 60 in the TR.

²⁹¹ Planned number of hauls do not match between NP proposal (62) and TR (65).

²⁹² . Planned number of hauls do not match between NP proposal (118) and TR (212).

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|-----|-------------|
| | Dard Nephrops | \ | Yes | |
| | Scottish Deepwater Survey | \ | Yes | |
| 9.2, 9.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | Yes | |
| 9.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| SECTION 10 : MODULE H – LENGTH AND AGE SAMPLING | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Landings | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Mostly | \ | 294 |
| | Were national targets met ? | Mostly | \ | 295 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Mostly | \ | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | 296 |
| Discards | | | | |
| 10.1, 10.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Mostly | \ | 297 |
| 10.2, 10.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Mostly | \ | |
| 10.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Mostly | | |
| SECTION 11 : MODULE I – OTHER BIOLOGICAL SAMPLING | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| Growth | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Mostly | \ | 298 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | \ | 299 |

²⁹³ Dard nephrops is presented as two surveys (one for each quarter) in the TR but as one entry in the NP proposal.

²⁹⁴ *Mullus surmuletus* should have been sampled for length as planned in the NP proposal 2007. *Pleuronectes platessa* in area IV should have been sampled for length and age based on TAC share, and the discrepancy between quota and landings share should be addressed.

Gadus morhua Vb under recovery plan was not sampled for length nor for age although it is stated that precision level 2 has been achieved. Same for *Melanogrammus aeglefinus* in area Vb.

STECF is doubtful that a precision level 2 can be achieved for *Gadus morhua* VIb with 163 individuals for length and 475 for age. This point should be clarified by MS.

²⁹⁵ STECF appreciates that MS has often planned much more samples than required in order to achieve precision targets or to provide a realistic sampling intensity. Despite the doubts expressed in footnote 1, STECF trusts that those stocks, where precision levels have been achieved, are not considered as under sampled even if the planned number of samples is not achieved. Taking this into account, 15 stocks out of 65 were under sampled for length and 10 stocks out of 47 were under sampled for age. 6 of these under sampled stocks have an explanation in the text of the TR, which means that 9 are missing. Missing information and clarification to be provided by MS.

²⁹⁶ Sections on actions to remedy shortfalls are missing.

²⁹⁷ There are few otoliths taken on the discards fraction in some fisheries. To be clarified by MS.

²⁹⁸ Numbers for length-at-age given in Table 11.2 do not match with numbers given under ‘age sampling’ (achieved) in Table 10.1. To be clarified by MS.

There are double entries (*Mullus surmuletus*, *Scophthalmus rhombus*, *Anarhichus lupus*, *Scophthalmus rhombus*, *Sprattus sprattus*, *Micromesistius poutassou* in Sub-areas IV and VI/VIa) in Table 11.1.

²⁹⁹ STECF notes that most of the stocks were sampled where MS asked for derogation based on the share in EU landings (not in compliance with DCR rule based on TAC share, thus derogation not accepted by SGRN). See footnote 16.

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|----|-------------|
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Sex ratios | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were DCR targets met? | ? | \ | 300 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | No | \ | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| Sexual maturity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Yes | \ | |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | NA | \ | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | NA | | |
| Fecundity | | | | |
| 11.1, 11.3 | Were DCR targets met? | ? | \ | 301 |
| 11.2, 11.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | ? | \ | |
| 11.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | ? | | |
| SECTION 12 : MODULE J – ECONOMIC DATA BY GROUP OF VESSELS | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 12.1, 12.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Mostly | \ | 302 |
| 12.2, 12.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Mostly | \ | |
| 12.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | No | | |
| SECTION 13 : MODULE K – PROCESSING INDUSTRY | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |
| | | MP | EP | |
| 13.1, 13.3 | Were DCR targets met? | Partly | \ | 303 |
| 13.2, 13.4 | Are deviations from aim sufficiently well explained? | Yes | \ | |
| 13.5 | Are suggested actions to remedy shortfalls acceptable? | Yes | | |
| SECTION 14 : DATABASES | | SGRN appreciation | | See comment |

Pleuronectes platessa in Sub-area IV were not aged (inconsistency with Table 11.1), derogation based on share in EU landings was not accepted (see SGRN Report on Eval. of NPs 2007). MS shall clarify deviation from aim.

³⁰⁰ The column ‘Nos. achieved’ in Table 11.2 is mostly empty. Missing information to be provided by MS.

³⁰¹ MS shall include the numbers of *Scomber scombrus* sampled for fecundity on the triennial Mackerel/ Horse mackerel egg survey.

³⁰² Almost no information has been provided on sampling methodology or data collection/estimation.

All responses are made on a voluntary basis and samples are therefore non-random. As a result, the data collected may not be representative. STECF understands that the MS employs a methodology to attempt to correct for sample bias but no details are provided in the TR. In addition, there are rather low response rates for some segments/variables. The explanation for this and the proposed way in which the problem can be addressed is rather vague. To be clarified by MS.

The variable “capital cost” appears to have been collected from company accounts (as bank interest payments?) rather than imputed from an estimate of capital value. The MS is urged to follow the definitions provided on the JRC website.

³⁰³ The MS has only partially fulfilled the requirements of Module K by relying on existing surveys undertaken by the UK Office of National Statistics. The MS indicates that it intends to adapt existing surveys in order to meet DCR objectives in future years.

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|----------------|
| 14.1 | Are databases sufficiently well described? | Yes | |
| 14.2 | Other relevant issues raised by MS | | |
| SECTION 15 : NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CO-ORDINATION | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| 15.1 | Is there sufficient information on national co-ordination? | Yes | |
| 15.2 | Is the participation ensured to the important international meetings and workshops? | Yes | |
| 15.3 | Are the RCM recommendations well followed through? | Yes | |
| 15.4 | Are the SGRN recommendations well followed through? | Yes | |
| SECTION 17 : COMMENTS, SUGGESTIONS AND REFLECTIONS | | SGRN appreciation | See comment |
| | Is there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections ? | None | ³⁰⁴ |

³⁰⁴ A comment is made for SGRN consideration in section 3.3. STECF agrees with MS statement that the precision estimates should not be based on the results from a single country but on the best stock estimate from a number of countries combined. This has been made clear in the provisions on the new DCR. Also the statement that the current system where all countries exceeding the 10% threshold have to sample to precision level 3 is excessively expensive and inefficient, has been addressed with the new DCR starting in January 2009.

ANNEX C. EXPERT DECLARATIONS

Declarations of invited experts are published on the STECF web site on <https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home> together with the final report.

European Commission

EUR 23631 EN – Joint Research Centre – Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Title: Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries. Report of Working Group on research needs (SGRN). Evaluation of 2007 national data collection programs undertaken under Commission Regulation (EC) no 1639/2001.

Author(s): Vigneau J., Adamidou A., Armesto A., Arneri E., Bell M., Berkenhagen J., Cardinale M., Charilaou C., Collet I., Degel H., Di Natale A., Ebeling M., Grzebielec R., Gustavson T., Hatcher A., Heessen H., Kornilovs G., Maertens B., Morgado C., Moura O., Ní Chonchúir G., Statkus R. & Ulleweit J.

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

2008 – 151 pp. – 21 x 29.7 cm

EUR – Scientific and Technical Research series – ISSN 1018-5593

ISBN 978-92-79-10867-9

DOI 10.2788/32806

Abstract

SGRN-08-02 was held on 30 June to 5 July 2008 in Ispra (Italy). The meeting focussed on the evaluation of 2007 national data collection programs undertaken under Commission Regulation (EC) no 1639/2001. The evaluation of the UK collection program was undertaken during the STECF November 2008 plenary meeting (Addendum to this report). STECF reviewed the report of the SGRN-08-02 Working Group during its plenary meeting on 3-7 November 2008.

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.

The mission of the JRC is to provide customer-driven scientific and technical support for the conception, development, implementation and monitoring of EU policies. As a service of the European Commission, the JRC functions as a reference centre of science and technology for the Union. Close to the policy-making process, it serves the common interest of the Member States, while being independent of special interests, whether private or national.

LB-NA-23631-EN-C

