

The Data Collection Framework

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 7th Liaison Meeting

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

Final Report

ILVO Institute, Ostend, Belgium,
3rd and 4th June 2010

There are no problems we cannot solve together, and
very few that we can solve by ourselves.

Lyndon B. Johnson (1908-1973)

Content

Summary and Main LM Recommendations	5
Introduction.....	9
Section 1 – Addressing TOR 1	13
Main outputs from the RCM's and specific recommendations to LM	
Section 2 – Addressing TOR 2.....	37
Regional Data Bases	
Review of Surveys	
Participation of Economists on RCM's in 2010- Review	
Section 3 – Addressing TOR 3.....	39
Outcome of First RCM Long Distance	
Section 4 – Addressing TOR 4.....	41
Workshops – review of list for 2011	
Section 5 – Addressing TOR 5.....	47
RCM's in 2011, Issues, Meeting schedule, TOR's and Infrastructure issues	
Section 6 – Addressing TOR 6.....	49
Studies in 2011 JRC website .	
References	51
Annex	52
1- LM Terms of Reference	
2 - LM Agenda.	
3 - LM Participants details	
4 – Full Recommendations of the 2010 RCM NA	

Summary and Main LM Recommendations

The following are some of the key recommendations from the 7th Liaison meeting. Please read the report to get the full overview of all LM recommendations, particularly in Section 1.

Following comments made on the draft LM report, the Chair has made two additional comments in relation to the proposals from the economists and in relation to the RCM NA report under item (23) and (24).

(1) The 7th Liaison Meeting (LM) between the RCM Chairs, a Co-chair of ICES PGCCDBS, the chair of PGMED, the ICES representative, the chair of SGRN and the European Commission was held at the ILVO Institute, Ostende, Belgium on 3rd and 4th June 2010.

(2) The report from the RCM North Atlantic (RCM NA) was not available to the LM, as the RCM NA had just finished the day before the LM.

(3) LM supports the establishment of a Regional Data Base steering group and considers this group to deal with the Baltic, NS&EA and NA regions, as the majority of requirements of a RDB are pan-European.

(4) The RCMs in April-May 2010 have reviewed the survey list provided by ICES, added the columns demanded by SGRN 09-04, merged lines by survey and added surveys that were not in the list but eligible under the current DCF (e.g. NAFO, redfish surveys). The RCM Med&BS adapted the table to their region, included 8 surveys (5 old, 3 new) and circulated the table among National Correspondents. Moreover, they agreed to provide short descriptions of all surveys. They identified difficulties of some MS not being able to participate in certain surveys.

(5) LM notes that data end-users should use the codifications of the DCF Decisions 2008/949/EC and 2010/93/EU. As a basis for developing a standard data exchange format and common codification to be used when exchanging DCF data, the specifications given in the ICES Coop.Res.Rep. 296 (2009) and RCM/LM codifications should be taken into consideration.

(6) LM supports the actions proposed on inconsistencies in National Programme Tables. LM suggests that SGRN highlight inconsistencies in codifications. LM notes that the Steering Group on RDB (see above) can help establishing codification tables. As there may be implications for the Mediterranean & BS region, the Steering Group should be in close contact with the RCM Med&BS.

(7) The LM regards the quality issues around metier variables as very important, in order to improve the DCF implementation with regard to regional sampling schemes and considers that SGRN will address this issue. The test cases planned (RCM NS&EA 2010 recommendation on 'Stock variables: Studies on shared international age-length keys' and RCM Baltic 2010 recommendation on 'Stock related variables: Upload of Sprat (SD22-32) data to FishFrame') could serve as working examples for regional allocation of sampling effort.

(8) LM recommend MS to use COST tools and encourage MS to report on the implementation of these tools in analyzing their data.

(9) LM endorses the recommendations from the RCM Baltic regarding métier variables. LM would like to widen the scope to all regions by recommending that before the RCMs in 2011, MS should look at their transversal data (landings, effort, value), review their métier ranking, and in the in case of significant changes, bring these to the attention of RCMs. As the RCMs had noted that some MS had used the reference years 2008-2009, instead of the reference years 2007-2008 agreed at the 2009 RCMs, the consistent use of the same reference years among MS can be critical in this respect.

(10) LM strongly encourages a close collaboration between RCM Med&BS and RCM LDF, in order to ensure that the métier sampling approach for large pelagic fish can be followed and to discuss areas of mutual interest, such as codification. LM recommends that the codifications for large pelagic fish are established in line with the DCF and relevant RFMOs (ICCAT etc.). Furthermore, the chair of RCM LDF should participate in the forthcoming LM.

(11) LM endorses the establishment of an online recommendations data base. The online tool will have multiple purposes and help the concerned persons and groups to closely follow the status of the work involved. LM recommends that ICES should evaluate a technical implication of such a database, and that SGRN keeps an eye on the progress.

(12) LM suggests that a standard ToR dealing with the end-users feedback should be added to the ToR of Assessment WGs.

(13) LM recommends that SGRN review the experiences of MS with concurrent sampling under the DCF.

(14) ML endorses RCM NA recommendation that MS use the template provided by RCM NA 2009 to update old métier descriptions (when needed) and describe new ranking métiers identified at this RCM, and strictly respect the agreed naming conventions of fishing ground and métiers as well as the deadline for submission of the information. Appointed persons are responsible for requesting the data and compiling it on a regional level.

(15) RCM NA recommends that a first review of the actions concerning recreational sampling that were proposed by MS in their NP's 2011-2013 should be taken care of by PGRFS. At a later stage, RCM NA will identify whether there is scope for regional coordination in this field. LM recommends that SGRN 10-01 takes this recommendation and the RCM-NA 2009 recommendation (which was not taken into consideration) into account when evaluating MS plans for recreational fisheries sampling.

(16) LM notes that the eel sampling issue was only brought up by one RCM and recommends that SGRN pays attention to MS sampling plans and reported sampling activities for eel.

(17) LM agree with the recommendation of the RCM NA that a case study for deriving regional stock based age-length keys be carried out for mackerel (*Scomber scombrus*) in the North East Atlantic and Western Channel. This information is required to evaluate if it is appropriate to introduce task sharing, at stock level, with regard to sampling for ageing of fish.

(18) LM agreed with RCM NS&EA to identify a list of species which should be sampled for maturity data during the quarter 3 IBTS. LM endorses that in order to implement this, that ICES should ensure that the ToR for Survey Planning Groups include a standard ToR on the review of RCM recommendations relevant to their Group.

(19) LM would like to recall that MS participation in the relevant RCMs is mandatory. Furthermore, LM considers that RCMs should continue their efforts in inviting third countries with fisheries in the relevant regions

(20) The LM noted the problem of poor participation by economists in the RCM's. Economists from all MS should attend the RCM on Supra regional level. The commitment of economists in the DCF work is limited. One of the problems is that the pool of fisheries economists is small. LM stress that the role of the economists in the RCM is to ensure the linkages between biological and economical data collection. LM would ask the Commission to ensure that DCF issues are within the remit of SGECA and to make sure that SGECA is taking care of DCF related issues. LM recommends that SGECA nominate a person to represent SGECA in the RCM and this person could lead the group and represent the Economists subgroup in the remaining RCMs. LM recommend that this discussion on the participation of economists in RCMs be held at the upcoming SGRN meeting in June 2010 with the economists present. LM notes that the economists register their frustration with the situation.

(21) LM notes that the first RCM Long Distance Fisheries (LDF) took place in the premises of the Secretaría General del Mar in Madrid from 3rd to 5th March 2010. LM agrees that all MS involved in industrial small pelagic fishery in "From Morocco to Guinea Bissau" fishing ground to ensure adequate sampling coverage for the landings and discards.

(22) LM recommends that the 2011 RCM meetings take place in September 2011 as follows;

RCM Baltic Sea

Copenhagen, Denmark, September 2011.

RCM North Sea and Eastern Arctic

Hamburg, Germany September 2011.

RCM North Atlantic

La Rochelle, France, September 2011

RCM Mediterranean and Black Sea

RCM Long Distance Fisheries

Proposal for a Joint Meeting in Slovenia in May 2011,

8th Liaison Meeting

Brussels, Belgium, First Week of October.

(23) CHAIRS COMMENT: Proposals from the Economists: Several participants commented that the proposals from the economists outlined in Section 4 of the draft LM report were unclear. The Commission agreed to redraft these comments and this redrafted material is presented in this report. Based on feedback from the LM participants, the role of the economists in the RCM's and LM process and the relationships between SGECA and SGRN is clearly an issue that needs to be addressed in 2011.

(24) CHAIRS COMMENT: 2010 RCM NA Recommendations: Some of the recommendations from the RCM NA report were not discussed by the 7th LM as the RCM NA meeting only finished the day before the LM. Therefore the full list of recommendations were not discussed by the LM and do not appear in Section 1 of the report. The full recommendations of the RCM NA are therefore attached to this report in Annex 4.

Introduction

1.1. Background

The 7th Liaison Meeting (LM) between the RCM Chairs, a Co-chair of ICES PGCCDBS, the chair of PGMED, the ICES representative, the chair of SGRN and the European Commission was held at the ILVO Institute, Ostende, Belgium on 3rd and 4th June 2010.

According to Article 5(1) of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 (Data Collection Framework, DCF) Member States shall coordinate their national programmes with other Member States in the same marine region. For this purpose the Commission may organise Regional Coordination Meetings (RCM) in order to assist Member States in coordinating their national programmes and the implementation of the collection, management and use of the data in the same region.

So far, four RCMs are operational in the framework of the DCF: Baltic, North Sea/Eastern Arctic, North Atlantic and Mediterranean/Black Sea. Most fleets subject to DCF activities are covered by these RCMs. However some other fleets, operating namely in third countries and/or in international waters, were not sufficiently covered by the existing RCMs. This was the case for fisheries taking place in CECAF area as well as several tuna fleets operating in the Atlantic or the Indian Ocean. Some Member states show interest before the European Commission in the coverage of fisheries for small pelagic in the new regional fisheries management organisation for the south Pacific SPRFMO.

The new EU Data Collection Regulation (EU Council Regulation 199/2008) established 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, 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 observe

Regional co-ordination greatly increases the efficiency, effectiveness and integration of the various DCF 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 coordination 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 7th Liaison Meeting

During the 7th Liaison meeting, the following RCM Reports were discussed:

- RCM Baltic Sea (RCM Baltic):
Vilnius, Lithuania, 10th to 14th May 2010
Chair: Jukka Pönni
Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for Baltic Sea, 2010.
- RCM North Sea & East Arctic, (RCM NS&EA):
Copenhagen, Denmark, 17th to 21st May 2010.
Chair: Sieto Verver
Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for the North Sea & Eastern Arctic, 2010
- RCM North Atlantic (RCM NA):
Ostend, Belgium, 19th to 22nd April and 31st May to 2nd June 2010.
Chair: Joël Vigneau

Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for North East Atlantic area, 2010.

(Final Report not available to LM as RCM only finished on 2nd June 2010).

- RCM Mediterranean and Black Sea (RCM Med&BS):
Varna, Bulgaria, 17th to 21st May 2010.
Chair: Paolo Carpentieri
Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for the Mediterranean and Black Seas, 2010
- RCM Long Distance Fisheries
Madrid, Spain, 3rd to 5th March 2010
Chairs: Maria Teresa Garcia and Jaime Mejuto
Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for Long Distance Fisheries 2010

1.3. Participants

Paul Connolly (Chair SGRN)

Joël Vingeau (Chair RCM Atlantic)

Christoph Stransky (Co-Chair PGCCDBS)

Sieto Verver (Chair RCM North Sea)

Paolo Carpentieri (Chair RCM Med)

Mark Dimech (Chair PG Med)

Jukka Pönni (Chair RCM Baltic)

Jørgen Dalskov

Els Torreele

Antonio Cervantes (EU Commission, DG MARE)

Angel Calvo (EU Commission, DG MARE)



1.4. Terms of reference and Meeting Agenda.

The terms of reference for the 7th Liaison meeting are given in Annex 1 of this report.

The meeting agenda for the meeting is given in Annex 2.

Section 1 – Addressing TOR 1

Main outputs from the RCM's and specific recommendations to LM

Please note that the RCM North Atlantic Final Report was not available to the LM and that the recommendations of the RCM North Atlantic were added to the list of recommendations from the other RCMs after the LM meeting. The recommendations from the first Long Distance Fisheries RCM are presented in Section 3 of this report.

CHAIRS COMMENT: 2010 RCM NA Recommendations: Some of the recommendations from the RCM NA report were not discussed by the 7th LM. Therefore the full list of recommendations were not discussed by the LM and do not appear in Section 1 of the report. The full recommendations of the RCM NA are therefore attached to this report in Annex 4.

Regional database (RDB)

The RDB meeting proposed by the 6th LM took place in Brussels in Feb. 2010. The RCMs have reviewed its report during April-May 2010. The RCM Baltic agreed on using FishFrame as Regional Database, and the RCM NS&EA has concluded on using a disaggregated RDB. The RCM Med&BS considers that no RDB is necessary, that survey DBs are existing and that JRC call data should be accessible. The RCM LDF noted that DBs are available from ICCAT and other relevant RFMOs.

At the RCM NA, a **RDB steering group** was proposed. The LM supports this proposal and considers this group to deal with the Baltic, NS&EA and NA regions, as the majority of requirements of a RDB are pan-European. The level of implementation, however, could differ between regions. The LM was informed that Katja Ringdahl (Sweden) accepted to chair the first meeting of the steering group. The venue has not been clarified yet, and the date should be as soon as possible, e.g. autumn 2010. The LM discussed the eligibility of travel costs for meetings of the steering group, and the Commission clarified that this will not be possible in 2010, but working hours spent on database development could be included in the cost statements.

Regional database: Mediterranean area	
RCM Med&BS 2010 Recommendation	The group considers that for the time being the RDB in the Mediterranean would be limited to surveys and large pelagic data. In the next future should deal with data required for the ecosystem indicators. Moreover, the group proposes that the information being stored by JRC in the context of the SGMED data calls should be accessible to all MS and play the role of a provisional storage where necessary.
Follow-up actions needed	
Responsible persons	MS, SGRN, JRC, RCM Med&BS, PGMed; Liaison Meeting

for follow-up actions	
Time frame (Deadline)	PG Med 2011; RCM Med&BS 2011

Regional database: Black Sea area	
RCM Med&BS 2010 Recommendation	Due to the fact that Romania and Bulgaria already follow a Regional approach for some shared stocks, the Group propose to BS countries to create a database for the sub-region. The output of this exercise will be presented in the next RCM Med&BS.
Follow-up actions needed	
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS, Liaison Meeting, PGMed, RCM Med&BS
Time frame (Deadline)	RCM Med&BS 2011

Regional database: North Atlantic area	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	<p>Committee on RDB should be set up with the following :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pre-requisite <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Organisation of the steering comity: participants (all member states interested for RDB in NA, EC ?), relation with other regions (a supra-steering comity or a unique steering group with all regions ?) b. Responsibility and decision level of the steering group ▪ Discussion and validation of requirements according to <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Specifications : functionalities (database, use of an existing solution , management of data calls, publication of references data or aggregated data, harmonized data exchange format, frequence of deposit of data, synchronisation with NDB, quality of datasets, coverage of datasets, hosting of database, etc.) b. And level of security required : responsibilities, what types of users (MS, EC, general public for several data access ?) for what use of data, availability/integrity/confidentiality ▪ Evaluation of needs/requirements/protocols for content and technical governance, users support, ect. ▪ First evaluation of the costs ▪ Go/No Go for the better scenario <p>Further, the following items should be addressed before starting the implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Steering of progress, allocation of budget and appropriateness of resources, plan project management.
Follow-up actions needed	SGRN to discuss the issue in one of the 2010 meeting
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	SGRN, DG-MARE
Time frame (Deadline)	July 2010

LM endorses these recommendations.

Surveys

The RCMs in April-May 2010 have reviewed the survey list provided by ICES, added the columns demanded by SGRN 09-04, merged lines by survey and added surveys that were not in the list but eligible under the current DCF (e.g. NAFO, redfish surveys). The RCM Med&BS adapted the table to their region, included 8 surveys (5 old, 3 new) and circulated the table among National Correspondents. Moreover, they agreed to provide short descriptions of all surveys. They identified difficulties of some MS not being able to participate in certain surveys.

The LM noted some deviations from the survey evaluation roadmap developed by SGRN 09-04 in terms of timing of the items listed, but the general approach was followed so far.

The LM agreed that RCM chairs should send their completed tables to the Commission until 15 June 2010, and that the Commission produces one compiled file including sheets per region and forwards this file to MS and MEDITS steering committee for filling the gaps, if any, before 25 June back to the Commission. SGRN will not review these tables, but bring them to the attention of STECF Plenary in July 2010 in order to obtain STECF endorsement.

Data quality

Data transmission:

Quality issue: Transmission of data	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends the European Commission, together with STECF to reflect on a standard data exchange format and a 'universal' coding for all the variables issued from the DCF. When a modification of the Comm. Dec. will occur, RCM NA recommends setting an annex of the decision with all the DCF codifications.
Follow-up actions needed	Propose a standard data exchange format and common codification to be used when exchanging DCF data.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	DG-MARE, STECF
Time frame (Deadline)	End of 2010

Data call (quality issue transmission of the data)	
RCM Med&BS 2010 Recommendation	Participants recommend the following improvements in the context of data calls: respect legal provisions to deliver data calls (1 month); provide clearer indications on variables; standardize formats of the request with agreed common formats at Regional Level (see RCM Med&BS 2009 report); <u>respect DCF format</u> and do not change format from one year to another; develop an upload system that clearly detail the errors occurred. Participants are also concerned about the extremely restrictive filter of the data calls that make upload of the data extremely difficulties.
Follow-up actions needed	
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS, SGRN, JRC, SGMED, DG MARE
Time frame (Deadline)	

LM notes that data end-users should use the codifications of the DCF Decisions 2008/949/EC and 2010/93/EU.

As a basis for developing a standard data exchange format and common codification to be used when exchanging DCF data, the specifications given in the ICES Coop.Res.Rep. 296 (2009) and RCM/LM codifications should be taken into consideration.

NP sections on data quality:

Metier and stock related variables: III.C, III.E, Data quality control and validation of data in NP proposals	
RCMMed&BS 2010 Recommendation	Following the analysis carried out during the meeting (analysis on the paragraph III.C and III.E related to data quality and validation), RCM Med&BS recommends MS to revise their NPs in order to achieve all requirements listed in the NP Guidelines for the submission of National Program Proposals, or to explain why it is not done.
Follow-up actions needed	Member States to review their National Programs; SGRN
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS; Liaison, SGRN
Time frame (Deadline)	Before NP evaluation by SGRN (June 2010)
LM 2010 comment	LM considers that SGRN 10-01 pays particular attention to those NPs where information on data quality control and validation of data is missing.

EUROSTAT data:

DCF requirements: Reference landings by country	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends MS to upload the landings in EUROSTAT by ICES division and by genus and species, and avoid as much as possible the use of the generic code "spp". It is reminded that STECF (2007) recommended the use of EUROSTAT as the reference for landings by country and area, and that all effort should be done to secure the quality of information provided to EUROSTAT. RCM NA recommends EUROSTAT to disseminate its transmission procedure for this kind of data, to all MS.
Follow-up actions needed	All MS EUROSTAT for dissemination of transmission procedure.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	National Correspondents
Time frame (Deadline)	before end of 2010
LM 2010 comment	LM recommend that MS populate EUROSTAT

Web tool for recommendations:

DCF requirements: Reference landings by country	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends ICES to reflect on the setting of an online 'recommendation database', with AWG, PGCCDBS, RCM chairs, National correspondents and other relevant people having access and being able to comment and update the status of each of the recommendations.
Follow-up actions needed	Setting of a public online database.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	ICES, DG-MARE
Time frame (Deadline)	Before March 2011 (for PGCCDBS first use)
LM 2010 comment	LM endorses this recommendation and considers that an online tool will have multiple purposes and help the concerned persons and groups to closely follow the status of the work involved. LM recommends that ICES should evaluate a technical implication of such a database, and that SGRN keeps an eye on the progress.

NP tables:

Stock related variables: Inconsistencies in NP proposal tables	
RCM Baltic 2010 Recommendation	To avoid inconsistencies and errors in the tables filled in by MS in their NP proposals, the following are recommended: Table III.E.1: <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) , following the list established by FishFrame, see recommendation below. • MS should follow the guidelines and put in absolute figures for landings even if landings are below 200 tonnes. • MS should follow the guidelines and put in absolute figures for percentage even if percentage is below 10%. Table III.E.3: <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) following the list established by FishFrame, see recommendation below. • data sources in a fixed list (survey, sea sampling, market sampling etc).
Follow-up actions needed	Revision of the Guidelines and templates for future NP proposal
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	To be considered by STECF-SGRN while updating the guidelines
Time frame (Deadline)	To be considered in the next update of the guidelines

Stock related variables: Inconsistencies in NP proposal tables	
RCM Baltic 2010 Recommendation	To avoid inconsistencies and errors in the tables filled in by MS in their NP proposals, the list of “stocks” established and used in FishFrame should be used as a standard. The list is presented in annex 6 of this report.
Follow-up actions needed	Revision of the Guidelines and templates for future NP proposal
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	To be considered by STECF-SGRN while updating the guidelines
Time frame (Deadline)	To be considered in the next update of the guidelines

Métier variables: Tasks prior to the LM 2010	
RCM NS&EA 2010 Recommendation	Based on the outcomes of RCM NA 2010 (first part), reference tables were provided to MS to inform on standardization of naming conventions. To extend these reference tables, RCM NS&EA recommends adding the métier level 6 by fishing ground.
Follow-up actions needed	Add information to the reference table and provide this table to participants and other RCMs for consideration.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Katja Ringdahl
Time frame (Deadline)	31 May 2010

Stock related variables: Inconsistencies in NP proposal tables	
RCM NS&EA 2010 Recommendations	In order to have correct reference list of species and stocks in Appendix VII 2010/93 and to avoid inconsistencies and errors in the tables filled in by MS in their NP proposals, the following is recommended: 1: Appendix VII 2010/93: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All MS should look for inconsistencies and errors and suggest on corrections this refers to naming of stock/area, species included and errors in sampling level 2: Table III.E.1 NP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Species list following reference list based on a corrected Appendix VII 2010/93 ▪ Area/Stock definition following reference list based on a corrected Appendix VII 2010/93 Table III.E.3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Species list following reference list based on a corrected Appendix VII 2010/93 ▪ Area/Stock definition following reference list based on a corrected Appendix VII 2010/93 3: Establish a reference list of available data sources (survey, sea sampling, market sampling etc).
Follow-up actions needed	1. MS to suggest on corrections and put on RCM share point 2. Revision of the Guidelines and templates for future NP proposal 3. Establish a reference list
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	1. Maria Hansson Sweden to collate the updates and comments received from MS and to pass these to the Chair of SGRN. 2 & 3 To be considered by STECF-SGRN while updating the guidelines
Time frame (Deadline)	1. Prior to September 30, 2010 2 & 3 To be considered in the next update of the guidelines

Stock related variables: Inconsistencies in NP proposal tables	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendations	In order to have correct reference list of species and stocks in Appendix VII 2010/93 and to avoid inconsistencies and errors in the tables filled in by MS in their NP proposals, the following is recommended: 1: Appendix VII 2010/93: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All MS should look for inconsistencies and errors and suggest on corrections this refers to naming of stock/area, species included and errors in sampling level.
Follow-up actions needed	MS to provide their comments to the RCM NA chair.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Chair of RCM NA to collate the comments received from MS and pass these to the Chair of SGRN.
Time frame (Deadline)	End of June 2010

Metier variables: Technical tables - Naming conventions	
RCM Med&BS 2010 Recommendation	RCM Med&BS recommends all MS to follow strictly the SGRN guidelines in terms of coding and naming conventions and also the reference lists of metiers established by the RCM at the regional level. Technical tables must be filled in English. Otherwise SGRN is invited to revise NP and TR guidelines as some discrepancies yet exist between texts and technical tables' samples, in order to ensure unambiguous documenting and coding of gears, metiers, fishing grounds etc... and to avoid fastidious and time consuming validation before tables' analysis and ranking process.
Follow-up actions needed	Revision of the Guidelines and templates for NP proposals Careful attention to the filling of technical tables.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	STECF-SGRN; Liaison All Member States
Time frame (Deadline)	Before NP evaluation by SGRN (June 2010)

Metier variables: Technical tables - Naming conventions – Miscellaneous metiers	
RCM Med&BS 2010 Recommendation	RCM Med&BS recommends all MS to follow strictly the metiers reference list established at the regional level (RCM Med&BS 2009 report). If the combination between gear and target assemblage does not correspond to an identified reference metier of level 6, the national metier must be registered as a Miscellaneous one (Misc.), ranked as the other metiers and described in the NP and the required forms if sorted by the ranking system.
Follow-up actions needed	Updating of NP following the RCM meetings.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	All Member States
Time frame (Deadline)	Before NP evaluation by SGRN (June 2010)

Metier variables: Technical tables – Ranking system parameters – Table III.C.1. missing data	
RCM Med&BS 2010 Recommendation	By processing the national technical table III.C.1 to perform ranking systems at different geographic scales, RCM Med&BS met difficulties by lack of information on some metiers, concerning one or several required ranking parameters (effort, landings and/or value). These gaps may bias the outcomes of the rankings carried out at international level or combining several GSAs, mainly for metiers targeting species of high commercial value. RCM Med&BS recommends all MS to complete their national table III.C.1

	(in compliance with the Guidelines 2009) to assess the real national and regional importance of each metier identified by MS in conformity with the DCF regulation.
Follow-up actions needed	Updating of NP following the RCM meetings.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	All Member States
Time frame (Deadline)	Before NP evaluation by SGRN (June 2010)

LM supports these activities and suggests that SGRN highlight inconsistencies in codifications.

The Steering Group on RDB (see above) can help establishing codification tables. As there may be implications for the Mediterranean & BS region, the Steering Group should be in close contact with the RCM Med&BS.

Role of the RCM:

Métier variables: Quality issues, role of RCM and DCF revision	
RCM NS&EA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NS&EA strongly advises STECF and the Commission to consider the present situation with respect to <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. defining a practical approach to the MS which deals with the present situation where most NP are not complying with the DCF; 2. preparing interim guidelines to MS and RCM with regard to national and regional sampling priorities taking into account available resources; 3. prepare timely for a revision of the Commission Decision while <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. ensuring the availability of statistically sound estimates to the scientific expert groups; b. taking into account that the ambitions of the Decision meet the limited resources of the Commission and MS; c. defining regional and national sampling priorities and the coordination role of the RCM; d. revising precision requirements based on scientific analyses of data;
Follow-up actions needed	Include a term of reference on quality issues (quantity vs. quality) and coordination tasks by RCM in the forthcoming SGRN meeting, including a roadmap for the revision of the Commission Decision
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	SGRN, DG-MARE
Time frame (Deadline)	June/July 2010
LM 2010 comment	LM regards this as an important issue in order to improve the DCF implementation with regard to regional sampling schemes and considers that SGRN will address this issue. The test cases planned (RCM NS&EA 2010 recommendation on ' Stock variables: Studies on shared international age-length keys' and RCM Baltic 2010 recommendation on 'Stock related variables: Upload of Sprat (SD22-32) data to FishFrame') could serve as working examples for regional allocation of sampling effort.

Métier variables: Allocation of sampling by France	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM 2010 recommends France to allocate precisely the sampling at-sea before SGRN June meeting, taking into considerations the recommendations given per fishing ground and metier in section 4.1.5
Follow-up actions needed	France to update NP proposal 2011-2013 text and tables.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	France
Time frame (Deadline)	Before June 2010

Métier variables: Allocation of French discard trips	
RCM NS&EA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NS&EA recommends France to allocate sea-sampling effort to gillnets and trammel nets targeting demersal fish and to sample these metiers for discards
Follow-up actions needed	France to sample and to amend their National Programme
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	France
Time frame (Deadline)	June 2010

Métier variables: Allocation of French discard trips	
RCM NS&EA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NS&EA recommends France to allocate sea-sampling effort to OTB_DEF_100-119_0_0 and to sample this metier for discards
Follow-up actions needed	France to sample and to amend their National Programme
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	France
Time frame (Deadline)	June 2010

Métier variables: Allocation of French discard trips	
RCM NS&EA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NS&EA recommends France to allocate sea-sampling effort to OTB_DEF_70-99_0_0 and to sample this metier for discards
Follow-up actions needed	France to sample and to amend their National Programme
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	France
Time frame (Deadline)	June 2010

Métier variables: Allocation of French discard trips	
RCM NS&EA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NS&EA recommends France to allocate sea-sampling effort to OTB_MOL_70-99_0_0 and to sample this metier for discards
Follow-up actions needed	France to sample and to amend their National Programme
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	France
Time frame (Deadline)	June 2010

LM notes that the RCM NS&EA provided advice in the form of recommendations, however, these recommendations are not to be seen as obligations as France remains solely responsible for fulfilling national targets, agreements and obligations as set by the DCF.

Discard sampling:

Discards sampling: List of métiers important to sample and provide scientific justification for not sampling certain métiers for discards	
RCM Med&BS 2010 Recommendation	RCM Med&BS recommends to strictly follow the output of the proposed table made up in the PGMed 2010 for the métiers to sample for discards.
Follow-up actions needed	LM and STECF validation of the reference list for discards issues
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	SGRN, Member states to apply or not the derogation procedure.
Time frame (Deadline)	2010, for NP 2011-2013 proposals reviews

Discards sampling: Creation of a regional view of the discard sampling program, identification of gaps and discrepancies for optimizing the spatial, time and métiers coverage	
RCM Med&BS 2010 Recommendation	For the purposes of optimizing the spatial, time and métiers coverage of the discard sampling program, RCM Med&BS recommends MS to revise the discards sampling program and the table on discards metadata (prepared during the RCM Med&BS 2010 but still to finalize) in order to provide missing information regarding the non sampling of certain métier.
Follow-up actions needed	Member states to review their National Programs updating of NP 2011 proposals; SGRN
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS; SGRN
Time frame (Deadline)	2010, for NP 2011-2013 proposals reviews

Discards sampling: Optimising discards sampling	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	Along with RCM NS&EA, RCM NA recommends SGRN to initiate a reflection on the cost efficiency of discards estimates, taking into considerations the enormous data collected so far in the frame of the DCR and DCF, and the expertise gained.
Follow-up actions needed	Modification of the Comm. Dec EU/2010/93.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	DG-MARE, SGRN
Time frame (Deadline)	Mid 2011

LM supports these recommendations and suggests that SGRN 10-01 pays particular attention to these aspects.

COST 2:

COST tool	
RCM Baltic 2010 Recommendation	To ensure the wide implementation of COST, the RCM Baltic recommends that after the trial period lasting until May 2011 the working experience of member states will be reassessed and a training workshop should be organized in the first half of 2012.
Follow-up actions needed	Gathering the information on experience from MS before the WK. Preparing the WK.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Appointed persons -> RCM Chairs -> LM -> COST WK organisers?
Time frame (Deadline)	By the end of 2011 (well before the WK)

Métier variables: COST 2	
RCM NS&EA 2010 Recommendation RCM NA 2010 recommendation	RCM NS&EA considers that given the fact that most likely, almost all Member States involved in the DCF will use COST for computing their precision levels for 2009 and prepare assessment working groups, resulting in a positive attitude of the EC towards the implementation of COST, a follow up of the COST project – COST 2- is required. The framework for the continuation of the project has several objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ avoiding the development of national versions of the tool ▪ creating a functional help mailing list and expanding/enhancing the examples (taking into account the simulation outcomes). ▪ correcting the possible bugs, improving the code, adapting to new versions of exporting (InterCatch) ▪ Progressing on benchmarking the methods and simulating different sampling schemes and levels with COSTsim ▪ Make the tool user friendly
Follow-up actions needed	MS to start to implement COST
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS to be prepared to use COST
Time frame (Deadline)	results to reported to EC and RCM NS&EA in 2011

COST tools hands-on workshop (quality issues)	
RCM Med&BS 2010 Recommendation	The Group discussed the outputs of the WS on Cost. The Group recognize that the tools generated by the COST project could improve noticeably the quality of DCF data collection schemes. But before to address the final request of the WS (a second Cost project), RCM Med&BS recommends to further progress testing the tool and to clearly screen the applicability and functionality. The Group recommend also waiting feedback from users (National laboratories and JRC) to assess and identify issues and need for improvement of the software.
Follow-up actions needed	
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS, Liaison Meeting, JRC, DGMARE
Time frame (Deadline)	

LM recommend MS to use COST tools and encourage MS to report on the implementation of these tools in analyzing their data.

Recreational fisheries:

Métier related variables: Recreational fisheries	
RCM Baltic 2010 Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Investigate the potential to coordinate recreational fisheries cod catches in SD 22-24 between Denmark, Germany and Sweden ○ Discuss the possibility to include recreational fisheries data into FishFrame ○ Compile 1-page status report of ongoing recreational fisheries surveys ○ Provide guidance how often recreational fisheries surveys need to be conducted ○ RCM Baltic endorses to use annual weight estimates
Follow-up actions needed	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Germany to contact relevant persons 2. Decide during PGRFS how to proceed 3. Upload required document to the sharepoint: RCMs 2010 > RCM Baltic > Data > Recreational fisheries 4. Guidance to be provided and disseminated to MS 5. PGRFS to discuss the proposal and come out with a recommendation to DG MARE
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. German national correspondent for recreational fisheries 2. PGRFS 3. MS national correspondents 4. European Commission DG MARE 5. PGRFS
Time frame (Deadline)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Before PGRFS meeting (7 June 2010) 2. June 2010 3. Until PGRFS meeting (7 June 2010) 4. End of 2010 5. June 2010

LM supports these recommendations and notes that guidance (point 4) should be given by SGRN, and that SGRN reviews its guidance given in 2008 is still valid.

Eel: Sampling of recreational eel fishery in Mediterranean area	
RCM Med&BS 2010 Recommendation	RCM Med&BS considers that sampling of recreational fisheries on eel in marine waters is not necessary, this activity not really being a real targeted practice.
Follow-up actions needed	
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	LIAISON and SGRN; DGMARE
Time frame (Deadline)	Before NP evaluation by SGRN (June 2010)

Recreational fisheries : Best practise	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends MS not to wait for the outcomes of the PGRFS to revise current (when relevant) and prepare future NP Proposal on recreational fisheries, but base their planning on the DCF requirements and their own knowledge of the fisheries. RCM NA also recommends to consider the recommendations of WKS MRF, WGEEL, and the future recommendations of PGRFS.
Follow-up actions	Revising MS NP proposals 2011-2013 and drafting new NP's.

needed	
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	All MS.
Time frame (Deadline)	October 2011

Recreational fisheries : Review actions proposed in National Programmes regarding recreational fisheries	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends that a first review of the actions concerning recreational sampling that were proposed by MS in their NP's 2011-2013 should be taken care of by PGRFS. At a later stage, RCM NA will identify whether there is scope for regional coordination in this field.
Follow-up actions needed	Review at PGRFS.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCM NA participants that also join PGRFS.
Time frame (Deadline)	Before PGRFS

LM recommends that SGRN 10-01 takes this recommendation and the RCM-NA 2009 recommendation (which was not taken into consideration) into account when evaluating MS plans for recreational fisheries sampling.

Metier-related variables:

Update the metier descriptions:

Métier variables: description of nationally ranked metiers	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM 2010 recommends that MS use the template provided by RCM NA 2009 to update old métier descriptions (when needed) and describe new ranking métiers identified at this RCM, and strictly respect the agreed naming conventions of fishing ground and métiers as well as the deadline for submission of the information. Appointed persons are responsible for requesting the data and compiling it on a regional level.
Follow-up actions needed	Preparation of métier descriptions/exchange data for task-sharing.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	All MS.
Time frame (Deadline)	Every year before RCM meetings
LM 2010 comment	LM endorses this recommendation.

Concurrent sampling:

Métier variables: Concurrent sampling	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM 2010 provides a template for summarizing national information on the actions undertaken by MS to include concurrent sampling in their sampling programmes, and recommends that MS use this template to document their activities regarding this topic.
Follow-up actions needed	Preparation of national descriptions on concurrent sampling.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCM participants and MS without delegates in RCM NA 2010.
Time frame (Deadline)	Before RCM 2011
Métier variables: Concurrent sampling	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM 2010 recommends SGRN to review the actions undertaken by MS regarding concurrent sampling, and give feedback to RCM for the 2011 meeting.
Follow-up actions needed	Preparation and collection of national descriptions on concurrent sampling
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCM participants and MS without delegates in RCM NA 2010.
Time frame (Deadline)	Before RCM 2011
LM 2010 comment	LM regards this as an issue for SGRN, by reviewing the experiences of MS with concurrent sampling under the DCF.

Overview of bilateral agreements:

Métier variables: Inclusion of bilateral and RCM agreements in NP	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	Revised National Programmes to include appropriate reference to RCM NA report in relation to sampling agreement at metier level. National Programmes to include in annex formal bilateral agreements, using the template in annex 9.
Follow-up actions needed	National Correspondents to ensure that National Programme includes appropriate reference to RCM and bilateral agreements in relation to sampling activities as referred to in the RCM NA report.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	National Correspondents
Time frame (Deadline)	March 2011
LM 2010 comment	LM considers that the overviews on bilateral agreements produced by RCMs should serve as basis for SGRN to highlight further needs. LM notes that this overview should be produced for the Baltic by the next RCM.

Recommendations based on overviews of sampling (to MS)

Métier variables: Sampling coordination	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA 2010 recommends MS to review precisely all statements made by RCM NA in the section describing the fishing and sampling activities per fishing grounds, and propose actions. RCM NA recommends SGRN to use the tables proposed by RCM NA in its evaluation of NP proposals 2011-2013 in June 2010.
Follow-up actions needed	Propose actions in line with RCM NA recommendations
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	All MS, SGRN
Time frame (Deadline)	June 2010, Revision of the NP proposals after SGRN evaluation
LM 2010 comment	LM endorses this recommendation

Harmonisation of mesh size ranges:

Métier variables: Harmonization of mesh size ranges	
RCM NS&EA 2009 Recommendation	In 2009, RCM NS&EA proposed mesh size ranges for towed and fixed gears by area. The proposed mesh size ranges for the NAFO area were not in line with the NAFO conservation measures. In 2010, RCM NS&EA proposed to bring the mesh size ranges in line with the NAFO measures and therefore recommends SGRN to take this correction into account in the guidelines for the NPs.
Follow-up actions needed	Update guidelines for NP
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	SGRN
Time frame (Deadline)	Prior to providing new guidelines in 2011
LM 2010 comment	LM recommends that each RCM report should contain the latest definition of mesh size ranges.

End-users feedback:

Métier variables: Relation between data collectors and end users	
RCM NS&EA 2010 Recommendation	WGCHAIRS to allocate sufficient time (half a day) during their next meeting in order to address the exact needs in terms of data collection and metiers requirements.
Follow-up actions needed	Develop a term of reference for the ICES WGCHAIRS
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	ICES ACOM, DG-MARE
Time frame (Deadline)	September 1, 2010
LM 2010 comment	LM suggests that a standard ToR dealing with the end-users feedback should be added to the ToR of Assessment WGs.

Tasks prior to RCMs:

Métier variables: Tasks prior to the RCM Baltic 2011	
RCM Baltic 2010 recommendation	Development of a report in FishFrame which calculate the top 90% ranking of metiers for each MS as well as on regional level. The data should be based on data from the two previous years.
Follow-up actions needed	Landing -, effort – and landing value statistics should be uploaded in FishFrame.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCM participants and FishFrame designers and developers.
Time frame (Deadline)	Prior to RCM in 2011.

Métier variables: Tasks prior to the RCM Baltic 2011	
RCM Baltic 2010 recommendation	For the purposes of regional understanding of sampling activities, national information on sampling should be compiled regionally in advance of the next meeting.
Follow-up actions needed	Preparation of exchange data for task-sharing.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCM chair and RCM participants
Time frame (Deadline)	Prior to RCM in 2011.

LM endorses these recommendations and would like to widen the scope to all regions by recommending that before the RCMs in 2011. MS should look at their transversal data (landings, effort, value), review their metier ranking, and in the in case of significant changes, bring these to the attention of RCMs. As the RCMs had noted that some MS had used the reference years 2008-2009, instead of the reference years 2007-2008 agreed at the 2009 RCMs, the consistent use of the same reference years among MS can be critical in this respect.

Sampling of large pelagic fish:

Metier and stock related variables: Large pelagic sampling	
RCM Med&BS 2010 Recommendation	RCM Med&BS recommends to continue the exercise carried out during PGMed 2010 reviewing yearly the sampling figures for metier related variables and to estimate CV at regional level. MS should adjust their NP accordingly to these results.
Follow-up actions needed	Member states to review their National Programs in accordance of the PGMed results
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS, Liaison Meeting, PGMed, RCM Med&BS, DGMARE
Time frame (Deadline)	PGMed 2011

Allocation of large pelagic species to one or various RCMs	
RCM LDF 2010 Recommendation	Ensure that the Regional Co-ordination Meetings (RCMs) move into the same direction
Follow-up actions needed	Assistance from the LM to have clearer views on allocation of large pelagic species to one or various RCMs
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Liaison Meeting
Time frame (Deadline)	Next Liaison Meeting in 2010.

Métier identification: Codification and naming convention	
RCM LDF 2010 Recommendation	Review the table produced during the meeting and make a proposal about how to identify and codify their metiers for the next meeting.
Follow-up actions needed	Review codification shown in table 8 at national level.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	All MS involved in tuna and tuna-like fisheries.
Time frame (Deadline)	Before the next RCM LDF, to be shown at the meeting.

LM endorses these recommendations and encourages a close collaboration between RCM Med&BS and RCM LDF, in order to ensure that the metier sampling approach for large pelagic fish can be followed and to discuss areas of mutual interest, such as codification. LM recommends that the codifications for large pelagic fish are established in line with the DCF and relevant RFMOs (ICCAT etc.).

Furthermore, the chair of RCM LDF should participate in the forthcoming LM.

Eel sampling:

Eel: Metier and Stock related variables on eel fishery in Mediterranean area	
RCM Med&BS 2010 Recommendation	The RCM Med & BS recommends that all the Mediterranean countries that are not performing biological samplings on eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) in Mediterranean area should present their grounds for not doing it. RCM Med&BS reminds that eel is Group 1 species and is under Recovery Plan. Metier data (i.e. length frequencies distribution) shall be collected by MS. Stock related variables (sex, age, weight and maturity) should be also collected. In case eel Stock variables are not collected justification shall be provided.
Follow-up actions needed	Provide an explanation overview of their eel biological sampling activities (temporal, spatial distribution, sampling intensities, and involved institutes). If they are not performing biological sampling activities on eel, they should provide reasons for not doing it. Member states to review their National Programs updating of NP 2011 proposals
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS; LIAISON; SGRN
Time frame (Deadline)	Before NP evaluation by SGRN (June 2010)
LM 2010 comment	LM notes that this issue was not brought up by other RCMs and recommends that SGRN pays attention to MS sampling plans and reported sampling activities for eel.

Sampling coverage in CECAF area:

Métier variables: Fishing activities and sampling coverage	
RCM LDF 2010 Recommendation	All MS involved in industrial small pelagic fishery in “From Morocco to Guinea Bissau” fishing ground to ensure adequate sampling coverage for the landings and discards.
Follow-up actions needed	All MS involved in fishery to draft one agreement to share tasks.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	National Correspondents from all MS involved in fishery. The Netherlands will take initiative.
Time frame (Deadline)	Before the next RCM LDF, to be approved and signed at that RCM.
LM 2010 comment	LM endorses this recommendation.

Stock-related variables:

International co-ordination of age-length keys

Stock related variables: Upload of Sprat (sd22-32) data to FishFrame	
RCM Baltic 2010 Recommendation	In order to be able to analyse the current sampling level of sprat in the Baltic and suggest optimal sampling levels for future regional coordinated sampling, the data must be available in an agreed format and checked for errors. Data has to be uploaded in Fishframe
Follow-up actions needed	All MS should upload 2009 sprat data into Fishframe before the end of October 2010. Data collected in 2009 Data on landing statistic on monthly and rectangle basis and all commercial sampling on sample basis should be uploaded.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Tapani Pakarinen (FIN) and Nik Probst (GER)
Time frame (Deadline)	To be presented preferably in WGBFAS April 2011 and RCM 2011 (Sept 2011)

Stock variables: Studies on shared international age-length keys	
RCM NS&EA 2010 Recommendations	The RCM NS&EA recommends that a case study for deriving regional stock based age-length keys be carried out for cod in IV. This information is required to evaluate if it is appropriate to introduce task sharing, at stock level, with regard to sampling for ageing of fish.
Follow-up actions needed	Coordinating country to contact UK, Denmark and Sweden for supply of data and support in analyzing the data.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Denmark (Marie Storr-Paulsen) to coordinate and produce working document. Denmark, UK and Sweden should send the sampling data to Marie Storr-Paulsen on request.
Time frame (Deadline)	RCM NS&EA 2011

Stock variables: Studies on shared international age-length keys	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendations	The RCM NA recommends that a case study for deriving regional stock based age-length keys be carried out for mackerel (<i>Scomber scombrus</i>) in the North East Atlantic and Western Channel. This information is required to evaluate if it is appropriate to introduce task sharing, at stock level, with regard to sampling for ageing of fish.
Follow-up actions needed	Coordinating country (Ireland) to contact Spain, United Kingdom, Portugal and The Netherlands for supply of data and support in analyzing the data.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Andy Campbell, Marine Institute, Ireland, to coordinate and produce working document. Spain, United Kingdom, Portugal and The Netherlands should send the sampling data to Andy Campbell (andy.Campbell@marine.ie) on request. ICES
Time frame (Deadline)	RCM NA 2011

LM endorses these recommendations. See also section on the 'Role of the RCM', where the general approach of internationally coordinated sampling efforts is supported by LM.

Task-sharing in ageing:

Stock related variables: task sharing of age reading of species caught in BITS survey and eel	
RCM Baltic 2010 Recommendation	For institutes collecting small volumes of otoliths for certain species and when new species are to be sampled, task sharing of age reading is necessary in order to optimise the use of age reading expertise. The RCM Baltic recommends that the NC's starts to discuss, decide and agree on which MS should be responsible for age reading of species rarely caught in BITS survey (brill, plaice, turbot, dab, sole). An agreement of task sharing for aging eel should also be established.
Follow-up actions needed	Discussion and agreements to be taken place among National Correspondent
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	The Chair or RCM Baltic
Time frame (Deadline)	December 2010

Age reading of eel:

Stock related variables: age reading of eel and use of data in the eel stock assessment	
RCM Baltic 2010 Recommendation	In order to optimise the strategies for age reading of eel and try to come up with proper task sharing of age reading on a regional scale, the WGEEL need to inform RCM Baltic on how / if age disaggregated data on eel will be used in the assessment.
Follow-up actions needed	Inform the RCM Baltic on the data needs for eel stock assessment
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	WGEEL – contact person?
Time frame (Deadline)	WGEEL meeting Sept. 2010

Maturity sampling:

Stock variables: Collection of biological data on IBTS	
RCM NS&EA 2010 Recommendations	RCM NS&EA to identify a list of species which should be sampled for maturity data during the quarter 3 IBTS.
Follow-up actions needed	UK (Scotland) to contact coordinator of the IBTS Q3 to develop a sampling plan to incorporate species indicated in the maturity sampling overview.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Scotland (Ken Coull) to liaise directly with the coordinator of IBTS Q3 (Brian Harley, CEFAS)
Time frame (Deadline)	July 2010
LM 2010 comment	LM endorses this recommendation, and in order to implement this, that ICES should ensure that the ToR for Survey Planning Groups include a standard ToR on the review of RCM recommendations relevant to their Group.

Regional sampling of stocks with national quota/landings shares of <10%:

Stock variables: sampling for stocks where the sum of MS having a share of quotas/landings less than 10%, altogether exceeds 25%	
RCM NS&EA 2010 Recommendations	The RCM NS&EA recommends that relevant countries investigate the distribution of their landings from the named stocks in Table IV-4 in relation to the overall distribution across the stock area. Where they have no sampling plans for catches, they should consider if their component of the stock is adequately sampled, spatially and temporally by other MS.
Follow-up actions needed	Check if MS has catches in this RCM area and if MS has no sampling plans for catches, ensure that its component of the catch is adequately covered elsewhere. MS to report back to RCM NS&EA 2011.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Belgium, Denmark, Germany, France, The Netherlands, Sweden, Portugal and Spain.
Time frame (Deadline)	10 June 2010 for NP Revision

Stock variables: sampling for stocks where the sum of MS having a share of quotas/landings less than 10%, altogether exceeds 25%	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendations	The RCM NA recommends that relevant countries investigate the distribution of their landings from the named stocks in Table IV-4 in relation to the overall distribution across the stock area. Where they have no sampling plans for catches, they should consider if their component of the stock is adequately sampled, spatially and temporally by other MS.
Follow-up actions needed	Check if they have catches in this RCM area and if they have no sampling plans for catches, ensure that their component of the catch is adequately covered elsewhere. MS to report back to RCM NA 2011.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Spain, Ireland, France, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Netherlands, UK, Denmark
Time frame (Deadline)	10 June 2010 for NP Revision

LM endorses these recommendations.

Any other business:

Member States participation to DCF meetings (1) (AOB)	
RCM Med&BS 2010 Recommendation	Because of the necessity to coordinate tasks sharing in both fishing grounds Black sea and Mediterranean region, RCM Med&BS addressed the problem of effective regional coordination with the absence of several member states (in this particular case the Group refers to Greece, Malta and Cyprus). The non-attendance to the DCF meetings (i.e. RCM Med, PGMed, Surveys working groups) may affect negatively also the work of all the other MS. RCM Med&BS recall the importance of the DCF Meetings at Regional level (especially the RCM Med&BS) and stresses the participation in the future meetings of all MS.
Follow-up actions needed	
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS; SGRN; DG MARE
Time frame (Deadline)	
LM 2010 comment	LM would like to recall that MS participation in the relevant RCMs is mandatory. Furthermore, LM considers that RCMs should continue their efforts in inviting third countries with fisheries in the relevant regions.

Member States participation to DCF meetings (2) (AOB)	
RCM Med&BS 2010 Recommendation	Considering the tasks that should be addressed by economists in RCM, 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. MS should ensure the attendance of their national economists.
Follow-up actions needed	
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS; SGRN; Liaison Meeting; DG MARE.
Time frame (Deadline)	
LM 2010 comment	LM endorses this recommendation.

Section 2 – Addressing TOR 2

Regional Data Bases

Review of Surveys

Participation of Economists on RCM's in 2010

Regional database (RDB) - (See also Section 1)

The RDB meeting proposed by the 6th LM took place in Brussels in Feb. 2010. The RCMs have reviewed its report during April-May 2010. The RCM Baltic agreed on using FishFrame as Regional Database, and the RCM NS&EA has concluded on using a disaggregated RDB. The RCM Med&BS considers that no RDB is necessary, that survey DBs are existing and that JRC call data should be accessible. The RCM LDF noted that DBs are available from ICCAT and other relevant RFMOs.

At the RCM NA, a **RDB steering group** was proposed. The LM supports this proposal and considers this group to deal with the Baltic, NS&EA and NA regions, as the majority of requirements of a RDB are pan-European. The level of implementation, however, could differ between regions. The LM was informed that Katja Ringdahl (Sweden) accepted to chair the first meeting of the steering group. The venue has not been clarified yet, and the date should be as soon as possible, e.g. autumn 2010. The LM discussed the eligibility of travel costs for meetings of the steering group, and the Commission clarified that this will not be possible in 2010, but working hours spent on database development could be included in the cost statements.

Review of Surveys - (See Section 1)

The RCMs in April-May 2010 have reviewed the survey list provided by ICES, added the columns demanded by SGRN 09-04, merged lines by survey and added surveys that were not in the list but eligible under the current DCF (e.g. NAFO, redfish surveys). The RCM Med&BS adapted the table to their region, included 8 surveys (5 old, 3 new) and circulated the table among National Correspondents. Moreover, they agreed to provide short descriptions of all surveys. They identified difficulties of some MS not being able to participate in certain surveys.

The LM noted some deviations from the survey evaluation roadmap developed by SGRN 09-04 in terms of timing of the items listed, but the general approach was followed so far.

The LM agreed that RCM chairs should send their completed tables to the Commission until 15 June 2010, and that the Commission produces one compiled file including sheets per region and forwards this file to MS and MEDITS steering committee for filling the gaps, if any, before 25 June back to the Commission. SGRN will not review these tables, but bring them to the attention of STECF Plenary in July 2010 in order to obtain STECF endorsement.

Participation of Economists in RCM's

The LM noted the problem of poor participation by economists in the RCM's. All economists should attend the RCM on Supra regional level. The commitment of economists in the DCF work is limited. One of the problems is that the pool of fisheries economists is small.

LM stress that the role of the economists in the RCM is to ensure the linkages between biological and economical data collection.

LM would ask the Commission to ensure that DCF issues are within the remit of SGECA and to make sure that SGECA is taking care of DCF related issues.

LM recommends that SGECA nominate a person to represent SGECA in the RCM and this person could lead the group and represent the Economists subgroup in the remaining RCMs.

LM recommend that this discussion on the participation of economists in RCMs be held at the upcoming SGRN meeting in June 2010 with the economists present.

The economists register their frustration with the situation.

Section 3 – Addressing TOR 3

Outcome of First RCM Long Distance

The first RCM Long Distance Fisheries (LDF) took place in the premises of the Secretaría General del Mar in Madrid from 3rd to 5th March 2010. It was attended by scientists and two National Correspondents from 10 Member States (ES, FR, GER, IT, LV, LIT, PL, MT, PT, and NL) as well as by 2 representatives from ICCAT (see list of participants, Annex II). A coordination meeting between the chairpersons and the Commission representative took place on 2nd March in the premises of the Spanish Institute of Oceanography (IEO).

In order to introduce the issue the Commission representative made a presentation on the main background elements and on the discussion preceding the constitution of this RCM. The overall objective of the meeting was to address for each one of the relevant fisheries the terms of reference established by the 6th Liaison Meeting last December as follows:

- Allocation fishing grounds/MS
- Current coordination taking place and prospects for future coordination
- Inventory of fisheries, naming conventions
- Identification of metiers (2009 RCMs template to be used)
- End users feedback
- Propose issues for following years

In order to properly discuss these Terms of Reference the participants worked in three sub-groups according to the thematic/geographical criteria:

- CECAF (Scientists from IT, PL, LIT, LV, PT, NL and ES)
- Tuna Fisheries in Atlantic and Indian Oceans (PT, IT, MT, FR, ES)
- SPRFMO (LIT, PL, NL, GER)

The main recommendations from the RCM LDF are given below.

The RCM participants consider that ToR for the forthcoming RCM LDF could be the same as for the others RCM.

The next RCM LDF is scheduled to be held in autumn 2011 as the other RCM. One of the ideas to strengthen cooperation with the Mediterranean and Black Sea RCM and to ensure that both RCM's are going in the same direction, it is proposed to have the two RCM's at the same date and place. RCM LDF will await the decision of RCM Med & BS for the next venue. However, LDF RCM recognizes the organization problems to hold two RCMs on the same date and place. If this situation is not possible, the RCM LDF accept the offer to hold the meeting in Sicily in 2011, and suggest the attendance of the chairman of RCM LDF tuna subgroup to the next RCM Med & BS.

Summary of Recommendations from the Long Distance Fisheries RCM

Métier variables: Fishing activities and sampling coverage	
RCM LDF 2010 Recommendation	All MS involved in industrial small pelagic fishery in “From Morocco to Guinea Bissau” fishing ground to ensure adequate sampling coverage for the landings and discards.
Follow-up actions needed	All MS involved in fishery to draft one agreement to share tasks.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	National Correspondents from all MS involved in fishery. The Netherlands will take initiative.
Time frame (Deadline)	Before the next RCM LDF, to be approved and signed at that RCM.

Allocation of large pelagic species to one or various RCMs	
RCM LDF 2010 Recommendation	Ensure that the Regional Co-ordination Meetings (RCMs) move into the same direction
Follow-up actions needed	Assistance from the LM to have clearer views on allocation of large pelagic species to one or various RCMs
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Liaison Meeting
Time frame (Deadline)	Next Liaison Meeting in 2010.

Métier identification: Codification and naming convention	
RCM LDF 2010 Recommendation	Review the table produced during the meeting and makes a proposal about how to identify and codify their metiers for the next meeting.
Follow-up actions needed	Review codification shown in table 8 at national level.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	All MS involved in tuna and tuna-like fisheries.
Time frame (Deadline)	Before the next RCM LDF, to be shown at the meeting.

Section 4 – Addressing TOR 4

Proposed Workshops and Studies for 2011 and Proposals from economists

The LM considered the following Workshops from the RCM's for 2011. Appropriate LM comments are presented after each proposal.

RCM Baltic

Proposal for a workshop on operating FishFrame 5.0

Workshop Fish frame 5.0 workshop in early 2011	
RCM Baltic 2010 Recommendation	To ensure the wide implementation of for several agreed/recommended tasks, the RCM Baltic recommends that a Fish frame 5.0 workshop should be arranged in early 2011.
Follow-up actions needed	
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	European Commission DG-MARE, MS
Time frame (Deadline)	Early 2010

LM supports this training workshop and it will be hosted by DTU Aqua. The LM proposed that if the WK could not be an ICES WK it should be held as a DCF WK and be on the list for eligible meetings.

RCM NS&EA

Proposal for a Study Group on Discard Sampling

Studies: Study Group on Discard Sampling	
RCM NS&EA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NS&EA recommends establishing a Study Group on Discard Sampling. The main objective of the Study Group is to exchange expertise and experience in sampling techniques and cooperation with the industry.
Follow-up actions needed	ICES to establish Study Group (probably under ACOM)
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	LM meeting to approve, ICES for follow up.
Time frame (Deadline)	2011

LM supports the establishment of the proposed SG. The PGCCDBS chairs will support this and present the proposal to the ICES secretariat.

Proposal for a Workshop on discard estimates

Métier variables: Workshop on discard estimates	
RCM NS&EA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NS&EA considers that, in a situation where sampling resources are limited priority should be given to the sampling of discards in those métiers with high discarding. In order to be able to allocate and prioritize sampling effort to observer programmes at sea or self sampling programmes for estimating discards, preliminary information is required on discarding by métier where it is available. The information required is an estimate of the level of discarding (volume and percentage) and the main species contributing to the discard fraction of the catch.
Follow-up actions needed	MS to prepare information on level of discarding in national métiers collected in recent years to be presented at a dedicated workshop to be defined
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	SGRN to plan a workshop MS to be prepared to provide information for the workshop
Time frame (Deadline)	results to reported to RCM NS&EA in 2011

The LM support this proposal but suggest more information to be provided and will referred to by SGRN and final decision will be taken by SGRN.

RCM NA

Proposal for the study on Harmonized methodology of age estimation procedure

Should be evaluated by the PGCCDBS and the age-reader coordinator forum.
The LM support this proposal.

The RCM Mediterranean and the Black Sea

Workshops

- 1) **An otolith and scale exchange on *M. barbatus* and *M. surmuletus* (2010 proposal)**

LM does not need to consider and the exchange is being conducted within the PGCCDBS/PGMED framework

2) A scale exchange for sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) and Sparidae spp. (2010 proposal)

LM does not need to consider and the exchange is being conducted within the PGCCDBS/PGMED framework

3) A small Angler (*Lophius piscatorius*) and black-bellied angler (*L. budegassa*) otoliths/ilicia exchange for 2011 (2010 proposal)

LM does not need to consider and the exchange is being conducted within the PGCCDBS/PGMED framework

4) Proposal for a Workshop to develop guidelines to convert DCF biological, economic and transversal data to GFCM Task 1 (2010 proposal)

LM support this proposal but suggest that the final ToR should await the outcome of the GFCM workshop to be held in September 2010 and sub-committee meeting.

5) Training workshop on the estimation of capital value and capital costs.

LM support these Workshop Proposals

Proposals from the Economists

CHAIRS COMMENT: Proposals from the Economists: Several participants commented that the proposals from the economists in the draft LM report were unclear. The Commission agreed to redraft these comments and this redrafted material is presented below. Based on feedback from the LM participants, the role of the economists in the RCM's and LM process and the relationships between SGECA and SGRN is clearly an issue that needs to be addressed in 2011.

Response Economists Supra region

Recommendation on common practices of data collection. :

A table summarizing the methodologies across MS for economic variables was prepared by the economists. MS are invited to check the table and input information consistent with their National Programs. SGECA will review the results of this input. Recommendation to be addressed to MS instead of NC's.

LM endorses this recommendation. Table will be circulated to MS. Meant for review by SGECA.. The table has to be completed also by Mediterranean MS.

Workshop proposals:

5 workshop proposals were listed in order of priority and forwarded to SGECA 2010 for further discussion, to name chairs and propose Terms of Reference.

LM supports the ideas of the proposals.

Common understanding of transversal variables

A table summarizing the methodologies across MS for transversal variables was prepared by the economists. MS are invited to check the table and input information consistent with their National Programs.

LM endorses this recommendation. The table should go to back for consideration to the RCM and SGECA. The Mediterranean MS should be included as well in this table.

Link between biologists and economists.

Proposal for a workshop on the common understanding of transversal variables.

LM regards this as a crucial workshop to ensure the linkage between biological and - economic data collection.

LM endorses this proposal for the workshop in early 2011 and recommends including the Mediterranean area following the proposal outlines in the RCM Med report on the effort variables.

RCM Med reiterates the request made by last year. The recommendation of SGRN 09-04 was not clear. So still decision is needed on whether the stated variables should be optional or not. This year RCM Med requests for guidance again.

SGRN will revisit to the recommendation in June 2010 to clarify the matter and provide a final conclusion. LM suggests the SGRN to make clear: For the ranked metiers, the collection of transversal variables is mandatory, for the others the collection is optional.

Data confidentiality

For coordination of sampling, it is crucial to have data on rectangle basis. In some MS, there is a national requirement to cluster at least 10 vessels, but in some cases less than 10, so MS cannot provide data. This hampers coordination. The DCF is overarching the national legal rules. Thus, legal support should be requested how to solve this problem.

LM cannot solve the problem, but needs legal support for a solution. LM endorses the recommendation and encourages MS to seek legal advice.

Economics Med

Economic variables: Clustering of fleet segments

The clustering procedure must follow the statistical methodology provided by SGECA, setting out the different approaches. Further work is to be undertaken at a regional level, through the RCMs.

LM endorses the recommendation as SGECA provided guidance already. For the second part, clarification will be sought in SGRN June 2010.

Common methods to ensure consistency and comparability of economic variables

MSs are requested to perform checks on the quality of their data. Further work is to be undertaken before the RCMs in order to facilitate the recommended comparability checks within regions.

LM endorses/supports the need for these quality checks.

Development of indicators of accuracy and precision

There is a study proposal (2009) to harmonize quality reporting and propose methodology in the case of non-probability sample surveys. The methodological reports should be evaluated and the practice of MSs related to the types of data collection should be checked. More detailed information is needed on how MSs calculate the quality indicator (CV) in their NP

LM endorses/supports the development of these indicators.

Role of SGECA and the role of economists within the RCM framework

The role of the economists in the RCMs should be formalised, for example by considering appointment of a chairperson for the RCM Economist Sub-groups and establishing ToRs for those Sub-groups; and by establishing effective links between the various groups dealing with economic variables. Supported and already discussed.

Storage and provision of meta data

Guidance to be developed (SGECA) as to what definition, storage and provision of metadata should be covered by MSs.

LM requests the Commission to clarify which type of information in terms of meta data MS should be stored in data. Which data should be stored and be accessible to the Commission. In order to assess the status of the data collection. Biological data is down to detailed level.

Section 5 – Addressing TOR 5

RCM's in 2011, Meeting Schedules, TOR's and Infrastructure Issues

The LM agreed that the various RCM's would meet in late 2011 and the following provisional venues and dates were agreed.

- (1) RCM Baltic Sea
Copenhagen, Denmark, September 2011.

- (2) RCM North Sea and East Arctic
Hamburg, Germany September 2011.

- (3) RCM North East Atlantic Area
La Rochelle, France, September 2011

- (4) RCM Mediterranean and Black Sea
- (5) RCM Long Distance Fisheries
Proposal for a Joint Meeting in Slovenia in May 2011,

- (6) 8th Liaison Meeting
Brussels, Belgium, First Week of October.

The key Data Collection Framework meetings and general dates for the second half of 2010 and for 2011

Body	Meeting	2010					2011														
		J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	
STECF / SGRN	SGRN Review of NP																				
	SGRN Review of TR																				
	8 th Liaison Meeting in Oct 2011																				
	STECF Plenary																				
	Research Survey Review																				
Member States	Submission amended NP 2011																				
	Submission amended NP 2012																				
	Adjustment NP																				
	Submission TR and CS																				
	Clarification of TR																				
PG's	PGCCDBS/PGMED																				
RCMs	RCM (Med/Balt/NA/NS&EA/LDF)																				
ICES	ICES Benchmark Wks and assessment WGs																				
	Annual Science Conference																				
NAFO	WGEAFM																				
	SC June meeting																				
	SC September meeting																				
	SC/NIPAG meeting																				

The meeting noted that the LM is not a technical meeting but a co-ordination meeting

Section 6 – Addressing TOR 6

Proposed Studies in 2011, JRC Website

The LM considered the following Studies from the RCM's for 2011. Appropriate LM comments are presented after each proposal.

Studies

1) Study on the adverse impacts of the Black sea fisheries on cetacean populations from EU Black sea waters (2010 proposal)

LM endorses and supports this proposal

2) Study to harmonize quality reporting and propose methodology in the case of non probability sample survey (2009 proposal)

Already dealt with by the Commission

3) Study: standardization of the summer (medias) and winter (ecomed) pelagic surveys carried out in Spanish Mediterranean waters. (2010 proposal)

National issue and should be dealt with the internally by the MS

4) Study: inter-calibration exercise by the medias research vessels. (2010 proposal)

LM support and consider that study is important and it is important for the harmonization. Should wait for the out outcome of the harmonization project. LM suggests that the RCM Mediterranean and the Black Sea at its meeting in 2011 revisit the proposal.

5) Study: Multidisciplinary identification of stock boundaries for stock assessment purposes (through DCR data and other sources) for the most relevant species in the Mediterranean Sea (2009 proposal)

LM recognized the importance of the proposal and have at previous meeting supported the proposal .

RCM Long Distance fisheries

Tagging and biological studies.

LM is not the in a position where it can evaluate the proposal due to the lack of information and suggest that more information is provided for the LM at its meeting in 2011.

JRC Website

The LM noted that no progress has been made on the SGRN website. The LM noted the Sharepoint facilities offered by ICES to the RCM and how important this facility was to the efficient and effective work of the RCM's. The LM had a brief discussion on the issue. Problems persist at the JRC due to staffing shortages. LM recommend that a sharepoint facility be available for SGRN work as soon as possible.

References

- Anon. 2010a. Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for Baltic Sea, 2010. Vilnius, Lithuania, 10th to 14th May 2010
- Anon. 2010b. Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for the North Sea & East Arctic, 2010. Copenhagen, Denmark, 17th to 21st May 2010.
- Anon. 2010c. Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for North East Atlantic area, 2009. Ostend, Belgium, 19th to 22nd April and 31st May to 2nd June 2010 (Final Report not available to LM as RCM only finished on 2nd June 2010).
- Anon. 2010c. Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for the Mediterranean and Black Sea area, 2010. Varna, Bulgaria, 17th to 21st May 2010.
- Anon. 2010d. Report of the Regional Co-ordination Meeting for Long Distance Fisheries 2010. Madrid, Spain, 3rd to 5th March 2010.
- - Anon. 2006. Report of the 2nd Liaison Meeting between the Chairs of the RCMs, the Chair of SGRN and the European Commission Brussels, 6-7 February 2006, 37 pp.
 -
 - EC 2008a. Council Regulation (EC) 199/2008 of 25 February 2008 concerning the establishment of a Community Framework for the collection, management and use of data in fisheries sector for scientific advice regarding the Common Fisheries Policy.
 -
 - EC 2008b. Commission Decision (EC) No 2008/949/EC of 2008 adopting a multi annual Community programme pursuant to Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 establishing 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.
 -
 - Anon. 2009a. Report of the 6th Regional Coordination Meeting for the Mediterranean and Black seas (RCM Med & BS) 2009 Venice, Italy, 13 to 16 October 2009, 155 pp.
 -
 - Anon. 2009b. 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, 42 pp.
 -
 - Anon. 2009c. Report of the 6th Liaison Meeting between the Chairs of the RCMs, the Chair of SGRN, Hamburg, Germany, December 2009.
 -

ANNEX 1

7th Liaison Meeting between the chairs of the RCMs, the chairs of PGCCDBS and PG MED, the chair of SGRN and DG MARE

Terms of Reference

TOR 1. Discussion on possible follow-up to the main outputs of RCMs and to the specific recommendations addressed to the Liaison Meeting.

TOR 2. Discussion on horizontal issues:

- Regional databases: outcomes of the Workshop and position of the RCMs
- Feedback from data end users : implication on the evaluation of Annual Reports 2009
- Surveys: Analyse the information provided by MS according to templates agreed by SGRN-09-04
- Participation of economists on RCMs 2010

TOR 3. Outcomes of the first RCM Long Distance

TOR 4. Workshops:

- Review of list 2011
- Proposals from the economists

TOR 5. RCMs 2011 issues: schedule, ToRs, infrastructure issues

TOR 6. Studies and AOB

- Studies 2011
- JRC Website

ANNEX 2

7th Liaison Meeting between the chairs of the RCM's, the chairs of PGCCDBS, PGMED and SGRN and DG MARE

ILVO Institute, Ostende, Belgium.

Thursday 3rd and Friday 4th June 2010

DRAFT AGENDA

(Version 1)

Thursday 3rd June 2010 (Start 9am – Finish 6.15pm)

- 09.00 Introduction and Welcome
Meeting Logistics and Information
Format and Content of Meeting Report
- 09.30 Review of 6th Liaison Meeting Report
Have Action Points Been Followed up ?
Any outstanding Issues?
- 10.15 Addressing TOR 1 – Outputs from RCM Meetings
Key outcomes from each RCM (Presentation by each Chair)
Identify who will follow up outcomes ?
Specific Recommendations for the 7th Liaison Meeting
- 13.00 LUNCH
- 14.00 TOR 1 Continued
- 15.30 Addressing TOR 2 – Horizontal Issues
Regional Databases
Outcome of Workshop
Current Position of each RCM
A Way Forward
- Feedback from Data End Users
- Survey Review
Update from RCM Discussions
Analyses of Information provided by MS according to
template in SGRN 09-04
- Participation of Economists at RCM's 2010
- 17.00 Addressing TOR 3 – Long Distance RCM

(If not already covered in TOR 1)

17.15 Addressing TOR 4 – Workshops
Review List for 2011
Proposals from Economists
Recommendations

18.00 Recap on Day 1
Outstanding Issues from Day 1
Plan for Day 2
Report Status
Allocation of Homework

18.15 Close Day 1

20.00 Group Meal

Friday 4th June 2010 (Start 9am – Finish 13.00pm)

09-00 Plan for Day 2

09-15 Addressing TOR 5 – RCM's in 2011
Issues to be Addressed
Preparing TOR's
Meeting Schedule (Dates and Venues)
Infrastructure Issues

10.30 Addressing TOR 6 – Studies and AOB
Studies 2011
JRC Website – Status and Discussion

11-15 7th Liaison Meeting Report
Main Meeting Recommendations – Go Over Text
Status of the Report – Task Allocation

12-00 Final Discussions on Outstanding Issues
Completion of Report – Task Allocation and Timelines

13-00 Close of Meeting

14-00 Chair Finalise Available Material into Report

Final Outstanding Material to be received by 10th June
Draft Report to be circulated Monday 14th June

Annex 3

Participant Details

NAME	ADDRESS	e-mail
Jukka Ponni	Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute, Kotka, Unit Sapokankatu 2 48100 Kotka, FINLAND	jukka.ponni@rktl.fi
Sieto Veruer	CUO, Po Box 68, 1970 AB Ijmiuiden, NETHERLANDS	sieto.verver@wur.nl
Jorgen Dalskov	DTU Aqua Charlottenlund Slot, 2920 Charlottenlund, DENMARK	jd@aqua.dtu.dk
Els Torreele	ILVO Fisheries, Ankerstroot, 8400 Oostende, BELGIUM	Els.torreele@ilvo.olaudereu.be
Mark Dimech	Agriculture and Fisheries Regulation Department, MRRA, Fort San Lucjos, Marsaxlokk BBG 1293, MALTA	Mark.dimech@gov.mt
Christoph Stransky	VTI Institute of Sea Fisheries, Palmaille 9, 22767 Hamburg, GERMANY	Christoph.stransky@vti.bund.de
Antonio Cervantes	European Commission Joseph II 79, 1049, BRUSSELS	Antonio.cervantes@ec.europa.eu

Anger Calvo	European Commission Joseph II 79, 1049, BRUSSELS	Angel-andres.calvo- sants@ec.europa.eu
Paolo Carpentieri	University of Rome, 00185 Roma, ITALY	Paolo.carpentieri@uniroma1.it
Paul Connolly	The Marine Institute, Oranmore, Galway, IRELAND	Paul.connolly@marine.ie
Joel Vingeau	IFREMER, Nantes, FRANCE	j.vingeau@ifremer.fr

ANNEX 4

Full List of Recommendations from the 2010 RCM NA

(From Section 10 of the RCM NA Report – Pages 65-74)

DCF requirements : Reference landings by country	
RCM NA 2009 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends MS to upload the landings in EUROSTAT by ICES division and by gender and species, and avoid as much as possible the use of the generic code “spp”. It is reminded that STECF (2007) recommended the use of EUROSTAT as the reference for landings by country and area, and that all effort should be done to secure the quality of information provided to EUROSTAT. RCM NA recommends EUROSTAT to promulgate its transmission procedure for this kind of data, to all MS.
Follow-up actions needed	All MS EUROSTAT for promulgation of transmission procedure.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	National Correspondents
Time frame (Deadline)	No time frame

DCF requirements :collection of otoliths of turbot and John Dory	
RCM NA 2009 Recommendation	In order to increase the number of collected otoliths, RCM NA recommends all surveys to collect otoliths on every specimen of turbot and John Dory caught. RCM NA recommends MS to use the NESPMAM report for the procedure of age reading of John Dory, ICES WKART report for turbot and ICES WGNEW for data requirements, and distribution of sampling effort among participating MS.
Follow-up actions needed	Collection of otoliths during the surveys
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS, survey responsables and steering groups
Time frame (Deadline)	As soon as 2010

Feedback from assessment working groups : WGHMM	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends Ireland to clarify the situation regarding the non provision of revised tuning catches of megrim (Mgw-78 stock) since 2007, directly with the stock coordinator. This is a reiteration of last year’s recommendation. RCM NA recommends Portugal to contact stock coordinator for clarification on tuning fleets used for megrim (Mgb-8c9a stock). This is a reiteration of last

	year's recommendation.
Follow-up actions needed	Ireland and Portugal to liaise with relevant megrim stock coordinator
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Ireland
Time frame (Deadline)	Before WGHM 2011

Feedback from assessment working groups : WGHMM	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	All MS should deliver the data in time of expert groups, and SGRN should ensure the follow-up of this obligation while evaluating the NP proposals and technical reports. RCM NA was informed that the French 2009 problem affected most of the fisheries statistics and that a revision of all the data referring to 2009 should be made for the 2011 assessment working groups.
Follow-up actions needed	France to submit a revision of 2009 fisheries statistics in 2011 to the relevant expert groups. SGRN to give a special attention to this issue.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	France, SGRN
Time frame (Deadline)	Before expert groups 2011

Feedback from assessment working groups : WGHMM	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends ICES WGCHAIRS to consider the discards data requirements for stock assessment purposes during their next meeting (see also recommendation of RCM NS&EA for a term of reference on data issues for the next ICES WGCHAIRS). The requirements should consider the raising protocols and the stratification levels.
Follow-up actions needed	Item to be added to the term of reference proposed by RCM NS&EA for ICES WGCHAIRS
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	ICES
Time frame (Deadline)	September 2010.

Feedback from assessment working groups : WGHMM	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends MS to include a detailed methodology on the method used for estimating the catches of the 2 Lophius species. This description should be sent to the WGHMM Lophius stock coordinators in 2011 and included in a revised NP proposal.
Follow-up actions needed	Prepare a document to be forwarded to the WGHMM Lophius stock coordinators.
Responsible persons for	All MS having catches of Lophius in the Atlantic

follow-up actions	
Time frame (Deadline)	Early 2011

Feedback from assessment working groups : WGHMM	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends MS to forward to stock coordinators all their available data issued from the DCF, including stock-related variables such as growth, sex-ratio and maturity.
Follow-up actions needed	Transmission of all available DCF data to stock coordinators.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	All MS
Time frame (Deadline)	Early 2011

Feedback from assessment working groups : WGHMM	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends France and Belgium to investigate the cause of the discrepancies on weights at age, before the benchmark workshop 2011.
Follow-up actions needed	Prepare a working document for the benchmark 2011
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	France and Belgium
Time frame (Deadline)	Early 2011

Feedback from assessment working groups : Online database	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends ICES to reflect on the setting of an online 'recommendation database', with AWG, PGCCDBS, RCM chairs, National correspondents and other relevant people having access and being able to comment and update the status of each of the recommendations.
Follow-up actions needed	Setting of a public online database.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	ICES, DG-MARE
Time frame (Deadline)	Before March 2011 (for PGCCDBS first use)

Metier and stock variables : Reference tables	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends that the reference tables proposed in the 1 st part of its 2010 meeting be further refined and that SGRN should lead the process.
Follow-up actions needed	Setting of a reference tables for reporting DCF activities.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	SGRN
Time frame	June or July 2010 meeting

(Deadline)	
------------	--

Metier and stock variables : descriptions of nationally ranked métiers.	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM 2010 recommends that MS use the template provided by RCM NA 2009 to update old métier descriptions (when needed) and describe new ranking métiers identified at this RCM, and strictly respect the agreed naming conventions of fishing ground and métiers as well as the deadline for submission of the information. Appointed persons are responsible for requesting the data and compiling it on a regional level.
Follow-up actions needed	Preparation of métier descriptions/exchange data for task-sharing.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	All MS.
Time frame (Deadline)	Every year before RCM meetings.

Métier variables: concurrent sampling.	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM 2010 provides a template for summarizing national information on the actions undertaken by MS to include concurrent sampling in their sampling programmes, and recommends that MS use this template to document their activities regarding this topic.
Follow-up actions needed	Preparation of national descriptions on concurrent sampling.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCM participants and MS without delegates in RCM NA 2010.
Time frame (Deadline)	Before RCM 2011

Métier variables: concurrent sampling.	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM 2010 recommends SGRN to review the actions undertaken by MS regarding concurrent sampling, and give feedback to RCM for the 2011 meeting.
Follow-up actions needed	Preparation and collection of national descriptions on concurrent sampling .
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCM participants and MS without delegates in RCM NA 2010.
Time frame (Deadline)	Before RCM 2011

Metier and stock variables : Regional ranking	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends Spain to provide the information on the total value of the landings per metier and fishing ground before the RCM 2011, in order to perform a full regional ranking
Follow-up actions needed	Provide a revision of the NP proposal table III_C_1.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Spain
Time frame (Deadline)	September 2011.

Metier variables : Sampling coordination	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends Spain and Portugal to arrange between them a common split of mesh size ranges for their pot and net fisheries.
Follow-up actions needed	Propose common split of mesh size for potters and netters in the area
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Portugal, Spain
Time frame (Deadline)	Before RCM NA 2011

Metier variables : Sampling coordination.	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA 2010 recommends MS to review precisely all statements made by RCM NA in the section describing the fishing and sampling activities per fishing grounds, and propose actions. RCM NA recommends SGRN to use the tables proposed by RCM NA in its evaluation of NP proposals 2011-2013 in June 2010.
Follow-up actions needed	Propose actions in line with RCM NA recommendations.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	All MS, SGRN.
Time frame (Deadline)	June 2010, Revision of the NP proposals after SGRN evaluation.

Métier variables: Inclusion of bilateral and RCM agreements in NP.	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	Revised National Programmes to include appropriate reference to RCM NA report in relation to sampling agreement at métier level. National Programmes to include in annex formal bilateral agreements, using the template in annex 9.
Follow-up actions needed	National Correspondents to ensure that National Programme includes appropriate reference to RCM and bilateral agreements in relation to sampling activities as referred to in the RCM NA report.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	National Correspondents
Time frame	March 2011
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA 2010 recommends Scotland to liaise with Belgium to (investigate whether it is possible to) set up a regional coordination allowing for turbot and brill otoliths that were collected by Scotland to be transferred to Belgium for age reading.
Follow-up actions needed	Document availability of turbot and brill otoliths collected by Scotland. When relevant, sign agreement on regional coordination.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCM NA participants from UK-SCO and BEL.
Time frame (Deadline)	Before end of 2010

Métier variables: Allocation of sampling by France	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM 2010 recommends France to allocate precisely the sampling at-sea before SGRN June meeting, taking into considerations the recommendations given per fishing ground and métier in section 4.1.5
Follow-up actions needed	France to update NP proposal 2011-2013 text and tables.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	France
Time frame (Deadline)	Before June 2010

Recreational fisheries: Best practice.	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends MS not to wait for the outcomes of the PGRFS to revise current (when relevant) and prepare future NP Proposal on recreational fisheries, but base their planning on the DCF requirements and their own knowledge of the fisheries. RCM NA also recommends to consider the recommendations of WKSMRF, WGEEL, and the future recommendations of PGRFS.
Follow-up actions needed	Revising MS NP proposals 2011-2013 and drafting new NP's.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	All MS.
Time frame (Deadline)	October 2011

Recreational fisheries: Review of actions proposed in National Programmes regarding recreational fisheries.	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends that a first review of the actions concerning recreational sampling that were proposed by MS in their NP's 2011-2013 should be taken care of by PGRFS. At a later stage, RCM NA will identify whether there is scope for regional coordination in this field.
Follow-up actions needed	Review at PGRFS.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCM NA participants that also join PGRFS.
Time frame (Deadline)	Before PGRFS

Stock related variables: Inconsistencies in NP proposal tables	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	In order to have correct reference list of species and stocks in Appendix VII 2010/93 and to avoid inconsistencies and errors in the tables filled in by MS in their NP proposals, the following is recommended: All MS should look for inconsistencies and errors and suggest on corrections this refers to naming of stock/area, species included and errors in sampling level.
Follow-up actions needed	MS to provide their comments to the RCM NA chair.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Chair of RCM NA to collate the comments received from MS and pass these to the Chair of SGRN.
Time frame (Deadline)	End of June 2010

Stock variables: Studies on shared international age-length keys	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendations	The RCM NA recommends that a case study for deriving regional stock based age-length keys be carried out for mackerel (<i>Scomber scombrus</i>) in the North East Atlantic and Western Channel. This information is required to evaluate if it is appropriate to introduce task sharing, at stock level, with regard to sampling for ageing of fish.
Follow-up actions needed	Coordinating country (Ireland) to contact Spain, United Kingdom, Portugal and The Netherlands for supply of data and support in analyzing the data.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Andy Campbell, Marine Institute, Ireland, to coordinate and produce working document. Spain, United Kingdom, Portugal and The Netherlands should send the sampling data to Andy Campbell (andy.Campbell@marine.ie) on request. ICES.
Time frame (Deadline)	RCM NA 2011

Stock variables: sampling for stocks where the sum of MS having a share of quotas/landings less than 10%, altogether exceeds 25%	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendations	19 The RCM NA recommends that relevant countries investigate the distribution of their landings from the named stocks in Table ### in relation to the overall distribution across the stock area. Where they have no sampling plans for catches, they should consider if their component of the stock is adequately sampled, spatially and temporally by other MS.
Follow-up actions needed	Check if they have catches in this RCM area and if they have no sampling plans for catches, ensure that their component of the catch is adequately covered elsewhere. MS to report back to RCM NA 2011.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Spain, Ireland, France, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Netherlands, UK, Denmark.
Time frame (Deadline)	10 June 2010 for NP Revision

Quality issue: Transmission of data	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA recommends the European Commission, together with STECF to reflect on a standard data exchange format an a 'universal' coding for all the variables issued from the DCF. When a modification of the Comm. Dec. will occur, RCM NA recommends setting an annex of the decision with all the DCF codifications.
Follow-up actions needed	Propose a standard data exchange format and common codification to be used when exchanging DCF data.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	DG-MARE, STECF
Time frame (Deadline)	End of 2010

Quality issue: Regional DataBase	
RCM NA 2010	A steering committee on RDB should be set up with the

Recommendation	<p>following :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pre-requisite <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organisation of the steering comity: participants (all member states interested for RDB in NA, EC ?), relation with other regions (a supra-steering comity or a unique steering group with all regions ?) ▪ Responsibility and decision level of the steering group ▪ Discussion and validation of requirements according to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Specifications : functionalities (database, use of an existing solution , management of data calls, publication of references data or aggregated data, harmonized data exchange format, frequence of deposit of data, synchronisation with NDB, quality of datasets, coverage of datasets, hosting of database, etc.) ▪ And level of security required : responsibilities, what types of users (MS, EC, general public for several data access ?) for what use of data, availability/integrity/confidentiality ▪ Evaluation of needs/requirements/protocols for content and technical governance, users support, ect. ▪ First evaluation of the costs ▪ Go/No Go for the better scenario <p>Further, the following items should be addressed before starting the implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Steering of progress, allocation of budget and appropriateness of resources, plan project management
Follow-up actions needed	20 SGRN to discuss the issue in one of the 2010 meeting
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	SGRN, DG-MARE
Time frame (Deadline)	July 2010

Quality issue : COST 2	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	RCM NA considers that given the fact that most likely, almost all Member States involved in the DCF will use COST for computing their precision levels for 2009 and prepare assessment working groups, resulting in a positive attitude of the EC towards the implementation of COST, a follow up of the COST project – COST 2- is required. The framework for the continuation of the project has several objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6. avoiding the development of national versions of the tool 7. creating a functional help mailing list and expanding/enhancing the examples (taking into account the simulation outcomes). 8. correcting the possible bugs, improving the code, adapting to new versions of exporting (InterCatch) 9. Progressing on benchmarking the methods and simulating different sampling schemes and levels with COSTsim 10. Make the tool user friendly
Follow-up actions needed	MS to start to implement COST
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	21 All MS
Time frame (Deadline)	Results to be reported to EC and RCM NA in 2011

Quality issue: Optimising discards sampling	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	Along with RCM NS&EA, RCM NA recommends SGRN to initiate a reflection on the cost efficiency of discards estimates, taking into considerations the enormous data collected so far in the frame of the DCR and DCF, and the expertise gained.
Follow-up actions needed	Modification of the Comm. Dec EU/2010/93.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	DG-MARE, SGRN
Time frame (Deadline)	Mid 2011

AOB - WKEID Data needs and identification of key fisheries	
RCM NA 2010 Recommendation	The RCM NA recommends that GNS_DEF_120-219_0_0 in the Celtic Sea and West of Ireland and OTM_SPF_32-69_0_0 all fishing grounds are used as case studies for North Atlantic in the ICES WKEID. The RCM NA further recommend MS submit data to the ICES WKEID.
Follow-up actions needed	WKEID to use the suggested metiers as case studies. Chairs to provide MS with the data format definition. MS to submit data
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Chairs WKEID, MS
Time frame (Deadline)	Early September 2010

