

EU Council Regulation 199/2008

Establishing a Community framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector for scientific advice regarding the CFP

Report of the 5th Liaison Meeting between the Chairs of the RCMs, the chair of ICES PGCCDBS, the chair of PGMED, the ICES representative, the Chair of SGRN and the European Commission

Brussels, 26-27 February 2009

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

The Liaison meeting was held in the premises of the DG Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Brussels from 26-27 February 2009.

The new EU Data Collection Regulation (EU Council Regulation 199/2008) is establishing a community framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector for scientific advice regarding the CFP. According to this regulation and without prejudice to their current data collection obligations under Community law, Member States (MS) shall collect primary biological, technical, environmental and socio economic data within the framework of a multi-annual national programme drawn up in accordance with the Community programme. According to EC Regulation 665/2008, laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) 199/2008, and its technical Decision 2008/949/EC specifying practical aspects for data collection, actions planned by MS in their national programme shall be presented according to the following regions:

- the Baltic Sea (ICES areas III b-d),
- the North Sea (ICES areas IIIa, IV and VIId) and the Eastern Arctic (ICES areas I and II),
- the North Atlantic (ICES areas V-XIV and NAFO areas),
- the Mediterranean Sea and the Black Sea,
- regions where fisheries are operated by Community vessels and managed by Regional Fisheries Management Organisation's (RFMO) to which the Community is contracting party or observer.

Regional co-ordination greatly increases the efficiency, effectiveness and integration of the various DCR National Programmes (NPs). Regional Coordinating Meetings (RCMs) are held annually and involve National Correspondents and both biologists and economists from each MS involved in the DCR programme. The key objectives of the RCMs are to identify areas for standardisation, collaboration and co-operation between MS. A Liaison Meeting (LM) between the chair of SGRN, the chairs of the different RCM, the Chair of the PGCCDBS, the chair of PGMED, ICES and the Commission is being held annually to analyse the RCM reports in order to ensure overall co-ordination between the RCMs. On the basis of the reports, the LM makes recommendations to the Commission.

The 2nd Liaison Meeting (2006) has identified the following areas where it can contribute to the effectiveness of data collection and co-ordination within the framework of the Data Collection Regulation (DCR):

- Make sure that the Regional Co-ordination Meetings (RCMs) move into the same direction.
- Address recommendations made by the RCMs and comment on these / modify them when considered appropriate / necessary.
- Identify issues, developments etc. that are of a pan-European interest and propose actions to be undertaken at the appropriate level (Member States, bilateral, regional or international level)

1.2. RCM Reports discussed at the 5th Liaison Meeting

During its meeting in February 2009, the LM discussed the following RCM Reports:

- RCM Baltic Sea (RCM Baltic): Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for Baltic sea, Hamburg, Germany, 1-5 Dec 2008.
- RCM North Sea & East Arctic, (RCM NS&EA): Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for the North Sea & East Arctic, Aberdeen, Scotland/UK, 17-21 Nov 2008.
- RCM North Atlantic (RCM NEA): Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for North East Atlantic area, York, UK, 8-12 December 2008.
- RCM Mediterranean and Black Sea (RCM Med&BS): Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for the Mediterranean and Black Sea area, Sète, France, 24-28 November 2008

1.3. Participants

Name	Country/Organisation	Function
Hans Lassen	ICES	ICES representative
Paolo Carpentieri	Italy	Chair of PGMED
Antonio Cervantes	EU Commission	EU Commission
Paul Connolly	Ireland	Chair of STECF/SGRN
Christian Dintheer	France	Chair of the RCM NA and chair of RCM Mediterranean
Jukka Pönni	Finland	Future chair of RCM Baltic
Katja Ringdahl	Sweden	Chair of the RCM Baltic
Evelina Sabatela	Italy	Chair of STECF/SGECA
Christoph Stransky	Germany	Chair of the ICES PGCCDBS and chair of RCM NS&EA
Sieto Verver	The Netherlands	Future chair of RCM NS&EA
Joël Vigneau (chair)	France	Future chair of RCM NA

1.4. Terms of reference

Overview of the main recommendations and outputs of the different RCM held in 2007, with a particular attention to the following aspects:

1. Overview of the main recommendations and outputs of the different RCM held in 2008, with a particular attention to the aspects linked to
 - a) the optimisation of the sampling programmes (merging metiers, regional cooperation and coordination between countries at RCM scale, regional sampling design,...)
 - b) the practical implementation of the DCR (ranking system, concurrent sampling, collection of effort variables, ecosystem variables, economic variables...)
2. Data Quality assurance. Role defined for each parties (RFMOs/Advisory Bodies, PGCCDBS/PGMED, SGRN and JRC) and current developments.

- a) Reflection on the ongoing initiatives (common exchange format for the information that is vital to the quality evaluation system, meta database, regional database, RFMO/ Advisory Body databases, development, dissemination and maintenance of COST, outcomes of WKACCU,)
 - b) Regional protocols for the collection of biological and economic data.
 - c) Category 11 stocks (discussion on data availability).
3. Strengthening of the role of RCMs in the framework of the new DCR; definition of precise ToRs.
 4. Future workshops.
 5. Studies in support of the CFP: Balance and prospects (2009-2010)

2. Overview of the main recommendations and outputs of the different RCM held in 2008,

2.1. RCM organisational aspects

To make sure that communication between RCMs, LM, SGRN, ICES benchmarkworkshops and the European Commission is most effective, the LM reviewed the timing for the relevant meetings from 2009 onwards, and proposed some modifications:

Meeting	OLD DCR				NEW DCF																							
	2008				2009												2010											
	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
MS Submission NP																												
RCM																												
ICES Benchmarks																												
SGRN Review of NP																												
Liaison Meeting																												
STECF Plenary																												
SGRN Review of TR																												
MS ADJUSTMENT OF NP																												
MS Submission TR																												
MS Cost Statements																												
PGCCDBS, PGMED																												
Research Survey Review																												
NP + TR Guidelines																												
NP Review Procedure																												
TR Review Procedure																												

Figure 1 : Time schedule for meetings of direct or indirect relevance to the DCF.

- 31st May 2009 : Submission by MS of the 2008 TR.
- June 2009 : **LM suggests to convene a dedicated SGRN meeting in early June for the review of the guidelines for NP proposals and elaborating the guidelines for TR.** This meeting should be before the permanent SGRN meeting on the review of the 2008 TR (end of June). The supplementary SGRN meeting should also reflect on the internal procedure to apply when evaluating the NP proposals and TR in close relation to the guidelines.
- April to October 2009 : Time window for MS to review the NP proposal 2010.
- September-October 2009 : All RCMs to take place, with particular objective of coordinating the regional actions 2010, but also find agreements preliminary to the drafting of the next NP proposals 2011-2013 (see section 4).

- December 2009 : **LM suggests to hold the next Liaison meeting exceptionally during the SGRN meeting**, to take advantage of the appropriate timing and on the fact that the SGRN meeting will not have to evaluate the full set of NP proposals but only their revisions by MS.
- January 2010 : SGRN meeting on the Research Survey review (recommended by SGRN February 2009 meeting).
- 1st Quarter 2010 : ICES benchmark meetings.
- 31st March 2010 : Submission of NP proposal 2011-2013. When drafting their NP proposals, MS should take into consideration the outcomes of the SGRN December 2009, including the recommendations by the 6th LM, the outcomes of the SGRN review of the eligible surveys and the outcomes of the ICES benchmark workshops. Given that the list of eligible surveys is an appendix of the Commission Decision 2008/949, the official list, taking into account the SGRN review of surveys, the review by STECF and the approval by the Commission, will only be available after the deadline for the NP proposals submission. Nevertheless, **LM was of the opinion that the outcomes of the SGRN review of surveys would be a good basis for the NP proposal submission, even if some adjustments have to be done after STECF and Commission approvals.**
- April 2010 : SGRN review of NP proposals 2011-2013, to report for April STECF plenary.
- 31st May 2010 : Submission by MS of the 2009 TR

LM endorsed the recommendation by RCM NA to shift the coordination of the NAFO areas and ICES sub-area XII, XIV and Division Va within the RCM NS&EA..

The participation of economists to the RCMs remained an issue in 2008. The previous LM proposed a solution that has not been followed through. As a consequence, the RCMs have proposed alternative solutions to address this issue. LM has taken into consideration the RCM proposals and the difficulties for economists to attend all RCMs and **LM recommends that participation of economists from all MS should be ensured at the supra-region level**, i.e. All Med&BS Member States in RCM Med&BS and all Atlantic Member States in RCM NA or RCM NS&EA or RCM Baltic. In the latter case, the rationale should be the attendance of all economists during the first RCM on the agenda, and then the attendance of one or two economists in the other RCMs to present the outcomes of the full RCM and ensure the linkage with the biologists.

Agreements on fishing grounds

RCM	Name of fishing ground	Location
Baltic	Western Baltic	ICES Subdivision 22-24
	Eastern Baltic	ICES Subdivision 25-32
North Sea & Eastern Arctic	Skagerrak and Kattegat	ICES Division IIIa
	Eastern Arctic	ICES Sub-areas I and II
	North Sea and Eastern Channel	ICES Sub-area IV and Division VIIId
North Atlantic	Western Channel	ICES Division VIIe
	Bay of Biscay	ICES Divisions VIIIabde
	Celtic Sea	ICES Divisions VIIfgh
	Irish Sea	ICES Division VIIa
	Faeroe Islands	ICES Division Vb
	Western Scotland	ICES Sub-area VI
	Western Ireland	ICES Divisions VIIbcjk
	Iberian	ICES Sub-area IX and Division VIIIc
	Area XII, XIV, Va	ICES Sub-area XII, XIV and Division Va
	Azores	ICES Sub-area X
	NAFO	NAFO areas
Mediterranean and Black Sea	Northern Alboran Sea	GSA01

	Azov Sea	GSA30

Agreements on métiers at level 6

The RCMs have agreed on the mesh size range to use for reporting data per métier at level 6, in relation to the relevant technical Regulation as specified in the DCF. For the Mediterranean the table presented in the RCM report was a first attempt which has been further revised during the PGMed. The final agreements are recalled below:

RCM Baltic

		Mesh size ranges (in mm)					
Towed gear	22-23 (_SPF_)		16-31	32-89		_>=105_1_110	
	24-27 (_SPF_)		16-31	32-104		_>=105_1_110	
	28-32 (_SPF_)		16-104			_>=105_1_110	
	22-23 (_DEF_)				90-104	_>=105_1_110	
	22-32 (_DEF_)	<16				>=105_1_110	
Fixed gear	22-27 (_SPF_)			32_109		110-156	>=157
	28-32 (_SPF_)		16-109			110-156	>=157
	22-23 (_DEF_)				90-109	110-156	>=157
	All region (_DEF_)					110-156	>=157
	All region (_ANA_)						>=157

RCM North Sea & Eastern Arctic

		Mesh size ranges (in mm)					
Towed gear	Skagerrak and Kattegat	<16	16-31	32-69	70-89	90-119	>=120
	Eastern Arctic, North Sea and Eastern Channel	<16	16-31	32-69	70-99	100-119	>=120
Fixed gear	Entire Region	10-30	50-70	90-99	100-119	120-219	>=220

RCM North Atlantic

		Mesh size ranges (in mm)					
Towed gear	V, VI & VII	<16	16-31	32-69	70-99	100-119	>=120
	VIII & IXb		16-31	32-54	55-69	>=70	
	Area IXa			40-54	>=55		
	Area X		20-39	40-64	>=65		
	NAFO	40	60	90	100	130	280
Fixed gear	V, VI & VII	10-30	50-70	90-99	100-119	120-219	>=220
	VIII & IXb	<40	40-49	50-59	60-79	80-99	>=100
	Area IXa	<40	40-49	50-59	60-79	80-99	>=100

RCM Mediterranean & Black Sea

Metier coding	Metier naming
DRB_MOL_0_0_0	Boat dredge for molluscs
OTB_DES_>=40_0_0	Bottom otter trawl for demersal species
OTB_DWS_>=40_0_0	Bottom otter trawl for deep water species
OTB_MDD_>=40_0_0	Bottom otter trawl for mixed and demersal deep water species
TBB_DES_0_0_0	Beam trawl for demersal fish
OTM_MPD_13-19_0_0	Midwater otter trawl for mixed demersal and pelagic species (Black sea region) according meshsize regulation
OTM_MPD_>=20_0_0	Midwater otter trawl for mixed demersal and pelagic species (Mediterranean region) according meshsize regulation
PTM_SPF_>=20_0_0	Pelagic pair trawl for small pelagic species
LHP-LHM_FIF_0_0_0	Hand and pole lines for finfish
LHP-LHM_CEP_0_0_0	Hand and pole lines for cephalopods
LTL_LPF_0_0_0	Trolling lines for large pelagics
LLD_LPF_0_0_0	Drifting longlines for large pelagics
LLS_DEF_0_0_0	set longlines for demersal fish
FPO_DES_0_0_0	Pots and traps for demersal species
FYK_CAT_0_0_0	Fyke nets for eels
FYK_DES_0_0_0	Fyke nets for demersal species
FPN_LPF_0_0_0	Stationary uncovered pound nets for large pelagic fish
GTR_DES_>=16_0_0	Set trammel nets for demersal species according meshsize regulation
GNS_SLP_>=16_0_0	Set gillnets for small and large pelagics according meshsize regulation
GNS_DEF_360-400_0_0 *	Set gillnets for demersal fish (turbot Black sea)
GNS_DEF_>=16_0_0 *	Set gillnets for demersal fish according meshsize regulation
GND_SPF_0_0_0	Driftnets for small pelagics
GND_DEF_0_0_0	Driftnets for demersal fish
PS_SPF_>=14_0_0	Purse seine for small pelagics according meshsize regulation
PS_LPF_0_0_0	Purse seine for large pelagics
LA_SLP_>=14_0_0	Lampara nets according meshsize regulation
SB-SV_DES_0_0_0	Beach and boat seines for demersal species
MIS	Miscellaenous metiers (defined at national level)

* in the Commission Decision (EC) 2008/949, it is made reference to Demersal species (DES), although it should be Demersal fish (DEF).

Additional métiers to be considered by all Mediterranean and Black Sea Member States for reporting and by STECF and the European Commission for further inclusion in the matrix.

Metier coding	Metier naming
HMD_MOL_0_0_0	Mechanised dredging for molluscs
SB-SV_SPF_0_0_0	Beach and boat seines for small pelagics

Topic : Geographic scope of the RCM NA Region			
RCM NA	Because the coordination of sampling the fishing activities from Eastern Arctic (ICES sub-areas I & II), NAFO areas and ICES sub-area XII, XIV and Division Va, involves the same expertise, the RCM-NA recommends to shift the coordination of the NAFO areas and ICES sub-area XII, XIV and Division Va within the RCM NS&EA.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Review the mandates of the RCM.	2009	European Commission
LM comment	LM endorses the recommendation and notes that the names of RCM NA and RCM NS&EA should reflect the move.		

Topic : Description of métiers			
RCM NS&EA RCM Baltic RCM NA RCM Med&BS	In the NP proposals, a short description of all métiers selected by the 90% ranking procedure should be provided. Such a table would enable RCM to identify whether a métier with the same name covers the same or different fisheries in different NPs.		
RCM NA	Moreover, the RCM-NA recommends MS to investigate on the mesh size ranges actually used in their fisheries and describes more precisely the métiers operating with bottom trawls with the objectives of defining possible common métiers at the national level (level 7).		
RCM Med&BS	Moreover, the RCM-Med&BS recommends MS to investigate on the mesh size or gear sizes ranges actually used in their fisheries, especially for nets and hooks, and to provide information during the next PGMed meeting, for a possible agreement of size ranges at level 6.		
<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>		<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
Adjust SGRN Guidelines for the submission of NP proposals. All MS to propose description of their métiers for the next RCM.		2009	Member States
LM comment	LM stresses the importance of this recommendation, particularly in light of the strengthened role given to RCM (see section 4). In the LM view, the description of metiers at the national level and/or before merging should include the name of the main species targeted, the precise fishing areas (inshore, offshore, shelf, slope, ...) and the main characteristics of the vessels.		

Topic : Planning of tasks requiring expertise	
RCM NA	The RCM-NA points out that any topic or work has to be clearly planned in ToRs or in the agenda before the meeting and with agreements of the Chair and the EC, in order to provide needed relevant expertise in the meeting
LM comment	LM agrees with this recommendation originating from additional task given to the RCM during the course of the meeting.

Topic : Status of tagging actions for large pelagics under DCR			
RCM Med&BS	Considering that all data available for stock assessment for large pelagics derive from commercial data and tagging and the need to precise the status of tagging operations under the new DCR, the RCM-Med&BS recommends the creation of a steering committee, which will elaborate the data collected during the implementation of the tagging programmes for the triennial period 2005-2007 and produce a final document with a full analysis of the results and proposed follow up.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Final document compiling PGTT conclusions to be reviewed by the next RCM-Med&BS, for proposing future issues	Autumn 2009, before next RCM-Med&BS venue	PGTT experts
LM comment	LM supports the recommendation to produce a full synthesis of previous tagging activities. However, as tagging is not in the provisions of the DCF, the creation of a steering committee cannot come under the DCF		

Topic : Participation of economists in RCM			
RCM NS&EA	The RCM NS&EA considers that it may not be necessary for the involvement of economists in every RCM meeting, but that if there are specific issues that require their involvement it would be best to involve the full range of Member States rather than a small group to ensure a wide range of opinions may be represented. Furthermore, the RCM NS&EA recommends that a joint economists meeting for the NS&EA and Baltic Regions be considered by the Chairs of the two RCMs involved and also at the next RCM Liaison meeting.		
RCM Med&BS	Considering the tasks that should be addressed by economists in RCM, that SGECA and RCM are complementary bodies with different tasks sharing, and that economics is a mandatory part of the NP, the RCM-Med&BS recommends the attendance of economists from all the MS in future meetings of the RCM MED&BS and that MS should ensure the attendance of their national economists.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Consideration by other RCMs and STECF-SGECA	Early 2009	STEC/SGECA, Member States

LM comment	<p>The 4th LM already commented on the difficulty to involve economists from all MS into all RCMs and recommended STECF/SGECA to name focal economists in all RCMs. This recommendation has not been echoed, and thus the issue has remained unchanged. The recommendations made here by both RCMs are different but not incompatible. In an attempt to reconcile all ideas developed so far, LM recommends that participation of economists from all MS should be ensured at the supra-region level, i.e. All Med&BS MS in RCM Med&BS and all Atlantic MS in RCM NA or RCM NS&EA or RCM Baltic. In the latter case, the rationale should be the attendance of all economists during the first RCM on the agenda, and then the attendance of one or two economists in the other RCMs to present the outcomes of the first RCM and ensure the linkage with the biologists.</p>
------------	--

Topic : procedure for decisions on task-sharing			
RCM NS&EA	<p>In order to improve the quality of the harmonisation process and the consistency in decision making, protocols should be established describing the evaluation process and quality checks to be carried out by RCM on the NPs. Also the protocol would specify guidelines for decision making by RCM aiming at achieving a standard approach for standard situations.</p>		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	<p>Establish guidelines for decisions concerning harmonisation; the same for all RCMs</p>	<p>2009</p>	<p>PGCCDBS/PGMED</p>
LM comment	<p>LM recommends PGCCDBS/PGMED to develop methodologies needed for conducting statistical analysis on merging métiers, between and within countries.</p>		

2.2. Economic variables

The RCMs held in 2008 have identified several issues within the new DCF requiring further work or clarification. In this context, a number of queries have been addressed to STECF/SGECA to be dealt with in the forthcoming workshop on data quality to be held in May 2009¹. These include the inventory of guidance existing in the MS for clustering practices in order to assess its implications in quality results, the inventory of methodologies followed for the production of economic variables from Member States, and reflection on how to deal with small-scale fisheries. On top of this, the RCM Baltic expresses also a demand to STECF/SGECA to launch a methodological workshop.

LM is of the opinion that all issues regarding quality of the economic variables should be discussed in STECF/SGECA. LM also wishes to stress the need to clearly define the general role given to SGECA in the frame of the DCF, together with specific ToRs. Moreover, LM understands that there is currently no clear channel for launching workshops on aspects of fisheries economics, compared to the PGCCDBS and PGMED in the biological field. **The role given to STECF/SGECA and its ability to launch workshops eligible under the DCF should be discussed in the forthcoming STECF plenary.**

Finally, the RCMs expressed **the need for STECF/SGECA to consider research needs** such as economic impact of discard reduction, economic benefit of MSC accreditation, development of IT systems for management of economic data and in general consider the need (and develop an outline project requirement) for research under FP7. LM views these recommendations as outside the scope of the DCF. However, given the relevance of the recommendations, **LM agrees that SGECA and STECF should address these issues when discussing the general role of SGECA.**

Topic : Clustering of fishing fleet			
RCM NA	The RCM-NA recommends that a questionnaire be sent to Member States to determine what current practice is followed in Member States with regards to clustering segments – this should be done before the planned workshop in Q1 2009 to help improve its effectiveness.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	This recommendation to be passed to SGECA for their consideration	December 2008	Chair of RCM-NA
RCM Med&BS	The RCM-Med&BS recommends that all MS in the Supra-region follow the methodology to cluster only length classes in order to compare economic variables, and so doing, give justification on the basis of statistical analysis, as required by the regulation		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
		Updating of 2009 NP, at last implementation of the 2010 NP	Member States SGRN

¹ SGECA-09-02 : Quality aspects of the collection of economic data - methods of calculation of the indicators and sampling strategies – 4-8 May 2009

RCM NS&EA	The RCM Baltic recommends that STECF/SGECA addresses the issue of clustering/publishing high-seas trawlers in segments and provides a solution to the confidentiality problem. The published data should not be dominated by a few vessels or companies that stand for more than 75 % of the (value of) landings		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Proposals for clustering/publishing high-seas trawlers in segments for economic data collection	Early 2009	STECF/SGECA
LM comment	LM endorses the recommendations to ask SGECA to address the issue of fleet segment clustering and agrees with the approach given by RCM NA to initiate the work by sending a questionnaire to all MS. The chair of SGECA should take care of elaborating this questionnaire in advance of the forthcoming SGECA meeting, and arrange with the Commission on the best channel to send the questionnaire to all MS.		

Topic : Quality aspects			
RCM NA	The RCM NA recommends that SGECA consider requesting information on the methodologies followed for the production of economic variables from Member States prior to the quality issues workshop planned for Q1 2009.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	This recommendation to be passed SGECA for their consideration	'December 2008	Chair of RCM NA
RCM NS&EA	<p>The RCM NS&EA recommends that the Chair of the RCM NS&EA circulates the notes related to economic variables to the other RCMs in time to help inform their discussions of these matters, and to help determine if the views of the RCM NS&EA with regards to suggestions for areas for STECF-SGECA to look at are supported.</p> <p>The RCM NS&EA also recommends that the following actions be carried out before the STECF-SEGECA Data Quality workshop (planned for 2009 quarter 1), in order to increase the effectiveness of the workshop with specific regard to clustering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A questionnaire be sent to Member States to determine what practice is followed in Member States, to identify if any formal procedures exist. 2. Work should be carried out by Member States prior to the workshop on the degree of variation within fleet segments of indicators as suggested below so that at the workshop various options and their implications for the quality of results can be tried out. 		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Forwarding information to the other RCMs and SGECA	'December 2008	Chair of RCM NS&EA

RCM NS&EA	In addition, as part of the wider preparation for the quality workshop, the RCM NS&EA recommends:		
	<p>3. A summary of procedures reported in NP proposals for the collection of economic data be drawn up (with a possible repeat of the 2004 exercise to collect such information from Member States).</p> <p>4. That SGECA work to develop early in 2009 a manual collating the various guidance that exists on the derivation of economic variables as part of helping to promote the use of such guidance by Member States during 2009.</p>		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Summary of collection procedures for economic data from NP's Collation of guidance on collection procedures into a manual	Early 2009	The Commission, JRC, STECF/SGECA
RCM NA	The RCM-NA recommends that SGECA consider whether the quality workshop could include a specific element related to the methodology and issues related to the collection of data related to small scale fisheries. It should also include an investigation of how various income/capital funding is being recorded – as direct subsidy or capital investment.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	This recommendation to be passed SGECA for their consideration	'December 2008	Chair of RCM NA
RCM Baltic	The RCM Baltic recommends that a formal forum for economic experts should be established under STECF-SGECA dealing with economic issues related to the DCR. This forum is considered to enhance the discussion among economic experts and to provide a platform where methodological problems can be discussed including the problem on missing indicators, which may or may not be estimated by data from neighbour countries.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Establishment of a formal forum under STECF-SGECA dealing with methodological issues related to the DCR	2009	STECF/SGECA
LM comment	LM endorses the recommendations to pass the issues regarding quality to STECF/SGECA for their consideration. Moreover, LM wishes to stress the need to clearly define the general role given to SGECA in the frame of the DCF, together with specific ToRs. This should be discussed in the forthcoming STECF plenary.		

Topic : Capital value: homogeneous determination within a region			
RCM Baltic	The RCM Baltic recommends a regional workshop (NS-EA and Baltic) on determination of the capital value of vessels following the Perpetual Inventory Method (PIM) as provided by the study FISH/2005/03. Participants should collect new vessel prices from shipyards beforehand in a concerted action as essential input for the PIM		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Participants should be invited early enough to provide sufficient time to coordinate and to collect the regional new vessel prices.	July 2009	STECF/SGECA
LM comment	LM agrees on the relevance of the proposed workshop and on the relevance for all supra-regions. LM understands that there is currently no clear channel for launching workshops on aspects of fisheries economics, compared to the PGCCDBS and PGMED in the biological field. This ability for SGECA should be discussed in STECF together with the general role (see section above).		

Topic : Research needs			
RCM NA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The RCM-NA requests that the Commission re-circulate the report from consultants on establishing common formats/templates for data storage under the DCR. 2. The RCM-NA requests that STECF and SGECA consider the need (and develop an outline project requirement) for research under FP7 into variations in the nature and status of fishing rights in Member States and their valuation. 		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commission to circulate the final report from the consultants. 2. Consideration of the including the proposed work in the STECF/SGECA work plan 2009 or 2010 	Early 2009	The Commission STECF/SGECA
RCM NS&EA	<p>The RCM NS&EA recommends that STECF and SGECA consider whether or how the following research needs might be included in the work plan for SGECA for either 2009 or 2010:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • economic impact of discard reduction • economic benefit of MSC accreditation • development of IT systems for management of economic data • consider the need (and develop an outline project requirement) for research under FP7 into variations in the nature and status of fishing rights in Member States and their valuation. 		

	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Inclusion of research needs for economic data in the STECF-SGECA work plan 2009 or 2010	Early 2009	The Commission STECF/SGECA
LM comment	LM views these recommendations as outside the scope of the DCF. However, given the relevance of the recommendations, LM agrees that SGECA and STECF should address these issues when discussing the general role of SGECA (see section above).		

2.3. Transversal variables

All RCMs have expressed concerns about the effort variables to collect within the new DCF, both in terms of common understanding of the definitions and in terms of prioritisation of the data to collect. LM endorsed the RCMs recommendations to address the methodological issues to the forthcoming PGCCDBS and PGMED, before SGECA reviews also the issue. Concerning the prioritisation issue, **LM understands that the métiers selected by the ranking system cannot be questioned on the relevance of collecting any parameters.** Every MS has expressed concerns about the collection of the full set of parameters for those métiers not selected. This important question of prioritisation should be discussed in SGRN (June meeting) for further consideration by STECF.

The inclusion of all effort variables to be collected under the DCF within the EU logbook Regulation is an issue already expressed by the 4th LM. Although, it seems too late for the current electronic logbook Regulation, **LM also recommends SGRN (June meeting) to take the revision of logbook regulation into consideration when addressing the prioritisation of transversal variables** (see section above).

Topic : Effort data			
RCM NA RCM Med&BS	SGRN considers the priorities for collecting these data need to match the rankings of métier for biological purposes, and should bear this in mind when considering requests for derogations in National Programmes.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	STECF/SGRN to consider this principle when evaluating National Programmes	'February 2009	STECF/SGRN
RCM NS&EA	The RCM NS&EA recommends that the Commission and STECF take note of the concerns with regards to the quality of some of the transversal variables related to fishing effort, and recommends that an assessment of the quality of the data be made before any use of it.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Assessment of quality of fishing effort data	Before use of effort data	STECF and Commission

Topic : Effort variables : procedures for data collection		
RCM Baltic	The RCM Baltic recommends to gather experience under the existing requirements and conditions for the collection of effort data and to come back on that issue at the next RCM Baltic to evaluate the progress and reliability, addressing the extent of problems, possible solutions and alternative approaches. In addition, it should be scrutinised for which purposes the effort variables are collected and if all of them are relevant for the concerns of the Baltic region.	
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>
	I: Report on experience with the collection of effort data II: Specification of the purposes for which the effort data are collected and of the relevance for the Baltic region.	Until RCM Baltic 2009
Topic : Common understanding of effort definition		
RCM Med&BS	Considering that some effort variables, and particularly those illustrating passive gears effort, could present different problems of estimations, the RCM MED&BS recommends that the next PGMed should collate information on these variables in order to discuss on the possible use of these data and to propose the best methodology to estimate the effort variables	
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>
	To include in 2009 PGMed terms of reference	Next PGMed in March 2009
LM comment	<p>LM stresses the importance of this issue, pointed out by all RCMs. As regards the methodological problems, LM recommends the PGCCDBS and PGMED to clearly define the situation and propose a way forward. The outcomes of the PGs should be considered by SGECA to ensure that this topic is addressed in a similar way following both biological and economic perspectives.</p> <p>As regards the prioritisation of the collection of effort variables, LM understands that the métiers selected by the ranking system cannot be questioned on the relevance of collecting any parameters. Every MS has expressed concerns about the collection of the full set of parameters for those métiers not selected. This important question of prioritisation should be discussed in SGRN (June meeting) for further consideration by STECF.</p>	

Topic : effort variables: revision of log-book regulation			
RCM NS&EA	The RCM Baltic strongly recommends that the upcoming revision of the logbook regulation assures that all effort variables in Appendix VIII of the Commission Decision 2008/949/EC can be derived from logbooks.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Revision of the logbook regulation with regard to effort variables	2009	European Commission
LM comment	<p>LM agrees on the relevance of the recommendation and recalls that this was already stated in the LM4 and previously pointed out in SGRN-06-03. This issue is not followed-up in the revision of the logbook regulation undertaken in 2007, and thus the issue persists. LM recommends MS to ensure that this request is channelled by the national representatives in the Management committee when the relevant implementing regulation for electronic logbooks will be discussed (probably in 2010).</p> <p>LM also recommends SGRN (June meeting) to take the revision of logbook regulation into consideration when addressing the prioritisation of transversal variables (see section above).</p>		

2.4. Métier-related variables

The RCMs 2008 spent the majority of their time arranging datasets in order to agree on common definitions and a naming convention, although the 4th LM had insisted that the RCM should not work out datasets during their meetings. The 2008 RCMs were considered as exceptional as regards the new DCF and the need to build all the necessary conventions as soon as the first implementation year. At the end, the exercise has been successful as all RCMs concluded on a full description of the major métiers in each fishing ground (see section 2.1). This first general overview of European fisheries is invaluable and will need to be updated in the light of new information. In order to start the 2009 RCMs with already updated overviews and avoid all treatment of data during the meetings, **LM recommends the Commission to include the need to submit a new set of technical tables for the NP proposal 2010, following the SGRN comments, in advance of the RCMs 2009.**

In order to avoid that the same name could cover the same or different fisheries in different NPs, it was recommended that in the NPs a short description of all metiers selected by the 90 % ranking procedure should be provided.

Topic : Harmonisation and preparation of exchange data			
RCM NS&EA RCM NA RCM Med&BS RCM Baltic	In order to use the time of the RCM more efficient, the pre-processing of the exchange data tables, namely the merging of the data on fisheries statistics and planned sampling NP proposal tables in the NPs, for the harmonisation of the NPs, including the quality checks, should be carried out before the next RCM.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Preparation of exchange data for task-sharing	Until August/September 2009	RCM Chair and RCM participants
LM comment	LM notes that the filling of the NP proposal tables with quality controls has been discussed in the SGRN (February 2009) and will further be developed during the year. LM also notes that all MS has received specific comments on resubmitting their tables together with the amendment of their NP proposal 2010. LM recommends the Commission to include the need to submit a new set of technical tables for the NP proposal 2010, following the SGRN comments, in advance of the RCMs 2009.		

Topic : Naming convention		
RCM NA	<p>The RCM-NA recommends that all MS should follow strictly the naming conventions for reporting the sampling and statistics information. To that aim, MS are invited to investigate closely on the mesh size range actually used.</p> <p>The SGRN Guidelines for NP proposals should be revised in order to ensure unambiguous coding of the métiers and fishing grounds and to stress the importance to adhere to these rules</p>	
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>
	<p>Revision of the Guidelines and templates for NP proposals</p> <p>Careful attention to the naming of the métiers</p>	<p>2009</p>
Topic : Coding procedures – Updating of the SGRN guidelines		
RCM Med&BS	<p>The RCM-Med&BS recommends that all MS should follow strictly the naming conventions for reporting the sampling and statistics information. The SGRN Guidelines for NP proposals should be revised in order to ensure unambiguous coding of the métiers and fishing grounds and to stress the importance to adhere to these rules.</p>	
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>
	<p>Revision of the Guidelines and templates for NP proposals</p> <p>Careful attention to the naming of the métiers</p>	<p>2009</p>
Topic : Avoidance of inconsistencies in NP proposal table		
RCM Baltic	<p>the following amendments to the SGRN Guidelines for proposal submissions are recommended:</p> <p>Table III.C.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Metier definitions in a fixed format (e.g. drop down menu) - Fishing ground definitions in a fixed format (e.g. drop down menu) <p>Stress the importance for MS to follow rules on naming and units of variables.</p>	
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>
	<p>Revision of the Guidelines and templates for NP proposals</p>	<p>2009</p>
LM comment	LM endorses RCM recommendations	

Topic : Fishing activities & sampling coverage			
RCM NS&EA	As non-EU countries (mainly Norway, Russia) are the major players in this area, the catches taken by vessels of EU MS do only constitute a minor part of the total catches. Consequently, all catches and sampling effort in this area should be considered when evaluating the MS fishing activities and sampling coverage.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Collation of data on fishing activities & sampling coverage of non-EU countries in ICES Sub-areas I and II.	April 2009	ICES Arctic Fisheries Working Group (AFWG)
LM comment	LM agrees with RCM NS&EA approach.		

Topic : Updating of the matrix (appendix IV.4 Decision 2008/949/EC))			
RCM Med&BS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The RCM-Med&BS suggests to re-include in the metier matrix for the Mediterranean region the gear hydraulic dredge (DRH), as the associated metier is very different that traditional dredging. - The RCM-Med&BS suggests the modification of target assemblage (level 5) of Trolling line [LTL] from “Large pelagic fish” to “Finfish”. - The RCM-Med&BS Group suggests the inclusion of the code “DES” for the description of “Demersal Species” in the target assemblage codes set by SGRN-08-01, for defining metiers at level 6 within the Standard Tables of the National Programme Proposals. 		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Adjust SGRN Guidelines for the submission of NP proposals. To include in 2009 PGMed terms of reference. Member states to provide preliminary useful information	Evaluation of NP by SGRN in Feb 2009, next PGMed in March 2009	Chair of PGMed, STECF SGRN Member states to provide preliminary useful information to PGMed
LM comment	LM notes that SGRN (February 2009) has addressed the issue of non listed métiers in the general comments section. LM agrees with SGRN that the appropriate codification should be used under the Miscellaneous category and encourages relevant MS to cooperate in order to cover these metiers by sampling if relevant.		

Topic : Accuracy on geographical origin of landings and effort data			
RCM Med&BS	The RCM-Med&BS recommends Member States to provide landings and effort data according to the fishing grounds at the GSA level instead of the landing places. The use of VMS data is recommended for analysing the fishing grounds by GSA and identifying all metiers exercised by the Member States		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	MS to provide transversal data by fishing areas	2009	MS to analyse VMS data and to provide more accurate transversal data on metiers
LM comment	LM endorses RCM Med&BS recommendation.		

Topic : Bilateral agreements on sampling task sharing for bluefin tuna			
RCM Med&BS	The RCM-Med&BS recommends Member States involved in metier “Purse seine for large pelagics” (especially for bluefin tuna) to establish agreements concerning the biological sampling of caged fish and to provide them in their NP.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Bilateral agreements between MS to be joined to their NP.	Before next SGRN meeting on NPs evaluation. At the latest, in the revision of 2010 NP.	MS involved in the Mediterranean blue fin tuna fishery
LM comment	LM notes that the RCM recommendation is in line with SGRN (Feb 2009) and ICCAT views and further analysis should be developed by PGMED, in preparation to RCM 2009.		

2.5. Recreational fisheries

The most important step forward regarding the collection of data from recreational fisheries in 2009 is the workshop on Sampling Methods for Recreational Fisheries that will be held in Nantes in May. Following the recommendation made by RCM Baltic, **LM recommends all MS to follow the request for preparation of the workshop given in the ICES resolution** (see <http://www.ices.dk/iceswork/recs/2008recs.asp>).

The fact that a workshop on methodology for sampling recreational fisheries is to be held in 2009 has “confused” some MS that have not clearly included this chapter in their NP and requested for derogations while waiting for the outputs of the workshop. **The European Commission stresses the obligation of MS to collect quarterly catches of relevant species even in the absence of an agreed common methodological framework.**

Topic : workshop preparation			
RCM Baltic	The RCM Baltic recommends that MS follow the request for preparation of the WKSMRF (Workshop on Sampling Methods for Recreational Fisheries), given in the ICES resolution (see http://www.ices.dk/iceswork/recs/2008recs.asp).		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Preparation of working documents for ICES WKSMRF	Early 2009	Member States
LM comment	LM endorses the recommendation and extends it to all MS participating to the workshop.		

Topic : Rules for monitoring recreational fisheries			
RCM Baltic	The RCM Baltic recommends that the SGRN rules for monitoring recreational fisheries under the new DCF are updated with regard to the requirements of the final version of Commission Decision 2008/949/EC (no length measurements necessary). Furthermore, the categories for deciding upon the dimension and frequency of sampling recreational fisheries need to be more clearly separated (the intervals of % are too narrow).		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Update the SGRN rules for sampling recreational fisheries under the new DCF	2009	STECF/SGRN
LM comment	LM recalls that the SGRN « rules » described in the June 2007 report are suggestions for a future monitoring system and that they will have to be revised in line with the Decision 2008/949/EC and the outcomes of the WKSMRF.		

2.6. Stock-related variables

A number of inconsistencies regarding stock area combination, species mixing, spelling errors and sources for compiling the individuals to be sampled were underlined by the different RCMs. Moreover, the need to obtain landing figures for non-TAC stocks presented by country and area to evaluate whether sampling is mandatory or not was outlined. For some stocks, joint target sampling intensities were set, and for some other stocks, MS were instigated to sample.

On the positive side, a number of cooperation agreements between MS for task sharing were identified by the different RCMs and committed by MS, e.g. a BFT regional sampling scheme in the Mediterranean and a joint case study on the spatial aspect of megrim growth patterns in the Atlantic.

The list of so-called Group 3 species was proposed by each RCM as requested by Commission Decision 2008/949/EC. Most of these species were obtained from the lists of species appearing in the relevant surveys and not belonging to Groups 1 or 2. Moreover some RCMs asked for the revision of the list of G1 and G2 species because some of the species are not relevant. **To LM opinion, the revision of the Appendix VII has to be followed through by SGRN under the STECF umbrella and the help of the relevant RFMOs.**

Topic : NP proposal tables III.E.1, III.E.2 and III.E.3	
All RCMs(?)	<p>To avoid inconsistencies and errors in the tables filled in by MS in their NP proposals as well as to ensure comparability, the following amendments to the SGRN Guidelines for proposal submissions are recommended:</p> <p>Table III.E.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MS to be included as a Table field - Species list in a fixed format (e.g. drop down menu) - For stock area and fishing ground (see list of fishing grounds in chapter 3.3.1 two separate columns). - Stock, fishing ground definitions in a fixed format (e.g. drop down menu). - Figures in Table III.E.1 should be given on stock level. If the stock is distributed over more than one fishing ground landing figures should be specified by fishing ground level. - In case of the widely distributed species mackerel, horse mackerel, blue whiting and hake landings should also be given for the following fishing grounds currently covered under other RCMs: Mackerel: I, IIIa, IVabc, VIId; Blue Whiting: I, II, XII, XIV; Hake: IIIa, IV. - Mixed TAC species (TAC applicable to more than one species, e.g. dab and flounder) should be split into landings by species. - Absolute figures for landings should be presented even if landings are below 200 tonnes. - Absolute figures for percentage should be presented, even if percentage is below 10%. <p>Table III.E.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MS to be included as a Table field <p>Table III.E.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Species list in a fixed format (e.g. drop down menu) - For stock area and fishing ground (see list of fishing grounds in chapter 3.3.1 two separate columns). - Stock/fishing ground definitions in a fixed format (e.g. drop down menu).

	<p>- Sampling numbers in Table III.E.3 should be given on stock level. If the stock is distributed over more than one fishing ground sampling numbers should be specified by fishing ground level.</p> <p>- In case of the widely distributed species mackerel, horse mackerel, blue whiting and hake landings should also be given for the following fishing grounds currently covered under other RCMs: Mackerel: I, IIIa, IVabc, VIId; Blue Whiting: I, II, XII, XIV; Hake: IIIa, IV.</p> <p>- Clarification needed on the number of individuals to be aged. Number of individuals sampled from market and number of individuals sampled from the retained part in sea-sampling to be presented separately on separate rows.</p>		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Revision of the Guidelines and templates for NP proposal submissions	2009	STECF/SGRN
LM comment	LM agrees that these issues have to be addressed by the SGRN meeting on the revision of the guidelines.		

Topic : Data quality - Case study			
RCM NA	The RCM-NA recommends that all MS take part in the case study on spatial aspects on growth patterns for Megrim spp. by submitting data to France using the template in Annex 7 (Megrim).		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Data delivery Data analysis	Before the end of April 2009 (data delivery), Before September (data analysis)	All participant MS (data delivery), Joël Vigneau (data analysis).
Topic : Landing figures			
RCM NA	The RCM-NA supports the recommendation of RCM-NS&EA that landing figures for non-TAC stocks presented by country and area should be available to MS to be able to evaluate if sampling is an obligation.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	List of landing figures by area to be compiled by JRC and sent to MS.	until RCM-NEA 2009	STECF
LM comment	LM endorses the recommendations.		

Topic : Minimum required taxonomical levels for identification			
RCM NS&EA	<p>The RCM NS&EA recommends that all invertebrates can be pooled into the category ‘invertebrates’, except for the following species/groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some commercially important crustaceans require identification at the species level both in landings and discards: <i>Cancer pagurus</i>, <i>Crangon crangon</i>, <i>Homarus vulgaris</i>, <i>Lithodes maja</i>, <i>Maja brachydactyla</i>, <i>Necora puber</i>, <i>Nephrops norvegicus</i> and <i>Pandalus borealis</i> • all shellfish at the species level in landings • <i>Pecten maximus</i> at the species level in discards in Division VIId (cf. Appendix VII of COM Decision 2008/949/EC) • cephalopods should be grouped into ‘squid’ and ‘octopus’ <p>Fish should always be regarded as G3-species wherever they are not in G1 or G2, except when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on-board identification is extremely difficult or even impossible (then genus or even family level can be sufficient, see Annex 4 Table 3) • identification is always difficult for a certain genus: <i>Argentina</i> spp., <i>Callionymus</i> spp., <i>Arnoglossus</i> spp. 		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Application of minimum required taxonomical levels for stock-based sampling	From 2009 onwards	STECF-SGRN, MS after approval by STECF
Topic : Proposal for Group 3 species			
RCM NA	<p>Considering i) the low landings levels for some small stocks registered in Appendix VII of the EC Decision 2008/949/EC and ii) that the cost of obtaining data of sufficient quantity to undertake a meaningful assessment, particularly if based on age data, would be prohibitive, the RCM-NA recommends that these species be well documented then reviewed and given if justified Group 3 status..</p>		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Better information for the concerned stock in the NPs revision for 2010 relating to RCM-NA proposals and advice by ad’hoc assessment working groups	Before next RCM-NEA in Autumn 2009	Member states involved, SGRN, ICES
RCM Med&BS	<p>The RCM-Med&BS recommends as minimal list of Group 3 species for the Mediterranean the 11 following fish : <i>Aspitrigla cuculus</i>, <i>Citharus linguatula</i>, <i>Helicolenus dactylopterus</i>, <i>Lepidorhombus boscii</i>, <i>Pagellus acarne</i>, <i>Pagellus bogaraveo</i>, <i>Phycis blennoides</i>, <i>Spicara flexuosa</i>, <i>Trigloporus lastoviza</i>, <i>Trisopterus minutus capelanus</i>, <i>Zeus faber</i>.</p>		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>

	Sampling of these G 3 species by Member States if present in the catches and/or landings	Before next RCM-NEA in Autumn 2009	STECF/SGRN, RCM-Med&BS
Topic : Recommended changes in G-status			
RCM NS&EA	The RCM NS&EA recommends changes in the G-status for the following taxa: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Anarhichas</i> spp.: G3 instead of G2 • introduction of G3-status for cephalopods grouped into squid and octopus (no species specific G-status), only requiring total weights • Introduction of G3-status for some crustaceans that are landed in significant quantities: <i>Cancer pagurus</i>, <i>Hommarus vulgaris</i>, <i>Lithodes maja</i>, <i>Maja brachydactyla</i>, <i>Necora puber</i>, <i>Crangon crangon</i> in Sub-areas I-II and Division IIIa, <i>Nephrops norvegicus</i> in Sub-areas I-II and <i>Pandalus borealis</i> in Divisions IVb, IVc and VIId • shellfish only G3 in landings (except for <i>Pecten maximus</i> in Division VIId -> remains G2) 		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Changes in the G-status for certain taxa.	From 2009 onwards	STECF-SGRN, MS after approval by STECF
Topic : Group 3 on a higher taxonomical level			
RCM NS&EA	When a certain G-status (G1 or G2) is applied to a higher taxonomical group (family or genus), the RCM NS&EA recommends that all species within this group benefit the same status on the species level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ammodytidae: G2-status for <i>Ammodytes tobianus</i>, <i>A. marinus</i>, <i>Hyperoplus lanceolatus</i> and <i>H. immaculatus</i> • <i>Anarhichas</i> sp.: same status for <i>Anarhichas lupus</i>, <i>A. denticulatus</i> and <i>A. minor</i> (see below for the status) • <i>Argentina</i> sp : G2-status for <i>Argentina silus</i> and <i>A. sphyraena</i> • Rajidae: G1-status for all species of <i>Amblyraja</i>, <i>Leucoraja</i>, <i>Raja</i> and <i>Rostroraja</i> • Sharks: G1-status for all shark species relevant for Sub-areas I, II, IV and Divisions IIIa and VIId 		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Setting the same Group (G1, G2) status to all species of a certain higher taxonomic group.	From 2009 onwards	STECF-SGRN, MS after approval by STECF

Topic : Irrelevant species			
RCM Baltic	<p>Within Appendix VII of the Commission Decision 2008/949/EC, the following species is considered not relevant as the species is absent in the area or no landings are likely to occur for those species.</p> <p>The RCM Baltic therefore recommends that Brill (<i>Scophthalmus rhombus</i>) is deleted from the list in Appendix VII.</p>		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Review by SGRN is needed, followed by agreement by STECF	2009	STECF/SGRN
LM comment	<p>The modifications of the Commission Decision 2008/949/EC have to be prepared with care. To LM opinion, this has to be prepared by SGRN under the STECF umbrella and the help of the relevant RFMOs.</p> <p>Today, MS can apply for derogations when the TAC share is less than 200 tonnes regardless of the grouping of the species. (SGRN 2006 valid for stocks over 200 tonnes). The issue of stocks <200t overall, has to be addressed by SGRN (specific ToR). The question on the relevance of stock assessment for these stocks has to be addressed by ICES.</p>		

Topic : Ageing and other parameters task sharing for bluefin tuna			
RCM Med&BS	<p>The RCM-Med&BS recommends Member States to conduct the regional ageing sampling scheme proposed for bluefin tuna in 2010 following the PGMed conclusions. If possible MS can start collecting samples since 2009 if they have included this task in their NP.</p>		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	To include this task in next PGMed ToRS, revision of NPs by concerned MS if needed.	Before next SGRN meeting on NPs evaluation. At the latest, in the revision of 2010 NP.	PGMed, MS involved in the Mediterranean blue fin tuna fishery
LM comment	LM endorses the recommendation.		

Topic : Manuals for maturity staging			
RCM Baltic RCM NS&EA	In order to standardise maturity staging for those species for which maturity staging manuals are not available, the RCM Baltic and RCM NS&EA recommends that dedicated workshops should be held to compile these manuals or guidelines.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Identification of (groups of) species that require standardisation. Approval by PGCCDBS	March 2009	ICES PGCCDBS
LM comment	LM endorses the recommendation.		

Topic : Task sharing in ageing			
RCM Baltic	Member states are recommended to seek for task sharing when starting ageing new species		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	MS to seek for task sharing	2009 onwards	Member States
LM comment	LM endorses the recommendations but encourages MS to continue investigating all means of task sharing.		

Topic : Inconsistencies in NP proposal tables		
RCM Baltic	<p>To avoid inconsistencies and errors in the tables filled in by MS in their NP proposals, the following amendments to the SGRN Guidelines for proposal submissions are recommended:</p> <p>Table III.C.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specify the data sources from which the Number of length measured individuals should be compiled of. <p>Table III.E.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species list in a fixed format (e.g. drop down menu) • Area/Stock definition in a fixed format (e.g. drop down menu) specified on stock level rather than area level. • Absolute figures for landings should be presented even if landings are below 200 tonnes. • Absolute figures for percentage should be presented, even if percentage is below 10%. <p>Table III.E.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species list in a fixed format (e.g. drop down menu) • Area/Stock definition in a fixed format (e.g. drop down menu) specified on stock level rather than area level. • Clarification needed on the number of individuals to be aged. No individuals sampled from market and number of individuals sampled from the retained part in sea-sampling to be presented separately in separate rows. 	
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>
	Revision of the Guidelines and templates for NP proposal submissions	March 2009
		<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
		STECF-SGRN
LM comment	LM endorses the recommendation.	

Topic : Landing figures			
RCM Baltic	Member states are recommended to report their salmon landings in numbers as well as in tons, in their national programmes.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Revision of the Guidelines and templates for NP proposal submissions	2009	STECEF/SGRN
LM comment	LM endorses the recommendation for addressing this issue during the SGRN revision of guidelines meeting (June 2009).		

2.7. Field coordination

LM has identified the recommendations below addressed directly to MS for coordination of their sampling activities. LM encourages such initiatives of field coordination by RCM and **is of the opinion that RCMs should focus more on this kind of recommendations in future (see also section 4).**

Topic : Fishing activities & sampling coverage – Celtic sea			
RCM NA	The RCM-NA recommends France to undertake sampling of landings of the métier GNS_DEF_120-219_0_0 operating in the Celtic Sea (ICES Divisions VIIIf, VIIg, and VIIh).		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Include sampling of the métier in France NP 2009-2010	Before SGRN February 2009	France
Topic : Small pelagic fisheries – All areas			
RCM NA	The RCM-NA recommends that intersessional work be carried out in order to address the issue of coordination of the sampling of small pelagic fisheries as these are operating in different fishing grounds during the same trip.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Full description of the fisheries, seasonal and spatial distribution and means of coordinating the sampling	Autumn 2009, for next RCM-NEA	France, UK and Netherlands to provide information

Topic : Fishing activities & sampling coverage – Western Channel			
RCM NA	The RCM-NA recommends France and UK to prepare a working document on the description of the métier LHM_FIF_0_0_0 operating in the Western Channel (ICES division VIIe).		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Working Document to be presented during the next RCM-NEA	Autumn 2009	France and UK
Topic : Fishing activities & sampling coverage – Iberian waters			
RCM NA	The RCM-NA recommends Spain to prepare a working document on the definitions of métiers occurring in the Iberian waters, in line with the current DCR Regulation, and taking into account the most updated Technical Regulation on mesh sizes.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Working Document to be presented during the next RCM NA	2009	Spain
Topic : Fishing activities & sampling coverage – North Sea and Eastern Channel			
RCM NS&EA	OTM_SPF_32-69_0_0 & PTM_SPF_32-69_0_0: The RCM NS&EA recommends that France and The Netherlands should formalise a bilateral agreement for sampling the landings, as the majority of French catches is taken by Dutch crews operating on French flag vessels and landing in The Netherlands.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Establish a bilateral agreement to be provided to SGRN.	'January 2009	France and Netherlands
Topic : Fishing activities & sampling coverage – Eastern Channel			
RCM NS&EA	NS DRB_MOL_0_0_0: The RCM NS&EA recommends France to implement a similar programme as the UK in order to compare the results, and recommends France and UK to elaborate a working document summarising the outcomes of previous sampling programmes on discard rates by dredgers.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Four on-board observer sampling trips	2009	France

Topic : Fishing activities & sampling coverage – North Sea			
RCM NS&EA	North Sea OTB_CRU_70-99_0_0: Denmark will sample the Nephrops fishery in FU 33 (Off Horn Reef), allowing Germany to apply for a derogation for sampling this fishery		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Answer to SGRN for consideration	'January 2009	Germany
Topic : Fishing activities & sampling coverage – North Sea			
RCM NS&EA	NS OTB_CRU_70-99_0_0: Denmark should also consider if the functional units are matching with those of UK to borrow samples or implement an on-board sampling programme if not.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Answer to SGRN for consideration	'January 2009	Denmark
Topic : Sampling intensities			
RCM NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sole VIIbc –need for assessment data for this stock to be reviewed. - Sole VIIhjk – Belgium and France to instigate sampling. - Sole VIIa – New agreement on international ALK see section XXX. Spain to provide area breakdown. - Cod VIIa - Belgium to instigate sampling - Cod VIa - France to instigate sampling - Saithe - Germany to provide breakdown by area. - Saithe in area VII, VIII - need for assessment data for this stock to be reviewed. - Pollack - All areas except IX, X - France to instigate sampling. - Pollack in IX, X - need for assessment data for this stock to be reviewed. - Hake in VIII/ IX, X – Spain and Portugal to review sampling levels once area split defined. - Plaice in VIIbc – need for assessment data for this stock be reviewed. - Plaice in IX – need for assessment data for this stock be reviewed. - Plaice - Belgium to provide landings breakdown for VIId / VIIe - Plaice - France to instigate sampling in VIIe, VIIfg and VIII - Dab - need for assessment data for this stock to be reviewed 		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
		2009	Member States, ICES

Topic : Task sharing on ageing and biological parameters			
RCM NA	The RCM-NA supports all the proposals for task sharing come for MS (Belgium on new flatfish species, UK on VIIa cod) and asked MS to find positive solutions to requests coming from MS with less expertise on monitoring of new DCR species. Concerning that last case, the RCM-NA recommends that Lithuania should cooperate with Spain and Portugal in data exchange and sharing of tasks in sampling		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Bi-lateral agreements to establish between concerned MS.	until 2010 NP revision or before SGRN evaluation in mid-February 2009	Member states involved, In NAFO areas, Lithuania, Spain and Portugal
Topic : Sampling of sea bass			
RCM NS&EA	The collection of stock-based variables for sea bass (<i>Dicentrarchus labrax</i>) is required on a triennial basis and data quality is expected to improve when international sampling is carried out in the same year. The RCM NS&EA recommends that the NP proposals for The Netherlands and the UK be amended to sample sea bass for the first time in 2010, which is in line with the scheduled sampling by France in 2010.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Coordination of sampling for sea bass	2009	The Netherlands, UK, ICES WGNEW
LM comment	LM endorses all recommendations.		

2.8. Future workshop and studies

Topic : COST tools hands-on workshop			
RCM NS&EA RCM Baltic	The RCM Baltic recommends that a hands-on workshop on the COST project tools should be planned. For the preparation of this workshop, MS should prepare their data in a specified exchange format and gain first experience with the analysis tools.		
RCM NA	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
RCM Med&BS	Setting up COST hands-on workshop.	March 2009	ICES PGCCDBS, PGMED
LM comment	LM endorses the recommendation for addressing this issue during the forthcoming PGCCDBS and PGMED meetings. Moreover, LM recommends PGs to address the issue of the maintenance of the software.		

Topic : Eligibility of GFCM/SAC workshops or meetings by DCR funding			
RCM Med&BS	The RCM-Med&BS strongly supports also the following workshops proposed by GFCM/SAC to be included in the EC eligible list for 2009: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transversal workshop on fishing capacity (Rome, May-June 2009), • Transversal workshop on the GFCM logbook (Rome, May-June 2009). • Workshop on selectivity (Tunis, Sep-Oct 2009). 		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Adding these workshops in the 2009 eligible meetings list.	December 2008	European Commission
LM comment	LM notes that this recommendation has already been taken into account in the eligible meetings list for 2009.		

Topic : combining ALKs (Workshop)			
RCM NS&EA	The RCM NS&EA recommends setting up a workshop on combining age-length keys to harmonise methodologies.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Setting up workshop on combining ALKs	March 2009	ICES PGCCDBS
LM comment	LM endorses the recommendation for addressing this issue during the forthcoming PGs meeting		

Topic : Studies in support of the DCR framework			
RCM Med&BS	<p>The RCM-Med&BS strongly supports the following proposals of studies workshops proposed by GFCM/SAC to be included in the EC eligible list for 2009:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodologies for estimation of economic data at metier level. • Compilation of GFCM task 1 for management purposes using data collected within the DCR framework. • Harmonization of Black sea historical data 		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Liaison meeting advice and implementation through the 2010 EC workplan.	Next Liaison Meeting	Liaison meeting, European Commission
LM comment	<p>LM agrees with the proposed study on methodologies for estimation of economic data at metier level.</p> <p>LM recommends PGMED to better specify the perimeter of the study on compilation of GFCM task 1 for management purpose, in complementarity of SGMED provisions.</p> <p>LM endorses the proposed study on the harmonization of Black Sea historical data.</p> <p>LM endorses also the request from RCM-Med&BS to PGMed to define during its next meeting the terms of reference of a specific study on a “Multidisciplinary identification of stock boundaries for stock assessment purposes (through DCR data and other sources) for the most relevant species in the Mediterranean Sea” (<i>Merluccius merluccius</i>, <i>Parapenaeus longirostris</i>, <i>Mullus barbatus</i>, <i>Nephrops norvegicus</i>, <i>Aristeus antennatus</i> and <i>Aristaeomorpha foliacea</i>).</p>		
Topic : Studies in support of the DCR framework			
	Age Determination and Maturity Staging of species for which biological sampling for analytical assessments has not been carried out on a routine basis yet		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Implementation through the 2010 EC workplan.	2009	European Commission
LM comment	<p>This proposal for a call for tender has not been channelled through the different RCMs, but comes from the PGCCDBS held one week after the LM. For the details, see the report of the PGCCDBS 2009.</p> <p>LM considers that the PGs proposals should go first to the RCMs, in order to be considered by LM. Nevertheless, given the relevance of the proposal and the exceptional current agenda, LM endorsed the proposal by correspondence.</p>		

3. Data Quality assurance. Role defined for each parties (RFMOs/Advisory Bodies, PGCCDBS/PGMED, SGRN and JRC) and current developments.

3.1. ICES benchmark workshops

The outcomes of the recent ICES benchmark workshops on roundfish (WKROUND) and on flatfish (WKFLAT) were presented. The time dedicated to data exploration has captured the LM attention as one of the outcomes of the workshops was the production of a data section giving feedback on data gaps and deficiencies to data collectors, and also views on the data collection in general, such as data access and availability. The recommendations made to Member States, ICES planning groups (PGCCDBS) and RCMs were appreciated. These workshops proved to be successful in addressing their terms of reference and should continue in future years with the objective of investigating all stocks and should also always be held in the beginning of the year. LM considers this first exercise very promising and considers the timing of the benchmark workshops as they are now perfectly situated within the whole DCF machinery (see section 2.1).

For the Mediterranean and Black Sea, it was the opinion of LM that the STECF/SGMED should take care of such a feedback process and consider a data section in their analysis. The GFCM stock assessment Working Group could also report on data gaps and deficiencies with the objective of improving the quality of their analysis.

3.2. Revision of the eligible surveys

SGRN (February 2009) proposed a new survey meeting in early 2010. The criteria for evaluating the eligibility of a survey have to be revised, based on those already used by SGRN (February 2007), adding other objectives, such as the production of ecosystem indicators. In general, the usefulness and quality should be addressed during this meeting and there should be a written procedure for this, linked to all objectives. The evaluation process could be initiated in the surveys steering committees. To LM opinion, the eligibility of surveys should not be a STECF only issue. The process used in 2008 for the ICES framework on evaluation of management plan in coordination between ICES and STECF, could be a way forward, including GFCM and NAFO. The initiative for such a formal process should be taken by STECF. LM recommends the European Commission to forward this demand to the chair of STECF.

3.3. Common data exchange format

The data exchange format for economic variables has been agreed and taken care of by the JRC. For the other variables, the data exchange format used by JRC is no longer valid, due to the importance of the changes made to the DCR. To LM, it is very important to avoid the multiplication of the data exchange format, to make the system more efficient and more consistent. It is unlikely that one data exchange format will fit for all uses, but all effort should be made to reduce as much as possible the number of different formats. The FishFrame/COST data exchange format is a candidate for exchanging detailed or aggregated information of on-board, market and biological sampling information. ICES InterCatch, GFCM task 1, ICCAT and IOTC data exchange formats are *de facto* acceptable. So are the survey international data formats such as MEDITS and DATRAS. For all others, the call for data using another format should be duly motivated, with particular attention to why the formats cited above cannot be appropriate.

3.4. The quality of discard sampling programmes

The use of the discards data collected under the former DCR (between 2002 and 2008) has remained a constant issue, especially as regards their availability and their quality. LM expressed concerns that the 7 years of DCR implementation by all European MS has resulted in little use of the thousands of sampled trips. At the start of a new DCF, it would be highly relevant to gain expertise from these samples, especially as regards the provisions of the new DCF authorising merging métiers based on scientific analysis and international coordination. There have been attempts in the past to tackle this issue through a discard atlas project and calls for data followed by STECF workshops. No proposal from any consortium was presented for the former, and the STECF workshops struggled with data formatting, before carrying out simple meta analyses. The correct channel to best address the issue remains to be found but to LM opinion, such a broad analysis should be done following a regional approach, and a first step could be to document what exists in the institutes databases (data, métiers, species, raising methods) by the RCMs. The second step would be to find a legal base to call all data on discards back to 2002 and proceed to the compilation of these in a common (regional) database. The only existing international database today is FishFrame in the Baltic. Ultimately, there would be an enormous amount of information for analysis, either utilised by a research project or a study.

3.5. Outcomes of the WKACCU

The bias indicators proposed by ICES WKACCU were discussed for a possible inclusion into ICES InterCatch database. It was said to be premature, both in terms of indicator and in term of the development of the database. The WKACCU indicators have first to be discussed in ICES PGCCDBS, together with the indicators to be proposed by the forthcoming WKPRECISE, in order to form a comprehensive set of quality indicators. The ICES InterCatch database has to continue its own development and broaden its use by all assessment working groups, before thinking of extending its capabilities. In the long run, the inclusion of quality indicators, linked to the estimations used for stock assessment, is relevant to be considered in a database such as InterCatch.

3.6. Regional database

The call for tenders MARE/2008/10/Lot 1 for the setting up of regional databases has been fruitless. The project presented by a consortium of European fisheries institutes did not meet the required standards. LM expressed its deepest concerns on the missed opportunity and recommends the Commission to seek all means to address the long awaited need to set up regional databases for fisheries data in Europe.

3.7. Category 6 stocks

The European Commission presented a list of “Category 6” stocks (Appendix I) which are stocks not currently assessed but important in term of data to be collected for stock assessment purposes. LM reviewed the list, which comprises stocks of G1, G2 and G3. Given the provisions in the new DCF, LM is of the opinion that the Category 11 stocks should be considered *a minima*, part of G2 species.

4. Strengthening of the role of RCMs in the framework of the new DCR; definition of precise ToRs.

Article 4 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 665/2008 stipulates that "The Regional Coordination Meetings referred to in Article 5(1) of Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 shall evaluate the regional coordination aspects of the national programmes and where necessary shall make recommendations for the better integration of national programmes and for task-sharing among Member States".

LM was very pleased with the achievements made during all the RCMs, in particular in terms of agreement on fishing grounds, naming conventions and production of comprehensive overviews of international fishing activities in all fishing grounds. The production of this information was critical for all countries to start with the new DCF, talking the same language and having the same level of understanding of the data collection programme to implement. The RCM should now focus more on coordination at the highest level (national correspondents) and on task sharing. To that aim, the 2008 RCMs have recommended MS to provide a more detailed description of their métiers selected at the regional level (see section 2.1. Topic: Description of métiers). The autumn 2009 agenda for the next RCMs is also important in preparation of the National Programmes 2011-2013 to be written before end of March 2010. The next RCMs could then be the forum where national correspondents begin drafting pieces of programmes agreed regionally, to be put jointly within each NP proposal.

To achieve these goals, the LM recommends the Commission to modify the term of reference 2 of the RCMs for 2009, from

2. Make recommendations in order to harmonise and coordinate the regional aspects in the NP proposals 2009-2010 following the new DCR framework, with particular emphasis on the following: [...]

to

2. Harmonise and coordinate the regional aspects in the NP proposals 2010, and prepare the ground for regional data collection programme in the NP proposals 2011-2013, following the new DCR framework, with particular emphasis on the following: [...]

5. AOB

Topic : REDNOR			
RCM NS&EA	The RCM NS&EA recommends that a cost and staff share is established for the redfish survey in the Norwegian Sea (REDNOR), similar to the ASH survey.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Cost and staff share for redfish survey in the Norwegian Sea	Late 2008, or early 2009	European Commission, MS with shares in the pelagic redfish fisheries in the Norwegian Sea
LM comment	LM notes that the inclusion of Portugal has been agreed within the RCM NA.		

Topic : Language			
RCM NS&EA	All tables and information in the NP proposals needed for evaluation and harmonisation (including descriptions and derogations) should be made available to the RCM in English.		
	<i>Follow-up actions needed</i>	<i>Time frame (Deadline)</i>	<i>Follow-up responsibilities</i>
	Translation of essential parts of the NP	Yearly	European Commission
LM comment	LM endorses the recommendation.		

6. Date and place of next RCM

LM expresses concerns about the reduction of the duration of RCM, especially as regards the strengthening role suggested in section 4. In order to consider also the cost effectiveness of the meeting, LM proposes to set up the duration of the RCM 2009 to 3 and ½ days, i.e. From Tuesday morning to Friday lunch time.

LM stresses the need to set up a RCM for long distance fisheries as soon as 2009.

RCM	Venue and dates		Chair
RCM NS&EA	Boulogne/Mer, France	15-18 September	Sieto Verver
RCM NA	Cadiz, Spain	29 September – 2 October	Joël Vigneau
RCM Baltic	Helsinki, Finland	6-9 October	Jukka Pönni
RCM Med&BS	Venice, Italy	13-16 October	Christian Dintheer

7. Pages to find the recommendations addressed to

Chair of RCM NA.....	11, 12, 13
Chair of RCM NS&EA.....	12
Denmark.....	32
European Commission.....	7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 17, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39
France.....	30, 31
Germany.....	32
GFCM stock assessment Working Group.....	36
ICES.....	25, 32
ICES Arctic Fisheries Working Group (AFWG).....	20
ICES PGCCDBS.....	10, 28, 34
ICES WGNEW.....	33
JRC.....	13
Liaison Meeting.....	35, 40
Lithuania.....	33
Member States.....	7, 8, 9, 11, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32, 39
Netherlands.....	30, 31, 33
PGMed.....	16, 20, 27
PGMED.....	10, 34
PGTT experts.....	9
Portugal.....	33
RCM Chairs.....	18
RCM Med&BS.....	26
Spain.....	31
STECF.....	7, 15, 16, 24
STECF/SGECA.....	9, 12, 13, 14, 15
STECF/SGMED.....	36
STECF/SGRN.....	11, 15, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30
UK.....	30, 31, 33

Appendix I: "Category 6" stocks in 2008

Species	Linnaean Binomial name	Zone
Black Scabbardfish	<i>Aphanopus carbo</i>	EC waters of CECAF 34.1.2
Herring	<i>Clupea harengus</i>	VI Clyde
Herring	<i>Clupea harengus</i>	VIIef
Dab and flounder	<i>Limanda limanda</i> and <i>platichthys flesus</i>	EC waters of IIa and IV
Whiting	<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>	VIII
Whiting	<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>	IX and X; EC waters of CEECAF 34.1.1
Lemon sole and witch	<i>Microstomus kitt</i> and <i>Glyptocephalus cynoglossus</i>	EC waters of IIa and IV
"Penaeus" shrimps	<i>Penaeus spp.</i>	Waters of French Guyana
Flounder	<i>Platichthys flesus</i>	EC waters of 22-32
Plaice	<i>Pleuronectes platessa</i>	VI; EC waters of Vb; international waters of XII and XIV
Plaice	<i>Pleuronectes platessa</i>	VIII, IX and X; EC waters of CECAF 34.1.1
Plaice	<i>Pleuronectes platessa</i>	EC waters of 22-32
Turbot	<i>Psetta maxima</i>	EC waters of 22-32
Pollack	<i>Pollachius pollachius</i>	All zones
Saithe	<i>Pollachius virens</i>	VII, VIII, IX and X; EC waters of CECAF 34.1.1
Turbot and brill	<i>Psetta maxima</i> and <i>Scophthalmus rhombus</i>	EC waters of IIa and IV
Common sole	<i>Solea solea</i>	VI; EC waters of Vb; international waters of XII and XIV
Sole	<i>Solea spp.</i>	VIIIcde, IX, X; EC waters of CECAF 34.1.1
Sprat	<i>Sprattus sprattus</i>	VIIde
Horse mackerel	<i>Trachurus spp.</i>	X; EC waters of CECAF (Azores)
Horse mackerel	<i>Trachurus spp.</i>	X; EC waters of CECAF (Madeira)
Horse mackerel	<i>Trachurus spp.</i>	X; EC waters of CECAF (Canary Islands)