

**Report of the
Regional Co-ordination Group
for the Long Distance Fisheries
(RCG LDF)
2018**

Fish Resources Research department of institute BIOR
Riga, Latvia
3-5 July2018

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 1. | Executive summary | 3 |
| 2. | Introduction | 4 |
| 2.1 | General | 4 |
| 2.2 | Legal requirements | 4 |
| 2.2.1 | Background of RCG LDF | 4 |
| 2.2.2 | Establishment of RCG LDF | 4 |
| 2.3 | Terms of Reference | 5 |
| 2.4 | Structure of the report..... | 5 |
| 2.5 | Participants and agenda..... | 6 |
| 2.6 | Response to 2018 data call | 6 |
| 2.7 | Preparation of 2019 data call..... | 8 |
| 3. | Review of EU Long Distance Fisheries activities (ToR 3) | 9 |
| 3.1 | CECAF area | 9 |
| 3.2 | SPRFMO area | 17 |
| 3.3 | Other areas..... | 17 |
| 4. | Review progress in regional co-ordination since the 2016 RCM (ToR 1) | 19 |
| 4.1 | Follow-up of the 14 th Liaison Meeting..... | 19 |
| 4.2 | Feedback STECF EWG 18-04 | 19 |
| 5. | Feedback from end users and 2018 state-of-play (ToR 2) | 20 |
| 5.1 | CECAF | 20 |
| 5.2 | SPRFMO..... | 21 |
| 5.3 | SPRFMO observer requirements..... | 21 |
| 5.4 | State-of-play 2018 data collection..... | 23 |
| 5.4.1 | SPRFMO | 23 |
| 5.4.2 | CECAF | 24 |
| 6. | Regional data collection, analysis and storage and the evolution towards RCGs (ToR 4)..... | 26 |
| 6.1 | Ranking of métier to find out whether any of the NPs need to be modified for 2018 | 26 |
| 6.2 | Use of RDB..... | 26 |
| 6.3 | Rules of procedures for future RCG work..... | 26 |
| 6.4 | Time frame for RCG LDF actions | 27 |
| 7. | Data collection of small pelagics in CECAF and SPRFMO area (ToR 5)..... | 29 |
| 7.1 | Data collection of small pelagics in SPRFMO area from 2019 onwards | 29 |
| 7.2 | Data collection of small pelagics in CECAF area..... | 29 |
| 8. | Any other business (ToR 6) | 30 |
| 8.1 | Surveys, studies and pilot projects..... | 30 |
| 8.2 | Call for tenders for studies in support of the CFP..... | 30 |
| 8.3 | Chairmanship, timing and venue of the RCM LDF meeting in 2019 | 30 |
| 8.4 | Draft ToR 2019..... | 31 |
| 9. | Recommendations..... | 32 |
| 10. | Glossary | 33 |
| 11. | Annexes | 34 |
| 11.1 | Annex 1 – Agenda..... | 34 |
| 11.2 | Annex 2 – Landings by species by area reported by MS | 36 |
| 11.3 | Annex 3 – RDB reference lists | 45 |
| 11.4 | Annex 4 – Amendment to the multilateral agreement for sampling small pelagics in SPRFMO area | 48 |
| 11.5 | Annex 5 - Rules of procedures for RCG LDF..... | 50 |

1. Executive summary

The 2018 RCG LDF meeting was held from July 3 to 5 at the Fish Resources Research department of institute BIOR, Riga, Latvia with the aim to address its Terms of Reference and to provide a platform for an overview of the EU Long Distance Fisheries over the previous year in order to evaluate the scope of required regional coordination in area of data collection.

The group reviewed the progress in regional coordination since 2017, the outcomes of the 14th Liaison Meeting and feedback from the end-users. Also, the group reviewed the Long Distance Fisheries activity by MS in CECAF and SPRMFO areas with the use of updated 2017 data provided by MS. There were relatively limited EU fishing activities in the SPRMFO area in 2017, as was in previous years.

As done during the previous years, all EU non-landlocked countries were addressed through a data call. The response provided improved insight in the coverage of the data the RCG LDF is using. To address the expressed interest and need stemming from the DG MARE International Directorate to support the development of a database holding the data for fisheries in non-EU waters, the RCG LDF will be included in the Regional Database as currently in use by the RCGs dealing with EU waters. The RCG LDF provided updated reference lists to fill the RDB reference tables, thus ensuring the capacity to upload the data.

In order to check whether there were any substantial changes in the fishing pattern in the CECAF area in 2017 the group updated last year's overviews and compared the updated version to these. Based on that comparison, the RCG LDF concluded that there is no direct need for amendments to the NPs for 2019 in respect of the long distance fisheries in the area of competence.

The current agreement for sampling small pelagics in the SPFRMO area terminates by the end of 2018, future setups were discussed by the group and it was concluded that the current agreement was amended regarding the end date as well as the budget. The agreement was extended to 2020, leaving Poland in the lead to facilitate sampling in the region on behalf of all partners involved.

RCG LDF established its rules of procedures shortly after the meeting. The RoPs are based on the RCG NA RoPs as were drafted in 2017. RCG LDF made relative minor additions to these RoPs. Italy agreed to become a member of the RCG LDF as well.

Both the establishment of the RoP as well as the amendment to the multilateral agreement for sampling in the SPFRMO area were due to be recommended for intersessional work. However, due to successful participation to the meeting by all National Correspondents (or mandated representatives) both recommendations could be settled during the meeting or very shortly after. Thus, no outstanding recommendations remained after the meeting.

The next RCG LDF meeting is planned for June 2018, and Spain kindly offered to host this meeting in Tenerife.

2. Introduction

2.1 General

The 2018 RCM LDF meeting was held from July 3 to 5 at the Fish Resources Research department of institute BIOR in Riga, Latvia, addressing its Terms of Reference set for the 2018 RCG and to provide a platform for an overview of the EU long distance fisheries over the previous year(s) in order to evaluate the scope for required regional coordination in area of data collection.

RCM LDF much appreciated the excellent great facilities and organisation offered by BIOR, facilitating effective and productive work of the group in a good atmosphere. The continued availability of a SharePoint hosted by ICES proved to be very efficient again in support of organising the work before, during and after the meeting.

2.2 Legal requirements

2.2.1 Background of RCG LDF

The EU Data Collection Framework (DCF) establishes a framework for the collection of economic, biological and transversal data by Member States (MS). This programme provides the basic data needed to evaluate the state of fishery resources and the fisheries sector.

Prior to the current Regulation, the RCG LDF (at that time RCM) stemmed from the Data Collection Framework (EC Regulation no. 199/2008), establishing a community framework for the collection, management and use of data in fisheries sector for scientific advice regarding the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP). According to this regulation and without prejudice to their current data collection obligations under Community law, Member States (MS) were obliged to 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 2010/93/EU specifying practical aspects for data collection, actions planned by MS in their national programme should be presented according to the predefined regions.

The coordination of the data collection was recommended at regional level and specific meetings were in charge of facilitating this and these meetings aimed to identify areas for standardisation, collaboration and task sharing between MS. RCMs were held annually with participants from each MS involved in fishing activity in the respective region. Being an end-user, RCM LDF might launch data calls to gather the information needed to complete its tasks.

From mid-2017 onwards, regulation 199/2008 was repealed and replaced by a new regulation. As a basic principle, the new Regulation (REGULATION (EU) 2017/1004) stipulates that “...*Member States shall coordinate their data collection activities with other Member States in the same marine region and shall make every effort to coordinate their actions with third countries having sovereignty or jurisdiction over waters in the same marine region.*” Apart from the requirement to establish Regional Coordination Groups (see following section), the Regulation also foresees the participation and contribution by the relevant MS as well as their respective National Correspondents.

2.2.2 Establishment of RCG LDF

During the 2nd RCG LDF meeting in 2017, the requirement for a formal establishment of the RCG was discussed and concluded upon by all parties present at the meeting. This conclusion led to the following statement regarding the establishment of RCG LDF:

Having regard Article 9.2 of REGULATION (EU) 2017/1004, stipulating that regional coordination groups shall be established by the relevant Member States for each marine region, and, having considered all regions outside EU waters as a marine region and in continuation of the previous definition of the RCM marine regions and having relevant Member States present at a meeting succeeding the RCM LDF 2016, the Regional Coordination Group for Long Distance Fisheries has been

established upon opening of the 2nd RCG LDF meeting on November 22, 2017 in Copenhagen, Denmark.

2.3 Terms of Reference

The following terms of reference were set for RCG LDF 2018:

Terms of Reference – RCM LDF 2018

1. Review progress since 2017 following up the 14th Liaison Meeting report

2. Review feedback from end users and how informative it is/how it can be improved, including NC meetings

3. Analyse data from 2018 RCM LDF data call

- Data compilation, providing overviews of fisheries
- Consider EU wide responses
- Consider future inclusion of emerging fisheries

4. Regional data collection, analysis and storage and the evolution towards RCGs

- Consider new DCF and EU-MAP, Work Plan and the implications including thresholds, cost sharing, regionalisation.
- Consider future mechanisms to continue strengthening regional cooperation incl funding
- Discuss data collection and dissemination in relation to scientific committees
- Define Rules of Procedures for RCG LDF

5. Future data collection set up in CECAF/SPRFMO

6. AOB

- Place and date of the next RCM/RCG LDF
- Studies and tenders

2.4 Structure of the report

ToR addressed by the 2018 RCG LDF meeting (July 3-5, 2018, Riga, Latvia) are referred to in the following sections of the report.

| | | |
|-------|---|--------------|
| ToR 1 | - | in section 4 |
| ToR 2 | - | in section 5 |
| ToR 3 | - | in section 3 |
| ToR 4 | - | in section 6 |
| ToR 5 | - | in section 7 |
| ToR 6 | - | in section 8 |

Recommendations, if any, stemming from this group are collected in section 9

2.5 Participants and agenda

The following persons participated to the RCG LDF meeting in 2018. On Thursday, a Skype session was held to allow for the (additional) participation of Spain, Germany and Italy.

| Name | Email address | Organisation | Mandate |
|---|--------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Antonio Cervantes | antonio.cervantes@ec.europa.eu | European Commission, DG MARE, unit C3 | NA |
| Christoph Stransky (skype session) | christoph.stransky@thuenen.de | Thünen-Institut for Seafisheries in Bremerhaven (DE) | Full NC Mandate |
| Didzis Ustups (part-time) | didzis.ustups@bior.lv | Fish Resources Research Department in Riga (LV) (National Correspondent) | Full NC Mandate |
| Eva García Isarch | eva.garcia@ieo.es | Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Centro Oceanográfico de Cádiz (ES) | NA |
| Irek Wójcik | iwojcik@mir.gdynia.pl | National Marine Fisheries Research Institute in Gdynia (PL) | Full NC Mandate |
| Jūrandā Savukynienė (by correspondence) | Juranda.Savukyniene@zum.lt | Fisheries department of the Ministry of Agriculture, Lithuania | Full NC Mandate |
| Kay Panten | kay.panten@thuenen.de | Thünen-Institut for Seafisheries in Bremerhaven (DE) | NA |
| Maksims Kovšars | maksims.kovsars@bior.gov.lv | Fish Resources Research Department in Riga (LV) | NA |
| Romas Statkus | romas.statkus@zuv.lt | Fishery Service, Ministry of Agriculture (LT) | NA |
| Sieto Verver (Chair) | sieto.verver@wur.nl | Centre for fisheries research (CVO), IJmuiden, The Netherlands | Delegated NC Mandate |
| Evelina Sabatella (Skype session) | e.sabatella@nisea.eu | Ministero Politiche Agricole, Alimentari e Forestali, Mipaaf, Rome, Italy | Full NC Mandate |
| María Moset Martínez (Skype session) | smosetma@mapama.es | Subdirección General de Protección de los Recursos Pesqueros, Madrid, Spain (acting National Correspondent) | Delegated NC Mandate |

The agenda of the meeting is included in Annex 1.

2.6 Response to 2018 data call

As in previous years, prior to the 2018 annual RCG LDF meeting and in line with the continued 2015 recommendation to address future data calls to all non-landlocked MS, the 2018 data call was sent to all National Correspondents of these MS. The call was launched at May 4th and in line with Regulation 2017/1004 of May 17th, 2017, the response deadline was 2 months later. However, by the time the deadline would pass, the RCG meeting would have already started. Therefore the MS were kindly requested to deliver the data by 25th of June at the latest, to allow for some pre-checking of data. The request was fortunately met by all respondents, so RCG LDF was pleased to see that all MS responded in a timely manner to the call, either by providing data or by indication that no relevant long distance fisheries occur in the respective MS. This active response indicating the absence of long distance fisheries was also requested in the data call.

The following list provides a general overview of the responses received by RCG LDF. The highlighted row is explained in the following paragraph. This overview doesn't discriminate between the various types of responses received. Some responses were not complete regarding full coverage or

appropriate level of detail. Value was almost never filled in as was sampling. Both items are of less relevance and were not considered crucial in terms of the response. Especially as value is no longer a criterion for determination of the sampling obligations. RCG LDF concluded that from 2019 onwards value shall no longer be included in the call.

As planned but not completed in 2018, future data calls will be adapted in terms of text (description of the level of detail and historical perspective), in terms of parameters requested and the format to be used (move from spreadsheets to RDB storage). This adaptation will bring this data call in line with other calls and will better reflect the data needed for the tasks at hand.

Table 2-1 Overview of 2018 data call response

| MS | Response (Y/N) | Activity (Y/N) | Data provided (Y/N) |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Belgium | Yes | No | No |
| Bulgaria | Yes | No | No |
| Croatia | Yes | No | No |
| Cyprus | Yes | No | No |
| Denmark | Yes | No | No |
| Estonia | Yes | No | No |
| Finland | Yes | No | No |
| France | No | No | No |
| Germany | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Greece | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ireland | Yes | (historical) | Yes |
| Italy | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Latvia | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lithuania | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Malta | Yes | No | No |
| Netherlands | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Poland | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Portugal | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Romania | Yes | No | No |
| Slovenia | Yes | No | No |
| Spain | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Sweden | Yes | No | No |
| United Kingdom | Yes | (historical) | Yes |

In line with the request from the 2017 RCG LDF, both Italy and Ireland provided updates to their respective historical data. Greece did not provide effort data due to confidentiality issues, RCG LDF is however of the opinion that a limited number of vessels should not hamper data delivery. France did not deliver any data or response. RCG LDF is not in the position to judge whether activities would be reported or not.

RCM LDF processed all data provided. The results are presented in chapter 3 and lead to a few suggestions.

- Based on the outcomes, suggestions for future recodification of metiers are provided to Italy and Portugal to ensure alignment with other metiers, see section 3.1.
- The data analysis also flagged the potential need for Italy to review sampling needs for *Penaeus spp* and *Sepia spp* in the CECAF area, depending on progress regarding the relevant SFPA (Section 3.1).

2.7 Preparation of 2019 data call

RCG LDF wishes to prepare the 2019 data at an earlier stage prior to the meeting, facilitating both a timely upload as well as preparatory work. The 2019 call aims to include the data into the Regional database, thus allowing MS to have more time to adapt to this changes is desirable. The actual deadlines should be set in line with the dates of the RCG LDF in 2019 and the provisions in the current DCF. Ideally, the deadline for data submission is 1 month before the meeting starts, as this will also allow ICES to contribute to the data extraction if needed while leaving sufficient time to prepare data and tables prior to the meeting. The 2019 data call will request data from 2014 onwards, but will invite MS to deliver historical data to the RDB when possible.

Section 6.2 provided further details on future use of the RDB for this RCG.

3. Review of EU Long Distance Fisheries activities (ToR 3)

3.1 CECAF area

After the RCM-LDF 2015 decision of including "Canary" as a new fishing ground, the three fishing grounds considered for CECAF are:

| FISHING GROUND | Area | FAO divisions |
|---|---------------|--|
| Madeira | EU waters | 34.1.2 |
| Canary Islands | | |
| From Morocco to Guinea Bissau (to be renamed West Africa) | Non EU waters | 34.1.1; 34.1.3; 34.3.1, 34.3.3, 34.3.6, 47 |

In Madeira and the Canaries, only Portuguese and Spanish vessels, respectively, operate and the fisheries/metiers are already included in respective National Work Plans and therefore, coordination between MS is not needed.

Fishery data are presented separately for the three Fishing grounds: "West Africa", "Madeira" and "Canary Islands". As suggested by the EC in previous meetings, the fishery information of those fisheries developed under direct authorizations¹ in fishing areas even southern Guinea-Bissau was reported for the first time in this RCG. Therefore, we suggest to rename the fishing ground corresponding to non EU waters as "West Africa" instead "From Morocco to Guinea Bissau". Note that the fishing ground where the EU is operating in Angola (FAO 47) is considered as belonging to the CECAF area (FAO 34).

FISHING GROUND "WEST AFRICA"

The information below describes the general types of fisheries in the relevant West African CECAF areas by MS (2017) as an overview of the CECAF fisheries carried out by EU-fleets. Some fisheries cover very large areas along the West African shelf. As non-EU countries also conduct fisheries in this area, the catches taken by vessels of EU MS do only constitute a part of the total catches.

Demersal fisheries are mainly carried out by the Spanish fleet, with a limited activity of other countries as Italy, Portugal and Greece. The other EU MS are operating in a small pelagic fishery of pelagic trawlers, currently developed in waters off Morocco and Mauritania. In addition, there is a small fleet of Spanish purse seiners targeting small pelagics in North-Morocco. An overview of species fished by EU MS in the CECAF area in 2017 is presented in Annex 2.

In most cases the EU fishery has been carried out in this area under bilateral Sustainable Fishing Partnership Agreements (SFPAs) between the EU and the coastal states. However, there are other fisheries developed in the CECAF area, under direct authorizations, independent from these SFPAs. This is the case of the demersal fisheries carried out by Spanish vessels in Guinea, Congo and Angola (OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0) and The Gambia, Guinea and Sierra Leona (OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0), reported for the first time in this RCG.

The responsibility for coordination of research activities in the area, stocks assessments and providing scientific advice for the stocks management lies with the Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (CECAF). In addition, the Joint Scientific Committees (JSCs) of the SFPAs between the EU and the partner countries (Morocco, Mauritania, Senegal and Guinea-Bissau) play important role in setting an independent scientific cooperation framework between the EU and the coastal States.

The situation of the SFPAs, by country, is described in the following sections:

¹ See Section 3 of the REGULATION (EU) 2017/2403 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 12 December 2017 on the sustainable management of external fishing fleets, and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1006/2008 (OJEU 28-12-2017, L347, 81-104).

Morocco

After years without fishing agreement with Morocco (since 2011), the last protocol of the FPA was ratified in July 2014, involving the re-opening of some EU fisheries in this fishing ground in September 2014. The current SFPA will expire on 14th July of 2018 and the conditions of a new agreement are currently under negotiation.

Mauritania

The last protocol of the FPA between the EU and Mauritania was signed in December 2015, allowing some métiers included in the Data Collection to return to their fishing activities after one year of closure. The fishing possibilities for cephalopod freezer trawlers were excluded in this Protocol.

Senegal

Last Sustainable Fisheries Partnership Agreement (SFPA) between the EU and Senegal was signed in September 2014, including fishing possibilities for trawlers targeting black hake.

Guinea-Bissau

The last Protocol of the FPA between the EU and Guinea-Bissau, signed in October 2014, allowed the return of shrimpers and cephalopod-finfish freezer trawlers to this fishing ground at the beginning of 2015. This last protocol expired in November 2017 and no fisheries have been conducted since then.

Table 3.1 General types of fisheries in relevant CECAF areas by MS (2017 data)

| FISHING GROUNDS | FISHERY | AREA | COUNTRIES | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|----------------|--|--------|
| West Africa | Small pelagic | Morocco | Latvia, Poland, Lithuania, Germany, Netherlands, Spain | |
| | Demersal fish | | Spain, Portugal | |
| | Crustaceans | Mauritania | Spain, Greece | |
| | Demersal fish | | Spain | |
| | Small pelagic | | Lithuania, Latvia, Netherlands, Germany, Poland | |
| | Crustaceans | Guinea-Bissau | Spain, Portugal | |
| | Demersal fish & cephalopods | | Spain, Greece, Italy | |
| | Demersal fish | | Senegal | Spain |
| | Demersal fish & cephalopods | | The Gambia | Spain* |
| | Crustaceans | Guinea | Spain* | |
| | Crustaceans | Congo | Spain* | |
| Madeira | Deep-water species | Madeira | Portugal | |
| | Small pelagic | | | |
| | Crustaceans | | | |
| | Demersal fish | | | |
| | Molluscs (cephalopods & limpets) | | | |
| Canary | Small pelagics | Canary Islands | Spain | |
| | Demersal species | | | |

* Fisheries developed under direct authorizations

The following tables, based on the data from 2013 to 2017 provided to the RCG LDF by MS, show the main fishing activities in relation to fishing effort and total landings.

Table 3.2 Effort (fishing days) by country and metiers from 2013 to 2017 (Fishing ground: "West Africa").

| Metier (level 6) | Country | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| LLS_DEF_6_0_0 | ESP | - | 505 | 1432 | 1098 | 815 |
| Total | | - | 505 | 1432 | 1098 | 815 |
| MISC_DEF_0_0_0 | ESP | - | 76 | 353 | 136 | 124 |
| Total | | - | 76 | 353 | 136 | 124 |
| OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0 (ESP) ^{*1} = OTB_CRU_>=70_0_0 (PT) | ESP | 1962 | 4674 | 3986 | 4509 | 4966 |
| | PT | | | | 114 | 130 |
| Total | | 1962 | 4674 | 3986 | 4623 | 5096 |
| OTB_DEF_>=70_0_0 | ESP | 666 | 753 | 832 | 1115 | 1657 |
| Total | | 666 | 753 | 832 | 1115 | 1657 |
| OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0 (ESP) ^{*2} =OTB_DES_70_0_0 (ITA) | ESP | 860 | 1451 | 1992 | 2237 | 2226 |
| | ITA | - | - | 308 | 470 | 1586 |
| | GRC ^{*3} | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Total | | 860 | 1451 | 2300 | 2707 | 3812 |
| OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0 | DEU | | 71 | 64 | 86 | 84 |
| | LIT | 843 | 673 | 394 | 943 | 560 |
| | LVA | 863 | 814 | 186 | 645 | 813 |
| | NLD | 182 | 620 | | 201 | 284 |
| | POL | 461 | 230 | 34 | 339 | 150 |
| | DNK | - | - | - | 36 | - |
| | UK | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | | 2349 | 2337 | 678 | 2250 | 1844 |
| LLS_DEF_0_0_0 | ESP | - | - | 27 | 945 | 708 |
| | PT | - | - | - | 330 | 235 |
| | Total | - | - | 27 | 1275 | 943 |
| PS_SPF_0_0_0 | ESP | - | 4 | 666 | 346 | 681 |
| Total | | - | 4 | 666 | 346 | 681 |

*1 Including for the first time data from fisheries developed with private licences in Guinea (2017), Congo (2013-2017) and Angola (2013 and 2015).

*2 Including for the first time data from fisheries developed with private licences in Gambia (2012-2015), Guinea (2013-2014) and Sierra Leone (2014).

*3 No effort data available from Greece.

It should be noted the effort increase of the Italian demersal fleet in Guinea-Bissau. Although the specific CEEAF country where this fishery is developed was not indicated by Italy, the species composition shows that the Italian métier OTB_DES_70_0_0 should be the same as OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0 (ESP), corresponding to trawlers targeting cephalopods and finfish in Guinea-Bissau. In addition the Spanish métier OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0 and the Portuguese métier OTB_CRU_>=70_0_0 were considered to be the same.

Table 3.3 Landings (tons) by country and metiers from 2013 to 2017 (Fishing ground: "West Africa")

| MÉTIER 2013 | ESP | DEU | ITA | LIT | LVA | NLD | POL | TOTAL |
|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|------|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0 | | | | 60469 | 52820 | 26406 | 54137 | 193832 |
| OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0 | 3683 | | | | | | | 3683 |
| OTB_DEF_>=70_0_0 | 4380 | | | | | | | 4380 |
| OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0 | 1496 | | | | | | | 1496 |

| MÉTIER 2014 | ESP | DEU | ITA | LIT | LVA | NLD | POL | TOTAL |
|------------------|------|------|-----|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0 | | 8282 | | 102129 | 57561 | 79559 | 19934 | 267465 |
| OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0 | 5994 | | | | | | | 5994 |
| OTB_DEF_>=70_0_0 | 4891 | | | | | | | 4891 |
| OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0 | 2568 | | | | | | | 2568 |
| PS_SPF_0_0_0 | 4 | | | | | | | 4 |
| LLS_DEF_6_0_0 | 199 | | | | | | | 199 |
| MISC_DEF_0_0_0 | 48 | | | | | | | 48 |

| MÉTIER 2015 | ESP | DEU | ITA | LIT | LVA | NLD | POL | TOTAL |
|---|-------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-----|------|-------|
| OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0 | | 18283 | | 26396 | 14303 | | 4496 | 63478 |
| OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0 (ES) = OTB_DES_70_0_0 (ITA) | 15264 | | 632 | | | | | 15896 |
| OTB_DEF_>=70_0_0 | 6567 | | | | | | | 6567 |
| OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0 | 2227 | | | | | | | 2227 |
| PS_SPF_0_0_0 | 1395 | | | | | | | 1395 |
| LLS_DEF_6_0_0 | 493 | | | | | | | 493 |
| MISC_DEF_0_0_0 | 161 | | | | | | | 161 |
| LLS_DEF_0_0_0 | 85 | | | | | | | 85 |

| MÉTIER 2016 | ESP | DEU | ITA | LIT | LVA | NLD | POL | PT | GR | TOTAL |
|---|-------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|------|--------|
| OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0 | | 20689 | | 70321 | 47742 | 21722 | 30488 | | | 190962 |
| OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0 (ES) = OTB_DES_70_0_0 (ITA) | 20802 | | 371 | | | | | | 4640 | 21173 |
| OTB_DEF_>=70_0_0 | 9523 | | | | | | | | | 9523 |
| OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0 (ES)= OTB_CRU_>=70_0_0 (PT) | 2343 | | | | | | | 28 | | 2371 |
| PS_SPF_0_0_0 | 692 | | | | | | | | | 692 |
| LLS_DEF_6_0_0 | 285 | | | | | | | | | 285 |
| MISC_DEF_0_0_0 | 100 | | | | | | | | | 100 |
| LLS_DEF_0_0_0 | 2798 | | | | | | | 346 | | 3144 |

| MÉTIER 2017 | ESP | DEU | ITA | LIT | LVA | NLD | POL | PT | GR | TOTAL |
|---|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|--------|
| OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0 | | 24956 | | 42954 | 48730 | 29250 | 12487 | | | 158377 |
| OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0 (ES) = OTB_DES_70_0_0 (ITA) | 17254 | | 1383 | | | | | | 700 | 19337 |
| OTB_DEF_>=70_0_0 | 13455 | | | | | | | | | 13455 |
| OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0 (ES)= OTB_CRU_>=70_0_0 (PT) | 3948 | | | | | | | 54 | | 4002 |
| PS_SPF_0_0_0 | 1674 | | | | | | | | | 1674 |
| LLS_DEF_6_0_0 | 196 | | | | | | | | | 196 |
| MISC_DEF_0_0_0 | 89 | | | | | | | | | 89 |
| LLS_DEF_0_0_0 | 2595 | | | | | | | 266 | | 2861 |

It is worth noting the increase landings observed for the some demersal métiers (i.e: OTB_DEF_>=70_0_0, OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0). Oppositely, a landing decrease of the pelagic trawlers (métier OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0) was noticed from 2016 to 2017.

The summary of landing statistics in the West African waters of the CECAF area, covering data from 2013 to 2016 is given in Table 3.4 below. After the important decrease observed in 2015, landings in 2016-2017 are approximately at the same levels than before 2015. These changes are mostly related to changes in the catches of small pelagics for some countries.

Table 3.4 Total EU landings (tons) in the West African waters of the CECAF area from 2013 to 2017. Data provided by RCG participants.

| Year | Total EU landings (t) |
|------|-----------------------|
| 2013 | 203391 |
| 2014 | 281169 |
| 2015 | 90302 |
| 2016 | 228251 |
| 2017 | 199991 |

Tables 3.5 - 3.6 show the results of métier ranking for effort and landings criteria respectively for EU fishing activity in the CECAF area. Although under the new DCF effort is no longer a criterion for sampling obligations, effort distributions over the different metiers provide however insights in possible shifts in fishing activities.

Table 3.5 Percentage of average effort of different métiers operating in the CECAF area. Métiers are comparable to previous reports. Métiers included in the 90% threshold are marked in grey (order based on 2014-2016 ranking)

| Métier | % Effort (2014-2016) | % Effort (2015-2017) |
|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0 | 35.546 | 30.571 |
| OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0 | 15.173 | 22.986 |
| OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0 | 13.622 | 15.980 |
| LLS_DEF_6_0_0 | 11.345 | 8.996 |
| OTB_DEF_>=70_0_0 | 9.555 | 9.300 |
| LLS_DEF_0_0_0 | 4.766 | 5.965 |
| PS_SPF_0_0_0 | 3.798 | 4.553 |
| MISC_DEF_0_0_0 | 2.441 | 1.649 |
| OTB_DES_70_0_0 | 2.112 | 0 |
| OTB_CRU_>=55_0_0 | 0.426 | 0 |

Table 3.6 Percentage of average landings of different métiers operating in the CECAF area. Métiers are comparable to previous reports. Métiers included in the 90% threshold are marked in grey. (order based on 2014-2016 ranking)

| Métier | % Landings (2014-2016) | % Landings (2015-2017) |
|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0 | 84.523 | 80.936 |
| OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0 | 8.485 | 10.351 |
| OTB_DEF_>=70_0_0 | 3.116 | 5.399 |
| LLS_DEF_0_0_0 | 1.507 | 1.109 |
| OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0 | 0.812 | 1.362 |
| MISC_DEF_0_0_0 | 0.791 | 0.035 |
| PS_SPF_0_0_0 | 0.356 | 0.720 |
| OTB_DES_70_0_0 | 0.240 | 0 |
| LLS_DEF_6_0_0 | 0.156 | 0.089 |
| OTB_CRU_>=55_0_0 | 0.013 | 0 |

According to the métier ranking, some changes were observed for 2017 as compared to previous years within the same métiers (Tab. 3.5 & 3.6). With regard to métier ranking for landings, the single métier OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0, targeting small pelagics has decreased. Together with OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0, targeting mixed demersal finfish and cephalopods, they constitute almost 90% threshold of métiers. In case of métier ranking for effort (Tab. 3.5), six métiers were in the 90% threshold, including five demersal métiers targeting crustaceans, cephalopods and demersal fish and one métier targeting small pelagics. The order of the three most important métiers is the same over the last years. Only the percentage composition has changed slightly. Therefore, no major changes occurred in the métiers sampled during the period analyzed.

In order to know the sampling obligation of demersal stocks by the different Member States (MS) according to their shared proportion in total EU catches, the last three years average landings of those stocks selected for sampling that are jointly fished by different countries were estimated (Table 3.7) and their proportions in the total EU landings calculated (Table 3.8). Following the 10% criteria (EU Impl. Dec. 2016/1251, Chapter V), Spain should continue sampling the four stocks considered (deep water rose shrimp *Parapenaeus longirostris*, Southern rose shrimp *Penaeus notialis*, common octopus *Octopus vulgaris* and the cuttlefish *Sepia* spp (*Sepia officinalis* and/or *Sepia hierredda*).

In addition, the proportion of *Penaeus* spp and *Sepia* spp fished by Italy in the last three years was higher than 10% and therefore, these stocks should be considered for sampling by this MS. However, it should be noted that the EU fishery, developed in Guinea-Bissau, was closed due to the end of the

SFPA UE-Guinea Bissau in November 2017. Therefore, if it is the case that the new SFPA is signed and the Italian fishery reinitiated, the fishery data should be reviewed for potential sampling of these stocks by Italy.

Table 3.7- Average landings (tonnes) of main demersal species jointly exploited by EU demersal fleets in CEFAF-West African fishing grounds.

| Main stocks jointly exploited by the countries | Average 2015-2017 | | | |
|--|-------------------|-----|----|----|
| | ES | IT | GR | PT |
| <i>Parapenaeus longirostris</i> | 1618 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| <i>Penaeus spp</i> | 337 | 59 | 1 | 1 |
| <i>Sepia spp</i> | 598 | 155 | 13 | 0 |
| <i>Octopus vulgaris</i> | 186 | 0 | 20 | 0 |

Table 3.8- Average landings (%) of main demersal species jointly exploited by EU demersal fleets in CEFAF-West African fishing grounds. Those values of stocks landing by country higher than 10% are highlighted in grey.

| Main stocks jointly exploited by the countries | Share (%) 2015-2017 | | | |
|--|---------------------|------|-----|-----|
| | ES | IT | GR | PT |
| <i>Parapenaeus longirostris</i> | 98.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
| <i>Penaeus spp</i> | 84.7 | 14.8 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| <i>Sepia spp</i> | 78.1 | 20.3 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
| <i>Octopus vulgaris</i> | 90.2 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 0.0 |

FISHING GROUND "CANARY"

Effort and landings of the Canary Islands metiers are included in Tables 3.9 and 3.10, respectively.

Table 3.9 Effort (fishing days) by metiers for the Canary Islands. 2013-2017.

| Country | Métier (level 6) | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---------|------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| ESP | PS_SPF_10_0_0 | 4010 | 2716 | 3462 | 3403 | 3253 |
| | MIS_DES_0_0_0 | 28039 | 29206 | 28775 | 28551 | 27103 |

Table 3.10 Landings (tons) by metiers for the Canary Islands. 2013 to 2017.

| Country | MÉTIER (level 6) | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---------|------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| ESP | PS_SPF_10_0_0 | 2353 | 1965 | 2165 | 2405 | 2471 |
| | MIS_DES_0_0_0 | 1006 | 1079 | 1063 | 1026 | 1059 |

No relevant changes were observed neither in effort nor in landings of the two Canarian metiers from 2016 to 2017.

FISHING GROUND "MADEIRA"

Table 3.11 Effort (fishing days) by metiers for Madeira. 2013-2017.

| Country | Métier | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---------|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| PT | LLD_DWF_0_0_0 | 2813 | 3110 | 3074 | 2821 | 2991 |
| | FPO_FIF_30_0_0 | 62 | 65 | 80 | 84 | 108 |
| | LHP_FIF_0_0_0 | 283 | 302 | 439 | 567 | 545 |
| | LLS_FIF_0_0_0 | 638 | 816 | 834 | 732 | 1229 |
| | MISC_FIF_0_0_0 | 4 | 16 | 5 | 7 | |
| | LHP_MOL_0_0_0 | | | | 6 | 36 |
| | LLS_MOL_0_0_0 | | | | 8 | 5 |
| | MISC_MOL_0_0_0 | 595 | 498 | 819 | 654 | 650 |
| | LHP_SPF_0_0_0 | 1 | 15 | 17 | 40 | 4 |
| | LLS_SPF_0_0_0 | | 18 | | | |
| | MISC_SPF_0_0_0 | 41 | 29 | 57 | 96 | |
| | PS_SPF_16_0_0 | 570 | 499 | 555 | 588 | 479 |
| | FPO_CRU_30_0_0 | 2 | | | 2 | 9 |

Table 3.12 Landings (tons) by metiers for Madeira. 2013-2017.

| Country | Métier | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---------|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| PT | LLD_DWF_0_0_0 | 1846 | 1983 | 1918 | 1965 | 2252 |
| | FPO_FIF_30_0_0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| | LHP_FIF_0_0_0 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 12 |
| | LLS_FIF_0_0_0 | 27 | 28 | 31 | 24 | 47 |
| | MISC_FIF_0_0_0 | 0.27 | 0.10 | 0.23 | 0.02 | 0 |
| | LHP_MOL_0_0_0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.10 | 1.86 |
| | LLS_MOL_0_0_0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.32 | 0.16 |
| | MISC_MOL_0_0_0 | 89 | 73 | 150 | 119 | 108 |
| | LHP_SPF_0_0_0 | 0.06 | 0.43 | 0.24 | 0.95 | 0.05 |
| | LLS_SPF_0_0_0 | 0 | 0.44 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | MISC_SPF_0_0_0 | 0.83 | 0.60 | 0.75 | 1.41 | 0 |
| | PS_SPF_16_0_0 | 593 | 516 | 772 | 953 | 473 |
| | FPO_CRU_30_0_0 | 0.02 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.03 |

A considerably effort increase is observed for the metier LLS_FIF_0_0_0 from 2016 to 2017. No fishery was reported for the métiers MISC_FIF_0_0_0 and MISC_SPF_0_0_0 in 2017. No relevant changes are noted for the other metiers.

3.2 SPRFMO area

EU fleet activities in the SPRFMO area are reported since 2012. In 2013 only one vessel under the Lithuanian flag was active with a negligible landings volume. Based on information available at the SPRFMO webpage² and the National Report of the European Union to the 2014 SPRFMO Science Committee, in 2014 only two EU vessels (one under DEU and one under NLD flag) were fishing in the SPRFMO area from May to October with the total catch of 19565 tonnes of *Trachurus murphyi* (representing 4.8% of the total catch of this species reported to SPRFMO). In 2015, Dutch and Lithuanian fisheries were reported (and sampled under the sampling agreement between Poland, Lithuania, Germany and The Netherlands) in the SPRFMO area, summing up to similar effort as in 2014, but increasing the total landings to 29483 tonnes, *i.e.* by 50%. For 2016, German and Polish fisheries were deployed in the SPRFMO area. Totalling the landings just under 13kt, less than half of the landings in 2015. The effort reduced to 75 days compared to 181 days in 2015. In 2017 however, with two fishing vessels engaged (under NLD and LTU flags) effort peaked close to 400 days in the region, thus yielding highest landings on record.

Table 3.13 SPRFMO small pelagic fishery effort (fishing days) by country from 2012 to 2017.

| COUNTRY | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| NLD | | | 109 | 89 | | 214 |
| DEU | | | 80 | | 36 | |
| LIT | | 150 | | 92 | | 177 |
| POL | | | | | 39 | |

Table 3.14 SPRFMO small pelagic fishery total landings (tons) by country from 2012 to 2016.

| COUNTRY | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| NLD | | | 10475 | 17740 | | 13637 |
| DEU | | | 10932 | | 9936 | |
| LIT | | 10342 | | 11296 | | 16017 |
| POL | | | | | 2891 | |

An overview of species fished by EU MS in the SPRFMO area in 2017 is presented in Annex 2.

3.3 Other areas

Based on the responses to 2018 RCG LDF data call, the following overview of fishing activities in other areas than CECAF or SPRFMO was made.

² COMM-03-INF-01; Data submitted to the SPRFMO Secretariat as at 15th January 2015 (<https://www.sprfmo.int/assets/Meetings/Meetings-2013-plus/Commission-Meetings/3rd-Commission-Meeting-2015-Auckland-New-Zealand/COMM-03-INF-01-Data-Submitted-to-the-Secretariat.pdf>)

Table 3.13 Effort (fishing days) from other regions by country from 2013 to 2017.

| AREA | COUNTRY | Metier (level 6) | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|-------------------------------|---------|-------------------|------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| Area 41 (Atlantic, Southwest) | GBR | OTB_CEP_>=70_0_0 | 24 | | | | | |
| | | OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0 | 130 | 149 | 83 | 39 | 147 | |
| | | OTM_MCF_>=70_0_0 | | | | | | |
| Total | | | 154 | 149 | 83 | | 147 | |
| Area 47 (Atlantic, Southeast) | NLD | OTM_SPF_32_69_0_0 | | 39 | | | | |
| | | POL | OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0 | | 182 | 254 | 140 | |
| | | | Total | | 221 | 254 | 140 | |
| Area 21 (Atlantic, Northwest) | POL | OTB_DEF_>=120_0_0 | | 34 | | | | |
| | | Total | | 34 | | | | |

Table 3.14 Landings (tons) from other regions by country from 2013 to 2017.

| AREA | COUNTRY | Metier (level 6) | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|-------------------------------|---------|-------------------|------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Area 41 (Atlantic, Southwest) | GBR | OTB_CEP_>=70_0_0 | 366 | | | | | |
| | | OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0 | 1732 | 3806 | 4282 | 2341 | 3405 | |
| | | OTM_MCF_>=70_0_0 | | | | | | |
| Total | | | 2098 | 3806 | 4282 | | | |
| Area 47 (Atlantic, Southeast) | NLD | OTM_SPF_32_69_0_0 | | 6359 | | | | |
| | | POL | OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0 | | 25324 | 41418 | 20337 | |
| | | | Total | | 31683 | 41418 | 20337 | |
| Area 21 (Atlantic, Northwest) | POL | OTB_DEF_>=120_0_0 | | 413 | | | | |
| | | Total | | 413 | | | | |

Based on these overviews, RCG LDF concluded that there is no rationale for regional coordination in the above mentioned regions. However, this does obviously not avoid the responsibilities for MS to execute sampling programmes when and where required under the regulations applicable for the respective area.

An overview of species fished by EU MS in other areas than CECAF, SPRFMO and SEAFO in 2017 is presented in Annex 2 (refers only to area 41 & 47 in 2016).

4. Review progress in regional co-ordination since the 2017 RCG (ToR 1)

4.1 Follow-up of the 14th Liaison Meeting

The RCG reviewed the report from the 14th Liaison Meeting. As described in the report, the role of the LM is to assist the Commission on data collection issues. This role is in line with EU Reg 2017/1004 article 9 (6) "Regional coordination groups shall coordinate with each other and with the Commission, where issues affect several marine regions".

Previously, the LM had to endorse recommendations emerging from the RCGs (RCM at the time). In the new role, LM mainly streamlines the recommendations from the various RCGs and provides additional support where and when needed.

Based on the 2017 RCG LDF, 2 recommendations were discussed.

- RCG LDF 2017 Recommendation 1: Data requirements small pelagics CECAF area (From Morocco to Guinea-Bissau)
- RCG LDF 2017 Recommendation 2: Suspension of EU sampling of small pelagics in CECAF area (From Morocco to Guinea-Bissau)

Regarding both recommendations: LM supported the view of the RCG LDF. As RCG LDF already proposed to have an ad-hoc meeting to follow-up on these issues, no further action was taken. The ad-hoc meeting was held in Copenhagen, November 2017, resulting in continued sampling of small pelagics in the CECAF area, thus surpassing the original recommendation.

4.2 Feedback STECF EWG 18-04

The STECF EWG 18-04 on "Preparation of the evaluation of the list of mandatory surveys at sea" was held in Varese from 14 to 18 May 2018. Based on the workplan emerging from this group, the Commission presented the outcomes of this group. The rationale of the meeting was to do all preparatory work to review the list of surveys which was last revised in 2007. Actually, although in 2009 and 2010 two STECF WG meetings were held that analysed the 2007 list in the light of a number of agreed criteria, their results were never reflected in the DCF legal framework.

The presentation went first through the evaluation process used in past meetings (criteria and their respective weight in the evaluation exercise) as well as the main results obtained in the revision exercise.

The new evaluation exercise is end-user driven and the starting point is not the survey itself but the target stocks. In this regard the EWG established a Decision Support Tool (DST, in the form of a flow chart) based on a binary system so that according to a number of elements a survey can be considered to be included in the list or not. This DST is connected with two databases on stock and surveys (to be fed by MSs, RCGs and end users) so that at the end each stock is coupled with the corresponding survey.

The summer plenary of STECF is expected to test the DST and the two databases, ensure the consistency of the guidelines and describe the information needed by end users to address the surveys being essential for advice. The actual revision of the list of surveys will take place in accordance to a roadmap to be finalised by spring 2019.

5. Feedback from end users and 2018 state-of-play (ToR 2)

5.1 CECAF

The CECAF scientific Subcommittee (SSC) has not met since 2015. Hence, no specific end user feedback was received through CECAF on specific scientific requirements. Four assessments Working Groups (WGs) were carried out in 2017 and first semester 2018: Small Pelagics-North (May 2017 and June 2018), Demersal Resources-North (June-2017) and Demersal resources-South (September 2017). The EU MS that are CECAF member states and participate in these WGs (Spain for demersal and small pelagics and The Netherlands for small pelagics) should provide fishery and biological information from their fisheries in the areas. The data calls are directly sent by the WG chair persons to the participants. Spain provided fishery and biological information (length frequency distributions, maturity, length-weight relationship, sex-ratio, etc.) for most small pelagics and demersal stocks required. Due to the impossibility of having observers onboard Dutch pelagic trawlers in 2016 and 2017, limited biological information on the stocks required was provided by The Netherlands in the two last small pelagics WGs. Research recommendations potentially affecting biological samplings from the EU fleets made in these WGs should be approved by the next CECAF SSC, which is expected to be held in October 2018. The only research recommendations available from these meetings are the ones from the FAO Working Group on the Assessment of Small Pelagic fish off Northwest Africa (CECAF-North)-2017³, which are similar to those compiled in the 2017 RCM-LDF report. RCG LDF reiterated that the group strives to have good cooperation and communication with the CECAF Secretariat.

The Joint Scientific Committees (JSCs) of Sustainable Fisheries Partnership Agreements (SFPA) between the EU and West African countries are very relevant end users of the information collected through the DCF on the EU fisheries developed in some CECAF countries (Morocco, Mauritania, Senegal and Guinea-Bissau). This information is generally provided to the JSCs through data calls launched by the EC (DGMARE) to the MS having any fishery activity in these West African countries. Thus, two data calls were transmitted and properly responded by the most relevant MS in 2017 (for the JSCs of Morocco and Mauritania) and other two has been launched in 2018 for the same JSCs. For the other JSCs (Senegal and Guinea-Bissau), the information has been directly provided by the MS (mainly Spain) through the Spanish experts participating in these meetings. The information requested mainly concerns the fishery statistics, length frequency distributions and biological information of main exploited stocks.

The following specific recommendation potentially affecting in some degree the Data Collection from EU fleets, were made by the JSCs in 2017:

JSC EU-Morocco⁴

- An increase of the number of fishing trips with scientific observers onboard the hake trawlers, and especially onboard the freezer fleet, was recommended, with special attention on discards quantification.

JSC EU-Mauritania⁵

- The JSC recommended to analyse the specific composition of total catches carried out by the EU shrimper fleet in the Mauritanian fishing ground, this including catches retained onboard and discards. For this, the JSC recommended the detailed analysis of the data obtained by the scientific observers onboard this fleet.
- The JSC noted the high increase of black hake catches fished as bycatch by the small pelagic trawlers, which are even much higher than those from the black hake trawlers. Therefore, the JSC recommended to follow this fleet, by observations onboard and landing samplings, in order to precise its impact on the black hake stocks.

³ <http://www.fao.org/3/i8896b/I8896B.pdf>

⁴ https://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/sites/fisheries/files/report-jsc-morocco-2017-07_fr.pdf

⁵ https://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/sites/fisheries/files/report-jsc-mauritania-2017-10_fr.pdf

- The JSC emphasized the relevance of programs of observers onboard the small pelagic trawlers, both European and non-European. It recommended to explore all the potential solutions to allow the embarking of scientific observers on these vessels.

JSC EU-Senegal⁶

- The JSC recommended to make available data concerning the populating structure of black hakes, by species and/or for the two species mixed as *Merluccius* spp., for their analysis in next meeting. Lengths should be obtained by all the fleets, both national and foreign and for catches retained onboard and discards. For that, the JSC recommended to reinforce the data collection through logbooks and to implement programs of observers onboard hake trawlers of all the métiers having catches of black hakes, both Senegalese and from the EU.

No specific new recommendations in relation to data collection were made in the JSCs EU-Guinea Bissau in 2017.

The above mentioned recommendations will be followed up through the Commission as an outcome of the Respective JSCs.

5.2 SPRFMO

With regard to the SPRFMO, its website gives clear details on the data required and the format for data submission.

The 2018 RCG LDF reviewed the SPRFMO's data collection requirements (called Data Standards). The SPRFMO updated Data Standards in May 2018 and its newest version (CMM 02-2018 Conservation and Management Measure on Standards for the Collection, Reporting, Verification and Exchange of Data) is published on Organization's webpage (<https://www.sprfmo.int/assets/Fisheries/Conservation-and-Management-Measures/2018-CMMs/CMM-02-2018-Data-Standards-8March2018.pdf>).

From the perspective of EU fishing activity, the newly published Data Standards provides for no changes to data requirements previously in force.

5.3 SPRFMO observer requirements

During its 2017 meeting, the RCG LDF addressed a document released by SPRFMO Working Group called "Draft Conservation and Management Measure for the SPRFMO Observer Programme" (CMM OP, OPWG Chair's 1st Draft 2017). This document was circulated in May 2017 by the European Commission (DG MARE B2 Regional Fisheries Management Organisations) to EU MS participating in small pelagic fishery in the South Pacific. Members of the RCG LDF from Germany, Poland and The Netherlands, in a coordinated effort, through their respective ministries, provided the European Commission with comments to this Draft document and with suggestion for decisive simplification of the text itself as well as the proposed requirements in relation to the SPRFMO observer program.

In August 2017 a second version of this document was circulated (OPWG Chair's 2nd Draft 2017) which was replaced by the third version released in November 2017 after the SPRFMO Scientific Committee meeting in September (SPRFMO Observer Programme CMM – OPWG Chair's 3rd Draft 2017). Some of the EU comments have been taken on board, but instead of the suggested deletions in the numerous and detailed „Minimum Standards“, a new sections were added.

The following RCG comments are based on the latest version of the CMM available to the group. The requirements laid out for the Observer Programme, described in a very detailed and complex way in Annexes, go far beyond the consistency of observer programmes applied currently in the EU MS. The perception of the RCG LDF is that specifications included in this OP are too complex and overly

⁶ https://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/sites/fisheries/files/report-jsc-senegal-2017-10_fr.pdf

prescriptive, resulting in a very high administrative burden, huge paper load and unavoidable workload to justify that SPRFMO's Member provides sufficiently trained observer.

The complexity of this draft CMM OP results primarily from the construction of the following Annexes as well as the actual substance of the annexes:

- a) Annex A: Rights and Responsibilities of Observers in the SPRFMO Observer Programme
- b) Annex B: Rights and Responsibilities of Vessel Operators, Captain and Crew
- c) Annex C: Minimum standards for accreditation for the SPRFMO Observer Programme
 - i) Accreditation Process
 - ii) Minimum Standards for Observer Qualifications
 - iii) Minimum standards for observer training
 - iv) Minimum standards for observer trainers
 - v) Minimum standards for measuring the performance of observers
 - vi) Minimum standards for briefing and debriefing
 - vii) Minimum standards for briefing and the data quality assurance process
 - viii) Minimum standards for observer identification cards
 - ix) Minimum standards for coordinating observer placement and observer deployment
 - x) Minimum Standards for Safety, Equipment and Materials
 - xi) Minimum Standards for Conservation and Management Measures
 - xii) Minimum Standards for Communications
 - xiii) Minimum standards for the code of conduct
 - xiv) Minimum standards for dispute settlement
 - xv) Minimum Standards for Observer Safety Emergency Action Plan
 - xvi) Minimum standards for insurance and liability
- d) Annex D: Format for Annual Report on Implementation of Observer Programme
 - i) Observer Training
 - ii) Observer Coverage Design and Implementation
 - iii) Observer Safety Issues

Procedures provided in the above Annexes require protocols addressing and documenting over a dozen different matters (including: observers and trainer qualifications, criteria to assess observer performance, briefing, debriefing, placing observers, provision of adequate materials and equipment, communication support, emergency actions etc.) of which all are subject of review by the SPRFMO Secretariat.

A number of the proposed requirements are ambiguous or simply redundant. Moreover, no connection is made to international maritime law applicable for the relevant regions.

Many aspects of the proposed CMM OP are also unclear, like for example:

- Who will review required documentation and what qualification this person/body will have?
- What competences/qualifications will Secretariat's Staff have to carry out accreditation?
- What criteria will be applied by the Secretariat to judge if the observers are trained to an acceptable standard?
- How the Secretariat will prove that has competence to evaluate eg. observer's training programme materials or criteria used for measuring observer performance?
- What tools the Secretariat will have to review if the equipment and materials provided to the observers are adequate? (in this context, fundamental question is: Who would send unqualified observer on the other side of the World and without materials and equipment to do the job?)

- Logistically, how in practice to arrange briefing of the vessel captain that he understands his responsibilities during the observer deployment - for example in case when the observer from state "A" is to be placed on the vessel of state "B" calling to port of state "C" (which is the case for currently implemented observer program by EU MS)?
- Briefing the Captain by the observer coordinator and advising on vessel's obligations shall not be responsibility of the Coordinator as the Coordinator has neither power nor competence to instruct Captain on anything!

The above list only shows a few examples of objections and does not cover all doubts and reservations.

One of the fundamental concerns is related to actual role of the observer in SPRFMO fisheries. The text of CMM OP only uses the term observer without clarification on what type of observer is intended, a scientific observer or a control/compliance observer. In EU law (control regulations) at least there is a strict distinction between control observers and scientific observers. Even though Article 28 of the SPRFMO Convention provides that the information collected by observers can be used to support the functions of the Compliance Committee, the RCG LDF is of very strong opinion that scientists engaged by EU MS are not to be used for control purposes in order not to lose trust and the cooperation of the industry for their work.

The opinion of RCG LDF is that the responsibility to confirm that observers are duly trained for the job to follow approved/certified sampling protocols and manuals lies with the relevant bodies (Institutes/Agencies) of the MS and in the opinion of the RCG LDF, the text of proposed CMM OP is very confusing, drafted in unclear and ambiguous manner and very difficult, if feasible at all, to implement. RCG LDF forwarded its concerns and comments to the responsible section in DG MARE and offered help, in line with its RCG role, for future consultations on this subject.

Many required criteria do not exist in EU MS legislations, the suggested standards go far beyond minimum standards for given purpose. This is particularly in case of EU fishing activity in the SPRFMO area where share of EU catch of a key species (Chilean jack mackerel) in total catch for that stock is limited (<4% in 2016 and <6% in 2017).

RCG LDF concluded that the joint sampling program currently in place for EU fishing activity in the SPRFMO is already very demanding and sufficient for provision of required data.

5.4 State-of-play 2018 data collection

5.4.1 SPRFMO

Following the RCM LDF 2016 recommendation, a "Multi-lateral agreement for 2017 and 2018 between Germany, Lithuania, The Netherlands and Poland for biological data collection of pelagic fisheries in SPRFMO waters" was agreed and signed, with Poland taking over the role of coordination of the sampling program from The Netherlands. This agreement is amended as described in section 7.1

In 2017, two EU fishing vessels engaged in the Chilean jack mackerel (*Trachurus murphyi*) fishery in the SPRFMO area. In total, ten fishing trips were performed by these two vessels in 2017. To sample this fishery, according to the multilateral agreement, Poland placed one observer on board the EU vessel for a fishing trip in March, two observers for a fishing trip from a second week of April till mid-May and one observer for the fishing trip conducted in August-September. Placing observers on board fishing vessel for three fishing trips out of total ten trips (30% coverage) allowed to meet the SPRFMO requirements of ensuring a minimum of 10% scientific observer coverage of trips for EU vessels participating in the *Trachurus murphyi* fishery (as set in the SPRFMO CMM 01-2017 Conservation and Management Measure for *Trachurus murphyi*).

So far, in 2018 only one EU vessel is engaged in the Chilean jack mackerel fishery in the SPRFMO area and it is not anticipated that other EU vessels will join the fishery. Based on the information received from the vessel's operator, it is not known at present how many fishing trips will be performed in total in 2018 as it depends very much on the availability of additional fishing quota and the fishing efficiency. It is assumed however, that in total there will be no more than 8-9 fishing trips. Polish observers collected data already during two fishing trips in 2018, with one observer placed on board from mid-March till end of April and two observers from beginning of May till mid-

June (including one observer was placed on board for training purposes to ensure continuity and uniformity in the future).

The contacts and exchange of information with vessels' operators so far as well as information received from the observers during briefings confirm very good cooperation with both vessels' operators and the crew in execution of the sampling programme.

5.4.2 CECAF

Canary Islands

In 2017, monthly concurrent samplings at sea were conducted by the IEO information and sampling network for the metier PS_SPF_10_0_0 (artisanal fleet targeting small pelagics in Canary Islands). In addition, stock specific landing samplings of *Scomber colias*, *Trachurus spp.*, *Sardinella aurita* and *Sardina pilchardus* were carried out on a monthly basis.

For the metier MIS_DES_0_0_0 (artisanal fleet targeting demersal species in Canary Islands), at least two fishing trips per month were sampled at sea in 2017 (concurrent samplings). Moreover, monthly length samplings of most important species in catches were carried out in landings by the IEO information and sampling network.

West Africa

For the EU trawlers targeting small pelagic in Morocco and Mauritania, due to many factors like lack of communication with the vessel operators, the Mauritanian research institute as well as the proclaimed lack of space for observers, only 1 trip has been sampled in CECAF area in 2017. Under the multi-lateral agreement, the Dutch subcontractor CMR, strived to complete the required sampling in CECAF waters, but did not succeed in expanding the number of trips to sample. Access to vessels in Moroccan waters has been limited if not impossible as well.

Until the end of 2017, data collection in CECAF waters was arranged for through a multi-lateral agreement between Germany, Lithuania, Latvia, The Netherlands and Poland. For this agreement NLD operated as the coordinator for the programme. The actual work was subcontracted to a dedicated partner having a vast experience in the region.

Following the conclusions from the second meeting of the RCG LDF in 2017 (Copenhagen, November 2017) all partners concerned expressed the wish to continue on a similar basis, a multi-lateral agreement, as this is seen as the most cost-effective manner to address all requirements in the region. The new multilateral agreement was concluded upon shortly after the November meeting for period 2018-2020 with Poland coordinating the data collection in the CECAF waters. In February 2018 a meeting was held in the Hague, the Netherlands, between the representatives of the Polish National Marine Fisheries Research Institute (NMFRI - coordinator of the joint sampling programme), the Dutch Wageningen Marine Research and the Dutch fishing companies engaged in the fishery for small pelagics in the CECAF area. The purpose of this meeting was to set up the rules of cooperation between the NMFRI and the Dutch vessels' operators in executing the joint sampling programme and in placing Polish observers on board the fishing vessel operating in the CECAF area. Contacts have also been established with operators of the Latvian and Polish vessels active in the CECAF area.

In March 2018, in cooperation between Institutes from Germany, the Netherlands and Poland, a new "Manual for scientific observers on board EU pelagic trawlers in CECAF area" was set.

Despite the efforts made, placement of observers on board the EU vessels operating in the CECAF area was not possible in the first half of 2018, mainly due to lack of space on the vessels. Regular contacts with the vessels' operators will be maintained with the hope that biological data from the EU fishery for small pelagics could be collected during the second half of the year.

Spanish small pelagic purse seiners operating in Morocco were sampled by the IEO information and sampling network, at landings in the Spanish port of Barbate (Cádiz, SW Spain), when the fishing activity was conducted in this fishing ground (eight months in 2017). Monthly length samplings (both concurrent and anchovy-stock specific samplings) were carried out. Landing samples of anchovy *Engraulis encrasicolus* for biological sampling were obtained only in six of these eight months of activity.

In relation to demersal fisheries, the Spanish demersal metiers operating in West Africa are sampled by the IEO programs of observations onboard. No observations onboard the EU demersal fleets were

carried out in November and December 2017 in Guinea-Bissau, due to the cease of the EU fishing activity in this fishing ground following the expiry of the SFPA at the end of October.

For the metier OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0 (fishing trawlers targeting cephalopods and finfish) in Guinea-Bissau, observations onboard were conducted during 109 fishing days in three quarters of 2017, until the end of the SFPA. This accounts for a total of four fishing trips sampled, representing a sampling coverage of 4% in a total of 100 fishing trips.

For the métier OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0 (shrimper trawlers), a fishing trip during the first quarter of the year was sampled in Mauritania, with the aim of getting a complete annual cycle of observations in this fishing ground, that were initiated in March 2016. From April 2017 onwards, observations were conducted in Guinea-Bissau in three fishing trips, covering three quarters and seven months of the year, until the closure of the fishery at the end of October. The four fishing trips (1 in Mauritania + 3 in Guinea Bissau) out of total of 104 fishing trips in both fishing grounds in 2017 (4% coverage) were performed during 184 fishing days.

For the metier OTB_DEF_>=70_0_0 (black hake trawlers), thirteen fishing trips, carried out in 92 fishing days, were sampled in 2017 by IEO observers onboard, ten conducted in Mauritania, two in Morocco and one in Senegal. This represent a sampling coverage of 8% of the 165 fishing trips carried out by this fleet in the three fishing grounds. Length samplings of black hake landings from this metier in Spanish ports were also conducted on a monthly basis by the IEO information and sampling network.

6. Regional data collection, analysis and storage and the evolution towards RCGs (ToR 4)

6.1 Ranking of métier to find out whether any of the NPs need to be modified for 2018

In order to check if the fisheries in 2017 had similar pattern as in previous years or whether there were significant changes to that pattern and to evaluate whether or not there is a need for amendments of Work Plans (WP) for 2019 in relation to the long distance fishing activity, the group performed the ranking of métiers using effort (days at sea) and landings data for 2014-2017 for the CECAF area (see section 3.1 – “CECAF area” for details). Based on the above analysis of the most actual métier ranking at the regional level compared with the métiers selected for sampling in the national WPs 2017-2019 in respect of the fishing activity in the CECAF area, the RCG LDF concluded that there is no need for changes or amendments to the national WPs for 2019.

6.2 Use of RDB

Already in 2016, RCM LDF 2016 decided to move to the current established Regional Database as the host for LDF data. As in 2017, the data call 2018 still used the old excel sheets for providing data to the RCG LDF as the RDB was not yet fit to hold the data as reference tables for the RDB were apparently not sufficiently complete when provided over the course of 2017. Due to the resulting time-constraints, the 2018 data call reverted to the existing excel-sheets.

RCG LDF prepared updated reference lists for species and areas to be included in the Regional Database. Annex 3 provides an overview of the species and fishing grounds currently missing from the RDB and are required to facilitate uploading of the RCG LDF data in the future. ICES will be requested to include these missing entries in the RDB in due time prior to the RCG LDF 2019.

The RCG received a specific request from ICES regarding splitting area 34.1.2.

"..... But for the fishing ground 34.1.2, that cannot be split. If needed then we have to make some sub-divisions e.g. 34.1.2.1 for the Northern part and for Madeira and 34.1.2.2 for the Southern part and for the Canary Islands?"

As solution could be adding new optional column with the name of region of interest (national waters of relevant country in case when more than one country belongs to one fishing region). For instance in fishing region 34.1.2 there are three fishing grounds – Canary, Madeira and international waters. In RDB these grounds could be indicates as 34.1.2 (Canary), 34.1.2 (Madeira) and 34.1.2 (International waters).

"Should areas 41, 21, 47, 87, 51 be included as well?. If so, which métiers are allowed"

In order to clarify which métiers are allowed in relevant areas it is needed to collect information from relevant agreements, international and national fisheries regulations. Those documents could contain fishing conditions including métiers, which are legally used. If these documents do not contain such information then we can rely on list of métiers provided by each MS.

Annex 3 lists all areas, sub areas and divisions as well as allowed métiers to be potentially used by the RCG LDF

6.3 Rules of procedures for future RCG work

Article 9.5. of EU Regulation 2017/1004 stipulates that RCGs shall draw up and agree on rules of procedures for their activities. In 2017, the latest draft (circulated to National Correspondents on 19 May) of the "Rules of Procedure" (RoP) for RCGs was presented to the RCG LDF. In general, the document was acknowledged as a good basis for the RCG work. Overall, however, the text was regarded as relatively heavy and too formal for the RCG LDF that works on comparatively 'slim' processes with only a few MS involved and only a few well-coordinated sampling programs for sampling common fisheries in the LDF regions. Other RCGs discussed the draft RoP as well in 2017 and fine-tuned the draft to their needs. RCG LDF considered the version of the generic RoP as simplified by the 2017 RCG NA as a basis for the RCG LDF RoP. In line with the RCG NA, RCG LDF assumes a positive and collaborative approach by all member states willing to regionally coordinate

their data collection activities as the starting point and incorporate solutions to any problematic scenarios if they arise. RCG adapted and fine-tuned the RCG NA version to its own needs without major changes to the general intentions and principles.

An important addition to the RoP is that at the beginning of the meeting, participants shall clarify the mandate, if any, given to them.

During the 2018 meeting, the draft RoP were finalized and in principle agreed upon during the meeting while anticipating the agreement from Lithuania and awaiting the final decision by Italy to become a full member of this RCG. Lithuania agreed to the RoP during the following week. Italy acknowledged its full membership as well as the approval to the RoP as well.

The Rules of Procedure for the RCG LDF are established on 9th of July 2018, based on the Article 9(5) of REGULATION (EU) 2017/1004 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 17 May 2017 on the establishment of a Union framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the common fisheries policy and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008, by the following MS coordinating their data collection activities for Long Distance Fisheries in 2018: Germany, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, The Netherlands, Spain and Poland. For the full RoP text, see Annex 5.

6.4 Time frame for RCG LDF actions

Based on the adopted Rules of Procedures, the following general mile stones are set for the annual RCG, including the data call and organisational aspects.

| When | What (incl. reference to RoP Article) | Who |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| t – 2 months (at the latest) | Formal request if an independent organisation or individual seeks to attend an RCG meeting as an observer (11.2). Note that SPRFMO and CECAF have a standing invitation to the RCG LDF (11.7) | Any organisation or individual |
| t – 2 months | Circulate draft regional workplan (if any) for decision to NCs (8.6) | Chair |
| t – 2 months (at the latest) | Launch data call to all non-land-locked MS. | Chair |
| t - 2 months | Provide details of accommodation, travel and other organizational information relevant for the meeting. (4.4) | Host Member State |
| t – 6 weeks | Consult members regarding observers (11.2) | Chair |
| t - 1 month | Provide details on participants to the chair | NC's of participating MS |
| t - 1 month | Provide draft agenda to participants | Chair |
| t – 4 weeks | Inform observers whether or not invited | Chair |
| t | Annual meeting (4.1) | All participants |

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| t + 2 months (at the latest) | Circulate draft report to participants | |
| t + ? | Represent RCG LDF at Liaison Meeting (10.3) | Chair (when applicable outgoing and incoming chair) |

7. Data collection of small pelagics in CECAF and SPRFMO area (ToR 5)

7.1 Data collection of small pelagics in SPRFMO area from 2019 onwards

Based on the "Multi-lateral agreement for 2017 and 2018 between Germany, Lithuania, The Netherlands and Poland for biological data collection of pelagic fisheries in SPRFMO waters" as agreed upon by the relevant MS in 2016, Poland coordinated sampling in SPRFMO waters during 2017 and 2018. As this agreement terminates at the end of 2018, RCG LDF had to explore the various options to continue data collection in this region. During the RCG 2016, the following options were discussed in detail:

- i) Organize and share the work between MS involved
- ii) Subcontract the work through 3rd party agency
- iii) Set up self-sampling procedures on board

resulting in the conclusion that option i) was the preferred solution. As no new arguments were identified over the years since then, RCG LDF 2018 did not conclude on another option.

Moreover, during the 2018 meeting, Poland indicated that it was willing to extend the current set up for 2019-2020. By extending the multi-lateral agreement up to 2020, the current agreement terminates at the end of the current EMFF period and aligns with the termination of the CECAF agreement, also being under coordination by Poland.

Following this, an amendment (see Annex 5) to the current multi-lateral agreement was drafted during the RCG LDF 2018. The partner MS were pleased to see that the agreement could be extended and approved the continuation. Due to increased costs, negatively impacted exchange rates, the maximum budget was raised to 80kEuro. The following table highlights the maximum budgetary impact for the MS involved, based on the relative share in fishing opportunities.

| Partner | Relative share (%) | Maximum Contribution 2017-2018 | Maximum Contribution 2019-2020 |
|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Germany | 25.15% | € 17,454 | € 20,120 |
| Lithuania | 17.50% | € 12,145 | € 14,000 |
| The Netherlands | 27.26% | € 18,918 | € 21,808 |
| Poland | 30.09% | € 20,882 | € 24,072 |
| | 100.00% | € 69,398 | € 80,000 |

In anticipation of agreement by all parties involved, the amendment was signed by Poland and The Netherlands at the meeting, while Germany and Lithuania signed the following week.

7.2 Data collection of small pelagics in CECAF area

As described in section 5.4.2, the standing multi-lateral agreement for sampling small pelagics in CECAF waters covers for 2018-2020. RCG LDF didn't flag any particular issue regarding this agreement.

8. Any other business (ToR 6)

8.1 Surveys, studies and pilot projects

RCG LDF did not propose new surveys, nor studies or pilot projects in 2018.

8.2 Call for tenders for studies in support of the CFP

COM outlined the main elements of this new call for tenders (deadline 31 August) for a framework contract for studies in support of the CFP. This call includes two lots (Baltic/North Sea and N. Atlantic/Outermost Regions) and is aiming at providing the Commission with a flexible tool to address day-to-day needs for scientific advice in support of the CFP in topics not yet covered by other Framework Contracts.

The advantage of such a formula is the establishment of a contractual relationship between DG MARE and a number of research centres (ideally in a Consortium) for a period of 3 years (possible 1 year extension) and avoiding the heavy procedure of launching calls for tenders on an ad hoc basis. Each one of the lots have three main work packages (Resource conservation and management; Ecosystem approach and socio-economic aspects) and the second one has an additional one exclusive for Outermost Regions issues.

RCG LDF will not directly response to this call for tender, but the information is considered to be of interest for the MS present.

8.3 Chairmanship, timing and venue of the RCG LDF meeting in 2019

During the 14th LM in 2017, a draft working schedule for all RCGs was laid out for 2018 and 2019. During 2019, all RCGs are expected to take place in June, in order to ease the coordination workload prior to setting the new multi-annual work plans.

The 2019 RCG LDF will then be held in June as well. Most likely, the dates will be 25th-27th of June. The meeting will be chaired by Sieto Verver (The Netherlands) for the last time as his second term ends by then.

Regarding the venue of the next RCG LDF meeting, Spain invites the group to visit Tenerife or Cadiz for its next meeting. The RCG appreciated the invitation by Spain to host the meeting. Most likely, the dates will be June 25-27 2019.

The following table provides an overview of the venues and chairmanship of this RCM/RCG.

| Year | Venue | Chair |
|-------------|----------------------------------|---|
| 2018 | Riga, Latvia | Sieto Verver (The Netherlands) |
| 2017 | Hamburg, Germany | Sieto Verver (The Netherlands) |
| 2016 | Vilnius, Lithuania | Sieto Verver (The Netherlands) |
| 2015 | Hamburg, Germany Cádiz, Spain | Irek Wojcik (Poland) |
| 2014 | IJmuiden, The Netherlands | Irek Wojcik (Poland) |
| 2013 | Constanza, Romania | Irek Wojcik (Poland) |
| 2012 | Madrid, Spain | Irek Wojcik (Poland) |
| 2011 | Ljubljana, Slovenia | Maria Teresa Garcia (Spain) and Dirk-Jan van der Stelt (The Netherlands) |
| 2010 | Madrid, Spain | Maria Teresa Garcia (Spain) and Jaime Mejuto (Spain) |

8.4 Draft ToR 2019

Pending future developments and decisions within the DCF realm and pending the outcomes of LM 2018, the following ToRs are proposed for RCG LDF 2019.

Draft Terms of Reference – RCG LDF 2019

1. Review progress since 2018 following up the 15th Liaison Meeting or other expert groups report
2. Review feedback from end users
 - Consider possible updates under the SPRFMO requirements EU observers (both observer requirements as well as data collection requirements)
 - State of play pelagic sampling in CECAF and SPRFMO area
 - Discuss and conclude upon requirements/recommendations specified by Scientific Committees
 - Other input received
3. Analyse data from 2019 RCG LDF data call
 - Data compilation, providing overviews of fisheries (if needed after inclusion in RDB)
 - Consider EU wide responses
 - Consider future inclusion of emerging fisheries
 - Identify sampling obligations facilitating future multi-annual work plan
4. Regional data collection, analysis and storage
 - Consider future mechanisms to continue strengthening regional cooperation, including end-user interaction (e.g. based on Workpackages as described in MARE 2016/22)
 - Discuss data collection and dissemination in relation to scientific committees
5. AOB
 - Discuss relevant upcoming call for tenders, studies
 - Review RoP and propose possible adaptations
 - Place and date of the next RCG LDF

9. Recommendations

RCG LDF 2018 did not yield any specific recommendations. The expected recommendations on the amendment of the multi-lateral agreement for sampling in the SPRFMO area as well as on finalizing the RoP were not needed as these topics were dealt with in an efficient manner during the meeting.

| | |
|--|--|
| Recommendation 2018-1 : | |
| RCG-LDF 2018 Recommendation | |
| Follow-up actions needed | |
| Responsible persons for follow-up actions | |
| Time frame (Deadline) | |

10. Glossary

| | |
|--------|--|
| AR | Annual Report (of activities carried out by MS under the DCF) |
| AWP | Annual Workplan |
| CECAF | Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic |
| CFP | Common Fishery Policy (EU) |
| CR | Control Regulations (EU) |
| DCF | Data Collection Framework (follow up of DCR) |
| DC-MAP | Multi Annual Programme for Data Collection (follow up of DCF) |
| EEZ | Exclusive Economic Zone |
| EFMM | European Fisheries and Maritime Fund |
| EWG | STECF Expert Working Group |
| FPA | Fishing Partnership Agreement |
| | |
| | |
| ICES | International Council for the Exploration of the Sea |
| IMROP | Mauritanian Institute for of Oceanographic Research and Fisheries |
| | |
| JSC | Joint Scientific Committees (of the FPA) |
| LDF | Long Distance Fishery |
| LM | Liaison Meeting |
| | |
| | |
| MS | Member State(s) (of the EU) |
| NA | North Atlantic |
| NP | National Programme (of activities carried out by MS under the DCF) |
| | |
| OP | Operational Programme |
| | |
| | |
| RCG | Regional Coordination Group |
| RCM | Regional Coordination Meeting |
| RDB | Regional Data Base (of the RCM) |
| | |
| RFMO | Regional Fisheries Management Organization |
| SPRMFO | South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization |
| STECF | Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries |
| | |
| | |
| | |

11. Annexes

11.1 Annex 1 – Agenda

Regional Co-ordination Group for the Long Distance Fisheries (RCG LDF 2018)

Fish Resources Research department of institute BIOR

Riga, Latvia

3-5 July 2018

Agenda

Tuesday:

9:00 walk-in and set up
10:00 - 18:00 meeting time

Wednesday

9:00 - 18:00 meeting time

Thursday

9:00 - 13:00 - meeting time

General

Coffee-break 11:00 & 16:00

Lunch 13:00-14:30

Work Plan

Tuesday, 3th July 20

9:00 – 10:00 : Walk-in, set up connections etc.

10:00 – 13:00 : Plenary session

- Welcome, introduction, organization & house rules, lunch options
- Discuss ToRs, adopt agenda, appoint rapporteurs

- **ToR 1 Review progress since 2017 following up the 14th Liaison Meeting report (Sieto)**
 - Follow-up of recommendations / output RCM LDF 2017 (incl November meeting)
 - Review of the outputs of the 14th Liaison Meeting
 - NC Meeting outcome

- ➔ **ToR 2 Review feedback and recommendations from data end users (Sieto)**
 - *Discuss feedback CECAF groups, any recommendations (Eva)*
 - *Discuss feedback SPRFMO (Irek/Sieto)*
 - *Discussion on new requirements EU rules observers (Irek)*

- ➔ **ToR 5 Future data collection set up in CECAF/SPFRMO (Irek)**
 - Feedback on current progress/experiences
 - First thoughts on organisation of follow-up from 2019 onwards

→ **ToR 6: AOB (Irek/Sieto)**

- Discuss draft RCG rules on procedures (RoP), prepare amendments specifically for RCG LDF
- Present outcomes of STECF EWG 18-04 on surveys (Antonio)
- Sampling by Italy in CECAF (Antonio)
- Other updates from the Commission e.g. new framework (Antonio)

14:30 – 18:00 : “subgroup” session

→ **ToR 3 Analyse data from 2017 RCM LDF data call (Kay/Max/Romas/Eva)**

- Update the catch statistics (based on data tables provided by MS)
- Compile tables and update report text
- Overview required regional coordination in light of new EU MAP
- Provide data tables for RDB and address issues by ICES(Romas)

→ **ToR 6**

- finalize draft RoP
- discuss future DCF requirements/amendments

Wednesday, 4th July 2017

9.00 – 12.00 : “subgroup” session

→ **ToR 3 continuation**

→ **ToR 6 continuation**

12:00 – 13:00 : Plenary session

→ Discuss outcomes and conclusions ToR 3

14:30 – 18:00 : Plenary session:

→ **ToR 4 Discuss outcomes EU call for proposals and possibilities for additional funds for research (Sieto)**

→ **ToR 5 Future data collection set up in CECAF/SPFRMO (Irek)**

- Conclude on organisation of follow-up from 2019 onwards

Social dinner

Thursday, 5th July 2017

9:00 – 13:00 : Plenary session

→ **Report assemblage and reading – continued**

→ **Skype session Spain/Italy/Germany discussing outcomes (around 11:30 Riga time, 10:30 Madrid/Rome/Berlin time)**

→ **ToR 6 AOB:**

- place and date of the next RCM/RCG LDF
- ToRs 2019

→ **Adoption of the draft report**

Closure of the meeting

11.2 Annex 2 – Landings by species by area reported by MS

Landings by species (tons) in Morocco-Guinea Bissau (CECAF area). Data from 2017

| Species | DE | ES | GR | IT | LT | LV | NL | PL | PT |
|------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|----|-----|----|----|----|----|
| Acanthurus monroviae (MDO) | | | <1 | | | | | | |
| Alectis alexandrinus (ALA) | | 7 | | | | | | | |
| Aphanopus carbo (BSF) | | 2 | | | | | | | |
| Argyrosomus regius (MGR) | | <1 | | | | | | | |
| Ariidae (CAX) | | 20 | | | | | | | |
| Aristaeomorpha foliacea (ARS) | | <1 | | | | | | | |
| Aristeus antennatus (ARA) | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Aristeus varidens (ARV) | | 196 | | | | | | | |
| Arius heudelotii (SMC) | | | | | | | 3 | | |
| Arnoglossus kessleri (RKZ) | | | 45 | | | | | | |
| Auxis rochei (BLT) | 121 | | | | | | | | |
| Auxis thazard (FRI) | | | | | | | 48 | | |
| Balistes carolinensis (TRG) | | 2 | | | | | | | |
| Beryx decadactylus (BXD) | | | | | | | | | 5 |
| Beryx splendens (BYS) | | 24 | | | | | | | <1 |
| Beryx spp (ALF) | | | | | 29 | | | <1 | |
| Bothidae (LEF) | | 149 | | | | | | | |
| Brachydeuterus auritus (GRB) | | 3 | | | | | | | |
| Brama australis (BRU) | | | | | | | | 53 | |
| Brama brama (POA) | 17 | 2584 | | | 227 | | 45 | | 36 |
| Branchiostegidae (TIS) | | 17 | | | | | | | |
| Branchiostegus semifasciatus (UAE) | | 26 | | | | | | | |
| Brotula barbata (BRD) | | 35 | 40 | | | | | | |
| Campogramma glaycos (VAD) | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Capros aper (BOC) | | | | | | | 8 | | |
| Caranx crysos (RUB) | | 4 | | | | | | | |
| Caranx rhonchus (HMY) | <1 | | 334 | | | | | | |
| Centrolophidae (CEN) | | 16 | | | | | | | |
| Chaceon macphersoni (HNQ) | | | | | | | | | <1 |
| Chaceon maritae (CGE) | | 25 | | | | | | | |
| Chaceon spp (GER) | | 3 | | | | | | | |
| Chelon labrosus (MLR) | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Citharus linguatula (CIL) | | | <1 | | | | | | |
| Conger conger (COE) | | 7 | | | | | | | 12 |
| Coryphaena hippurus (DOL) | | | | | | | | | <1 |
| Crustacea (CRU) | | 9 | | | | | | | |
| Cynoglossus senegalensis (YOE) | | | 14 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----|------|----|--|-----|----|----|----|
| Cynoglossus spp (YOX) | | 193 | | | | | | |
| Deania profundorum (SDU) | | 89 | | | | | | |
| Dentex angolensis (DEA) | | | | | | 48 | | |
| Dentex canariensis (DEN) | | 19 | | | | | | |
| Dentex dentex (DEC) | | | <1 | | 220 | | | |
| Dentex gibbosus (DEP) | | 10 | | | | | | |
| Dentex macrophthalmus (DEL) | 3 | 66 | 21 | | | 4 | | 47 |
| Dentex spp (DEX) | | 124 | | | | | 98 | |
| Dicologlossa cuneata (CET) | | | 1 | | | | | |
| Dicologlossa hexophthalma (DHZ) | | 4 | <1 | | | | | |
| Diplodus argenteus (DIG) | | | | | | 21 | | |
| Diplodus puntazzo (SHR) | | | | | | <1 | | |
| Diplodus sargus (SWA) | <1 | | | | | | | |
| Diplodus spp (SRG) | 14 | | | | | | | |
| Diplodus vulgaris (CTB) | | 11 | | | | | | |
| Eledone cirrhosa (EOI) | | 37 | | | | | | |
| Engraulis encrasicolus (ANE) | | 1094 | | | | 23 | <1 | |
| Epinephelus aeneus (GPW) | | 19 | 3 | | | | | |
| Epinephelus spp (GPX) | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Erythrocles monodi (EYO) | | 42 | | | <1 | | | |
| Ethmalosa fimbriata (BOA) | | 2 | | | | | | |
| Eucinostomus melanopterus (MFF) | | 10 | | | | | | |
| Euthynnus alletteratus (LTA) | | | | | | <1 | 16 | |
| Galeoides decadactylus (GAL) | | 133 | | | | | | |
| Galeorhinus galeus (GAG) | | 41 | 4 | | | | | |
| Gephyroberyx darwinii (GXW) | | 24 | | | | | | |
| Helicolenus dactylopterus (BRF) | | 90 | | | | | | 14 |
| Hoplostethus atlanticus (ORY) | | 19 | | | | | | |
| Illex spp (ILL) | | 2 | | | | | | |
| Istiophorus albicans (SAI) | | | | | | | | <1 |
| Isurus oxyrinchus (SMA) | | | | | | | | 4 |
| Isurus paucus (LMA) | | | | | | | | <1 |
| Katsuwonus pelamis (SKJ) | 2 | | | | | 2 | | |
| Lepidocybium flavobrunneum (LEC) | | | | | | | | 2 |
| Lepidopus caudatus (SFS) | | 134 | | | | | | <1 |
| Lichia amia (LEE) | | | | | 4 | 10 | 2 | |
| Loligo vulgaris (SQR) | | 12 | | | | | | |
| Lophiidae (ANF) | | 229 | | | | | | |
| Lophius piscatorius (MON) | | 108 | | | | | | |
| Lophius spp (MNZ) | | 131 | | | | | | |
| Lophius vaillanti (MVA) | | 40 | | | | | | 1 |
| Lutjanidae (SNX) | | 40 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----|-------|----|-----|-----|------|----|-----|
| Lutjanus spp (SNA) | | 8 | | | | | | |
| Macroramphosus scolopax (SNS) | | | | | | 108 | | |
| Makaira nigricans (BUM) | | | | | | | | <1 |
| Merluccius merluccius (HKE) | | 1 | | | 132 | | 88 | |
| Merluccius spp (HKX) | | 15274 | | | | | | 128 |
| Mugil cephalus (MUF) | | 17 | | | | 7 | | |
| Mullus barbatus (MUT) | | 313 | | | | | | |
| Mullus surmuletus (MUR) | | | 89 | | | | | |
| Muraena helena (MMH) | | <1 | | | | | | |
| Mustelus mustelus (SMD) | | | | 4 | | | | |
| Mustelus spp (SDV) | | 4 | | | | | | |
| Octopus vulgaris (OCC) | | 658 | 61 | | | | | |
| Ommastrephidae (OMZ) | | 2 | | <1 | | | | |
| Osteichthyes (MZZ) | | 157 | | 140 | | | | <1 |
| Osteichthyes (PEL) | | | | | | 4961 | | |
| Pagellus acarne (SBA) | | 14 | | | | | | |
| Pagellus bellottii (PAR) | | 247 | | | | | | |
| Pagellus bogaraveo (SBR) | | 36 | | | | 21 | | <1 |
| Pagellus erythrinus (PAC) | | 109 | 20 | | | 1 | | |
| Pagellus spp (PAX) | | 49 | | | | | | |
| Pagrus caeruleostictus (BSC) | | 4 | | | | | | |
| Pagrus pagrus (RPG) | | 81 | | | | | | |
| Pagrus spp (SBP) | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Palaemon serratus (CPR) | | | | | | | | <1 |
| Palinurus elephas (SLO) | | | | <1 | | | | |
| Pandalidae (PDZ) | | 203 | | | | | | |
| Parapenaeopsis atlantica (GUS) | | <1 | | | | | | |
| Parapenaeus longirostris (DPS) | | 1762 | 1 | | | | | 47 |
| Penaeus kerathurus (TGS) | | 315 | | 109 | | | | |
| Penaeus monodon (GIT) | | 21 | | | | | | 1 |
| Penaeus notialis (SOP) | | | 3 | | | | | |
| Penaeus spp (PEN) | | 57 | | | | | | |
| Phycis phycis (FOR) | | 791 | | | | | | |
| Phycis spp (FOX) | | | | | | | | 7 |
| Plectorhinchus macrolepis (GBL) | | 4 | | | | | | |
| Plectorhinchus mediterraneus (GBR) | | 29 | | | | 9 | | |
| Plesiopenaeus edwardsianus (SSH) | | 23 | | | | | | <1 |
| Polyprion americanus (WRF) | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Pomadasyss incisus (BGR) | 13 | | | | | 18 | | |
| Pomadasyss jubelini (BUR) | | 38 | 4 | | | | | |
| Pomadasyss olivaceus (PKV) | | | | | | <1 | | |
| Pomadasyss spp (BGX) | | 8 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|-----|----|-------|-------|-------|------|-----|
| Pomatomus saltatrix (BLU) | 5 | | | | | 3 | | |
| Pontinus kuhlii (POI) | | 43 | | | | | | |
| Portunidae (SWM) | | 46 | | | | | | |
| Portunus validus (PVQ) | | | <1 | | | | | |
| Prionace glauca (BSH) | | | | | | | | 113 |
| Pseudolithus spp (CKW) | | 43 | | | | | | |
| Pseudupeneus prayensis (GOA) | | 6 | | | | | | |
| Raja miraletus (JAI) | | 20 | | | | | | |
| Rajidae (RAJ) | | 78 | | | | | | |
| Sarda sarda (BON) | 89 | | | 77 | | 92 | | |
| Sardina pilchardus (PIL) | 21505 | 547 | | 1 | 2989 | 23325 | 142 | |
| Sardinella aurita (SAA) | 311 | | | 575 | | 392 | 581 | |
| Sardinella maderensis (SAE) | | | | 50 | 933 | | | |
| Schedophilus ovalis (HDV) | | | | | | | | 3 |
| Sciaenidae (CDX) | | 52 | | | | | | |
| Scomber japonicus (MAS) | 1557 | | | 21375 | | 3122 | | |
| Scomber scombrus (MAC) | | 54 | | | 14630 | | 5660 | |
| Scomber spp (MAZ) | | 13 | | | | | | |
| Scomberomorus tritor (MAW) | | 6 | | | | | | |
| Scorpaena porcus (BBS) | | 2 | | | | | | |
| Scorpaena scrofa (RSE) | | 50 | 6 | | | | | |
| Scorpaena spp (SCS) | | 81 | | | | | | |
| Scorpaenidae (SCO) | | 14 | | | | | | |
| Sebastes mentella (REB) | | | <1 | | | | | |
| Sepia officinalis (CTC) | | | 38 | | | | | |
| Sepia spp (IAX) | | 111 | | | | | | |
| Seriola dumerili (AMB) | | | <1 | | | | | |
| Serranus cabrilla (CBR) | | | <1 | | | | | |
| Solea lascaris (SOS) | | | <1 | | | | | |
| Solea solea (SOL) | | 13 | | 72 | | | | |
| Soleidae (SOX) | | 3 | | | | | | |
| Sparidae (SBX) | | 8 | | 1 | | | | |
| Sparus aurata (SBG) | | 17 | | | | | | |
| Sphyaena sphyraena (YRS) | | | <1 | | | | | |
| Spicara alta (QZU) | | 17 | | | | | | |
| Spondyllosoma cantharus (BRB) | | 10 | | | | 30 | | |
| Squaliformes (SHX) | | 50 | | | | | | |
| Stromateidae (BUX) | | 17 | | | | | | |
| Stromateus fiatola (BLB) | | 5 | | 27 | | | | <1 |
| Strongylura timucu (SGR) | | 2 | | | | | | |
| Tetrapturus albidus (WHM) | | | | | | | | <1 |
| Thunnini (TUN) | | | | 278 | | | | |
| Thunnus albacares (YFT) | | | | | | | | <1 |
| Thunnus obesus (BET) | | | | | | | | <1 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------|------|----|----|-------|-------|------|------|
| Todarodes sagittatus (SQE) | | 364 | 1 | | | | | |
| Trachinotus ovatus (POP) | | 3 | | | | | <1 | |
| Trachurus spp (JAX) | 103 | 9494 | | | | | | |
| Trachurus trachurus (HOM) | 1209 | 1 | | | 21701 | 25217 | 1906 | 5846 |
| Trachyscorpia cristulata (TJX) | | 46 | | | | | | |
| Trichiuridae (CUT) | | | | | 218 | | | |
| Trichiurus lepturus (LHT) | 5 | 232 | | | | | 2 | |
| Uca tangeri (UCG) | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Umbrina canariensis (UCA) | | 15 | | | | | | |
| Umbrina cirrosa (COB) | | | 12 | | | | | |
| Umbrina spp (UBS) | | 93 | | | | | | |
| Xiphias gladius (SWO) | | | | | | | | 3 |
| Xyrichtys novacula (XYN) | | | | 16 | | | | |
| Zenopsis conchifer (JOS) | | 319 | | | | | | 10 |
| Zeus faber (JOD) | | 235 | 4 | | | | | <1 |

Landings by species (tons) in Canary Islands (CECAF area). Data from 2017

| Species | ES |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| Balistes carolinensis (TRG) | 23 |
| Beryx spp (ALF) | 50 |
| Bodianus scrofa (IVD) | 7 |
| Boops boops (BOG) | 6 |
| Chelon labrosus (MLR) | 2 |
| Chromis limbata (HZL) | 3 |
| Conger conger (COE) | 25 |
| Dentex spp (DEX) | 130 |
| Dicentrarchus labrax (BSS) | 10 |
| Diplodus spp (SRG) | 36 |
| Enchelycore anatina (AWM) | 3 |
| Engraulis encrasicolus (ANE) | 9 |
| Epinephelus spp (GPX) | 33 |
| Helicolenus dactylopterus (BRF) | 3 |
| Heteropriacanthus cruentatus (HTU) | 3 |
| Lithognathus mormyrus (SSB) | 3 |
| Loligo spp (SQC) | 2 |
| Merluccius merluccius (HKE) | 11 |
| Mullus spp (MUX) | 13 |
| Muraenidae (MUI) | 50 |
| Mustelus spp (SDV) | 3 |
| Mycteroperca fusca (MKF) | 13 |
| Oblada melanura (SBS) | 3 |
| Octopus vulgaris (OCC) | 21 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----|
| Osteichthyes (MZZ) | 24 |
| Pagellus spp (PAX) | 32 |
| Pagrus spp (SBP) | 83 |
| Parapandalus narval (PVJ) | 41 |
| Parapristipoma octolineatum (GRA) | 8 |
| Phycis phycis (FOR) | 18 |
| Plesionika edwardsii (LKW) | 9 |
| Polyprion americanus (WRF) | 3 |
| Pomadasys incisus (BGR) | 2 |
| Pomatomus saltatrix (BLU) | 3 |
| Pseudocaranx dentex (TRZ) | 40 |
| Ruvettus pretiosus (OIL) | 5 |
| Sarda sarda (BON) | 3 |
| Sardina pilchardus (PIL) | 339 |
| Sardinella aurita (SAA) | 319 |
| Sardinella maderensis (SAE) | 79 |
| Sarpa salpa (SLM) | 31 |
| Scomber japonicus (MAS) | 987 |
| Scorpaena spp (SCS) | 4 |
| Seriola spp (AMX) | 39 |
| Serranus spp (BAS) | 33 |
| Sparisoma cretense (PRR) | 197 |
| Sphyraena viridensis (BVV) | 8 |
| Spondyliosoma cantharus (BRB) | 16 |
| Stephanolepis hispidus (FIK) | 22 |
| Trachinotus ovatus (POP) | 12 |
| Trachurus spp (JAX) | 710 |
| Umbrina canariensis (UCA) | 3 |
| Zeus faber (JOD) | 4 |

Landings by species (tons) in Madeira (CECAF area). Data from 2017

| Species | PT |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Abudefduf luridus (AUU) | <1 |
| Aphanopus carbo (BSF) | 2225 |
| Apogon imberbis (OGT) | <1 |
| Auxis thazard (FRI) | 3 |
| Balistes carolinensis (TRG) | <1 |
| Beryx decadactylus (BXD) | <1 |
| Beryx splendens (BYS) | <1 |
| Bodianus spp (BDY) | <1 |
| Boops boops (BOG) | <1 |

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| Brama brama (POA) | 1 |
| Cancer bellianus (KCB) | <1 |
| Centracanthus cirrus (EHI) | <1 |
| Centrophorus squamosus (GUQ) | 9 |
| Chaceon affinis (KEF) | <1 |
| Chromis limbata (HZL) | 1 |
| Conger conger (COE) | 2 |
| Coryphaena hippurus (DOL) | <1 |
| Deania spp (DNA) | <1 |
| Dentex gibbosus (DEP) | 17 |
| Dicentrarchus spp (BSE) | <1 |
| Diplodus cervinus (SBZ) | <1 |
| Diplodus sargus (SWA) | <1 |
| Diplodus vulgaris (CTB) | <1 |
| Epigonus telescopus (EPI) | <1 |
| Epinephelus marginatus (GPD) | <1 |
| Galeorhinus galeus (GAG) | <1 |
| Gephyroberyx darwinii (GXW) | <1 |
| Helicolenus dactylopterus (BRF) | <1 |
| Heteropriacanthus cruentatus (HTU) | <1 |
| Isurus oxyrinchus (SMA) | <1 |
| Katsuwonus pelamis (SKJ) | 2 |
| Kyphosus sectatrix (KYS) | <1 |
| Lepidocybium flavobrunneum (LEC) | <1 |
| Lithognathus mormyrus (SSB) | <1 |
| Lobotes surinamensis (LOB) | <1 |
| Loligo vulgaris (SQR) | <1 |
| Merluccius merluccius (HKE) | <1 |
| Mora moro (RIB) | <1 |
| Mugil cephalus (MUF) | <1 |
| Mullus surmuletus (MUR) | <1 |
| Muraena helena (MMH) | 1 |
| Muraena spp (MDZ) | <1 |
| Mustelus mustelus (SMD) | <1 |
| Mycteroperca fusca (MKF) | <1 |
| Nesiarchus nasutus (NEN) | <1 |
| Oblada melanura (SBS) | <1 |
| Octopus vulgaris (OCC) | <1 |
| Ommastrephidae (OMZ) | 3 |
| Pagellus acarne (SBA) | <1 |

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----|
| Pagellus bogaraveo (SBR) | <1 |
| Pagellus erythrinus (PAC) | <1 |
| Pagrus pagrus (RPG) | 7 |
| Palinurus elephas (SLO) | <1 |
| Patella spp (LPZ) | 107 |
| Phorcus atratus (OAW) | <1 |
| Phycis phycis (FOR) | 13 |
| Plesionika spp (XKX) | <1 |
| Polymixia nobilis (PXV) | <1 |
| Polyprion americanus (WRF) | <1 |
| Pomadasys incisus (BGR) | <1 |
| Pomatomus saltatrix (BLU) | <1 |
| Pontinus kuhlii (POI) | 3 |
| Promethichthys prometheus (PRP) | 2 |
| Pseudocaranx dentex (TRZ) | <1 |
| Raja spp (SKA) | <1 |
| Ruvettus pretiosus (OIL) | 6 |
| Sarda sarda (BON) | <1 |
| Sardina pilchardus (PIL) | 9 |
| Sardinella maderensis (SAE) | 1 |
| Sarpa salpa (SLM) | <1 |
| Schedophilus ovalis (HDV) | <1 |
| Scomber japonicus (MAS) | 195 |
| Scorpaena scrofa (RSE) | 1 |
| Scyllarides latus (YLL) | <1 |
| Seriola spp (AMX) | 2 |
| Serranus atricauda (WSA) | 3 |
| Setarches guentheri (SVG) | <1 |
| Sparisoma cretense (PRR) | <1 |
| Sphyaena viridensis (BVV) | <1 |
| Spondyliosoma cantharus (BRB) | <1 |
| Synodus saurus (SDR) | <1 |
| Taractichthys longipinnis (TAL) | <1 |
| Thunnus albacares (YFT) | <1 |
| Thunnus obesus (BET) | 3 |
| Todarodes sagittatus (SQE) | <1 |
| Trachinotus ovatus (POP) | <1 |
| Trachurus picturatus (JAA) | 262 |
| Xiphias gladius (SWO) | 4 |

Landings by species (tons) in SPRFMO area. Data from 2017

| Species | LT | NL |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Brama australis (BRU) | 43 | 53 |
| Cubiceps caeruleus (UBA) | 42 | 42 |
| Scomber japonicus (MAS) | 1321 | 476 |
| Trachurus murphyi (CJM) | 14611 | 13066 |

Landings by species (tons) in 41 (Atlantic, Southwest) area. Data from 2017

| Species | UK |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Genypterus blacodes (CUS) | <1 |
| Illex argentinus (SQA) | 296 |
| Loligo gahi (SQP) | 3068 |
| Macruronus magellanicus (GRM) | <1 |
| Merluccius hubbsi (HKP) | 16 |
| Patagonotothen brevicauda (NOT) | 26 |
| Raja montagui (RJM) | <1 |
| Salilota australis (SAO) | <1 |

11.3 Annex 3 – RDB reference lists

Metiers

The following metiers are allowed in the respective areas:

CECAF (Area 34)

- FPO_CRU_30_0_0
- FPO_FIF_30_0_0
- LHP_FIF_0_0_0
- LHP_MOL_0_0_0
- LHP_SPF_0_0_0
- LLD_DWF_0_0_0
- LLS_DEF_0_0_0
- LLS_DEF_6_0_0
- LLS_FIF_0_0_0
- LLS_MOL_0_0_0
- LLS_SPF_0_0_0
- MIS_DES_0_0_0
- MISC_DEF_0_0_0
- MISC_FIF_0_0_0
- MISC_MOL_0_0_0
- MISC_SPF_0_0_0
- OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0
- OTB_DEF_>=70_0_0
- OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0
- OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0
- PS_SPF_0_0_0
- PS_SPF_10_0_0
- PS_SPF_16_0_0

SPFRMO (AREA 87)

- OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0

AREA 41

- OTB_CEP_>=70_0_0
- OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0
- OTM_MCF_>=70_0_0

AREA 47

- OTM_SPF_32_69_0_0
- OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0

AREA 21

- OTB_DEF_>=120_0_0

Area, sub area and divisions

Primarily based on FAO coding as provided through <http://www.fao.org/fishery/area/search/en>

| Area | Subarea | Division |
|--|--------------|----------|
| Northwest Atlantic (Major Fishing Area 21) | Subarea 21.0 | 0 |
| | | 0.A |
| | | 0.B |
| | Subarea 21.1 | 1 |
| | | 1.A |
| | | 1.B |
| | | 1.C |
| | | 1.D |
| | | 1.E |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------|
| | | 1.F |
| | Subarea 21.2 | 2 |
| | | 2.G |
| | | 2.H |
| | | 2.J |
| | Subarea 21.3 | 3 |
| | | 3.K |
| | | 3.L |
| | | 3.M |
| | | 3.N |
| | | 3.O |
| | | 3.P |
| | | 3.P.n |
| | | 3.P.s |
| | Subarea 21.4 | 4 |
| | | 4.R |
| | | 4.S |
| | | 4.T |
| | | 4.V |
| | | 4.V.n |
| | | 4.V.s |
| | | 4.W |
| | | 4.X |
| | Subarea 21.5 | 5 |
| | | 5.Y |
| | | 5.Z |
| | | 5.Z.e |
| | | 5.Z.u |
| | | 5.Z.c |
| | | 5.Z.w |
| | Subarea 21.6 | 6 |
| | | 6.A |
| | | 6.B |
| | | 6.C |
| | | 6.D |
| | | 6.E |
| | | 6.F |
| | | 6.G |
| | | 6.H |
| ATLANTIC, EASTERN CENTRAL (Major Fishing Area 34) | Subarea 34.1 (Northern Coastal) | |
| | Morocco Coastal (34.1.1.1) | 1.1 |
| | Canaries/Madeira Insular (34.1.1.2) | 1.2 |
| | Sahara Coastal (34.1.1.3) | 1.3 |
| | Subarea 34.2 (Northern Oceanic) | |
| | Subarea 34.3 (Southern Oceanic) | |
| | Cape Verde Coastal (34.3.1) | 1 |
| | Cape Verde Insular (34.3.2) | 2 |
| | Sherbro (34.3.3) | 3 |
| | Western Gulf of Guinea (34.3.4) | 4 |
| | Central Gulf of Guinea (34.3.5) | 5 |
| | Southern Gulf of Guinea (34.3.6) | 6 |
| | Subarea 34.4 (Southern Oceanic) | |
| | Southwest Gulf of Guinea (34.4.1) | 1 |
| | Southwest Oceanic (34.4.2) | 2 |
| ATLANTIC, SOUTHWEST (Major Fishing Area 41) | Northern (Subarea 41.1) | 1 |
| | | 1.1 |
| | | 1.2 |
| | | 1.3 |
| | | 1.4 |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------|
| | Central (Subarea 41.2) | 2 |
| | | 2.1 |
| | | 2.2 |
| | | 2.3 |
| | | 2.4 |
| | Southern (Subarea 41.3) | 3 |
| | | 3.1 |
| | | 3.2 |
| | | 3.3 |
| ATLANTIC, SOUTHEAST (Major Fishing Area 47) | | 47.1.1 |
| | | 47.1.2 |
| | | 47.1.3 |
| | | 47.1.4 |
| | | 47.1.5 |
| | | 47.1.6 |
| | | 47.2.1 |
| | | 47.2.2 |
| | | 47.A.0 |
| | | 47.A.1 |
| | | 47.B.0 |
| | | 47.B.1 |
| | | 47.C.0 |
| | | 47.C.1 |
| | | 47.D.0 |
| | | 47.D.1 |
| PACIFIC, SOUTHEAST (Major Fishing Area 87) | Northern (Subarea 87.1) | 1 |
| | | 1.1 |
| | | 1.2 |
| | | 1.3 |
| | | 1.4 |
| | Central (Subarea 87.2) | 2 |
| | | 2.1 |
| | | 2.2 |
| | | 2.3 |
| | | 2.4 |
| | | 2.5 |
| | | 2.6 |
| | Southern (Subarea 87.3) | 3 |
| | | 3.1 |
| | | 3.2 |
| | | 3.3 |

11.4 Annex 4 – Amendment to the multilateral agreement for sampling small pelagics in SPRFMO area

**AMENDMENT TO:
Multi-lateral agreement for 2017 and 2018 between Germany,
Lithuania, The Netherlands and Poland for biological data
collection of pelagic fisheries in SPRFMO waters**

The Multi-lateral agreement between Germany, Lithuania, The Netherlands and Poland for biological data collection of pelagic fisheries in SPRFMO waters, as signed by all countries named in December 2016 and March 2017 is amended as follows from 1st January 2019 onwards:

This agreement is in accordance with EC Implementing Decision 1251/2016 of 12 July 2016 *adopting a multiannual Union programme for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors for the period 2017-2019* and Regulation (EU) 2017/1004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2017 *on the establishment of a Union framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the common fisheries policy and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008*.

Term:

The multi-lateral agreement is extended beyond its end date of 31 December 2018. The new end date is 31 December 2020.

Costs:

The total costs for the sampling programme is estimated at the amount of 80,000= ex VAT per year. This sampling programme is eligible for co-funding under the national EMFF budget of the respective partners.

The total costs are shared by the partners following the relative shares in fishing opportunities in the SPRMFO area as set in the *Council Regulation (EU) 2018/915 of 25 June 2018 amending Regulation (EU) 2018/120 as regards certain fishing opportunities*. Cost shares are maximum amounts, in case of lower costs, deductions might apply in line with the relative shares. The yearly costs by partner are shown in the following table:

| Partner | Share (%) | Contribution |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Germany | 25.15 | € 20,120 |
| Lithuania | 17.50 | € 14,000 |
| The Netherlands | 27.26 | € 21,808 |
| Poland | 30.09 | € 24,072 |
| Total contribution | | € 80,000 |

Signatures

| Member State | Name | Function | Signature |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|-------------|
| Germany | Christoph Stransky | National Correspondent | Date: |
| Lithuania | Jūrandą Savukynienė | National Correspondent | Date: _____ |
| The Netherlands | Sieto Verver | Head Centre for Fisheries Research | Date: |
| Poland | Ireneusz Wójcik | Head of Department (NMFRI), DCF Coordinator | Date: |

11.5 Annex 5 - Rules of procedures for RCG LDF

**Rules of Procedure for the Regional Coordination Group
for Long Distance Fisheries (RCG LDF).**

1. Scope

- a. These Rules of Procedure are valid for the Regional Coordination Group (RCG) for Long Distance Fisheries in the framework of the Regulation (EU) 2017/1004 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the establishment of a Union framework for the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the common fisheries policy and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008
- b. These Rules of Procedure are established based on the Article 9(5) of the above mentioned Regulation. These Rules of Procedure are established 9th of July 2018 by the Member States of the Regional Coordination Group coordinating their data collection activities for Long Distance Fisheries in 2018: Germany, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Spain and The Netherlands.
- c. The regional scope for the RCG LDF is based on the definition as set in the 5th Liaison Meeting: regions not managed by other RCGs, where fisheries are operated by Union vessels and managed by Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMO) to which the Community is contracting party or observer, except tuna and large pelagic RFMO as these are covered by another RCG.

2. Working language

- a. The working language of the RCG is English.

3. Terms of Reference for the RCG

- a. The RCG sets the Terms of Reference for the RCG taking into account necessary contributions and information.

4. Meetings of the RCG

- a. To perform its duties, the RCG shall hold one meeting annually unless agreed otherwise by the RCG. An annual meeting shall consist of plenary sessions and may include work in subgroups.
- b. The RCG may hold additional meetings to the annual meeting. The duration, form, meeting venue, terms of reference and other relevant elements for such an additional meeting may be agreed at the RCG annual meeting, by correspondence initiated by the RCG Chairperson(s).
- c. The venue of the RCG annual meeting will rotate between Member States coordinating their data collection activities in the same marine region unless otherwise agreed by the RCG.
- d. No later than two months before the annual or additional meeting, the Member State organizing the annual or additional meeting shall be responsible for providing details of accommodation, travel and other organizational information relevant for the meeting.

- e. In accordance with Article 7.2(c) of reg 2017/1004, the National Correspondent for each Member State coordinating the data collection activities in the same marine region and the European Commission shall coordinate the participation in a RCG meeting and shall inform the RCG chairs about the participants within one month before the meeting. The RCG chairs will then inform the hosting country.
- f. The European Commission shall participate at all Annual Meetings and may attend any other meetings.
- g. Member States not listed in point 1.2., that have an obligation or interest in coordinating their data collection activities under the scope of this RCG may nominate a national correspondent or an expert to participate at an RCG meeting.

5. The chairperson(s) responsibilities

- a. The chairperson(s) of the RCG shall promote effective and productive work and working methods of the RCG. The chairperson(s), an institution or a person indicated by the chairperson shall be responsible for making the documents and information available in time and shall take all necessary action to that effect.
- b. The chairperson(s) is responsible for preparing agendas for the RCG meetings.
- c. The RCG chairperson(s) shall be responsible for uploading to a shared platform and disseminating all documents and other information related to the meeting. The RCG is currently assisted in this task by ICES.

6. Agenda and submission of documents

- a. A draft agenda for the annual RCG meeting shall be made available no later than one month in advance of the meeting. This draft agenda will indicate the day(s) of the meeting when the decisions are to be made.
- b. The draft agenda shall be approved at the beginning of the meeting. The approved agenda may be supplemented during the meeting.
- c. At the beginning of the meeting, participants shall clarify the mandate, if any, given to them.
- d. For other documents than the draft regional work plans, the RCG chairperson(s) strive(s) to make these available no later than two weeks in advance to the RCG meetings.
- e. Documents made available later than two weeks in advance to the RCG meetings, may be dealt at the meeting in case of consent of all the national correspondents at the RCG NA annual meeting.

7. RCG subgroups

- a. To carry out its duties as set out in the Article 9 of the Regulation 2017/1004, the RCG may agree to establish permanent or temporary bodies, task groups, subgroups or other arrangements (hereafter called *subgroups*). The RCG will appoint the lead(s) and any other role(s) or working practices necessary and provide terms of references. The RCG may give this mandate to the subgroup(s).
- b. The subgroups will carry out their duties during and between the RCG meetings, as appropriate and as agreed by the RCG.
- c. The subgroup lead or a person nominated by the lead shall keep the RCG informed of the progress of such work and any issues arising at intervals agreed at the RCG.
- d. The subgroup lead sets the agenda and work schedule for the subgroup in cooperation with the RCG chairperson(s)

8. Draft regional work plans and RCG endorsement

- a. Member States coordinating their data collection activities in the region will endeavour to agree on a draft regional work plan under Article 9 of Regulation 2017/1004, by consensus at the RCG annual meeting.
- b. Apart from a Regional Work Plan, the RCG may establish agreements between MS to coordinate and harmonize sampling addressing end user needs in specific regions and/or fisheries under its competence.
- c. All relevant Member States shall ensure the participation of appropriate expert(s) in preparing draft regional work plans. The European Commission may participate at all stages.
- d. Member States shall take all necessary steps to ensure that they are represented by a person mandated to take a decision on the draft regional work plan.
- e. When the RCGNA endorses the draft regional plan by consensus, it will be submitted to the Commission for approval.
- f. A draft regional work plan, where a decision is expected to be made in accordance with the draft agenda of the RCG annual meeting, shall be circulated to the national correspondents two months in advance of the meeting.
- g. A decision on a draft regional work plan may, if necessary, be made by written procedure. The chairperson of the RCG will coordinate the written procedure through National Correspondents. The procedure should be completed within an agreed timeframe.
- h. In the event that a member states participant at the meeting does not have sufficient mandate to approve unscheduled changes to a regional work plan made at the meeting then the written procedure referred to in section 8.5 will be used.
- i. The chairperson of the RCG shall notify the RCG of the decision within two weeks after the written procedure has ended.

9. Procedure for recommendations

- a. The RCG may give non-binding recommendations only. The aim of the recommendation is to orientate further work to be carried out on all issues related to the scope of the Regulation 2017/1004.
- b. If to progress, the RCG requires input by external bodies outside the participation at the RCG, the RCG shall use a process of recommendations to other RCGs, institutes, RFMOS, MS, end-users and/or other external bodies and shall agree a list of recommendations at the annual meeting to be forwarded to the Liaison Meeting to align similar tasks emerging from other RCGs. .

- c. The recommendations should provide, but are not limited to, clear and understandable stand-alone guidance on the recommended work to be carried out, its justification, a foreseen time frame for fulfilment and to the extent possible, person(s) or institution(s) responsible for the follow up of such recommendation.

10. Cooperation between RCGs and the European Commission and other relevant bodies

- a. RCGs and subgroup chairs shall endeavour to cross reference the ToRs of other RCGs and their subgroups and/or other relevant Expert Groups.
- b. The chairperson of the RCG and/or other person(s) mandated by the RCG may participate and represent the RCG in any coordination with other RCGs and the commission under Article 9(6) of Regulation 2017/1004 and will keep the RCG informed at the earliest convenience, but at the annual meeting at the latest.
- c. The chairperson of the RCG and/or other person(s) mandated by the RCG annual meeting may participate and represent RCG in other relevant regional bodies, arrangements or meetings and will keep the RCG informed at the earliest convenience, but at the annual meeting at the latest.

11. Observers

- a. In accordance with the Article 9(7) of the Regulation 2017/1004, RCG shall invite as observers relevant end users of scientific data, including appropriate scientific bodies as referred to in Article 26 of Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013, regional fisheries management organizations, Advisory Councils and third countries, when necessary.
- b. If an independent organisation or individual seeks to attend an RCG meeting as an observer, they must make a formal request to the RCG Chairperson(s) in two months in advance with justification. The RCG Chairperson(s) will consult members for a final decision.
- c. The RCG shall decide by consensus and no later than four weeks prior to the annual meeting which observers shall be invited to attend RCG and subgroup meetings.
- d. Observers are bound by the conditions set by the RCG. If one or more of these conditions are violated repeatedly or seriously by the observer their continued attendance may be re-evaluated. The observer/organisation shall be informed of this, including the results of the re-evaluation, by a letter from the RCG chairperson(s) after consulting and with the consent of the RCG National Correspondents.
- e. After a written confirmation from the RCG chairperson(s), observers may attend the meeting. The attendance may be subject to conditions, for example – exclusion from particular discussions and presentations.

- f. Observers may be invited to provide written contributions or presentations.
- g. The Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (CECAF) and South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO) have a standing invitation to participate as observer in all annual RCG meetings and may be invited to participate in RCG subgroup work.

12. Election of the RCG chairperson(s)

- a. One term for a chairperson covers the period of two years. A chairperson may serve no more than two consecutive terms. The role will rotate between Member States coordinating their data collection activities in the same marine region unless otherwise agreed by the RCG.
- b. The Chairperson may be agreed by the MS present at the RCG annual meeting or elected by a simple majority.
- c. RCG may decide to have co-chairperson(s). The same procedures and conditions as to the chairperson(s) elections apply.

13. Reporting from a RCG meeting

- a. The chairperson(s) of the RCG or a person appointed by the chairperson(s) shall be responsible for drawing up a report from a RCG meeting. The draft report shall contain, but is not limited to, recommendations from the RCG, the decisions taken, a summary of the RCG intersessional progress and RCG discussions, future work directions, the intended work to be carried out before the next meeting, the list of foreseeable RCG meetings and list of participants, their contact information, role and institution.
- b. The draft report shall be uploaded to the shared platform for dissemination to all participants within two months of the RCG annual meeting. The final report will be published on the JRC website as appropriate.

14. Amending rules of procedure

- a. These Rules of procedure may be reviewed and amended at the RCG annual meeting by consensus of all member states present and endorsed by all National Correspondents of the RCG, or in a written procedure by all National Correspondents replying within one month after the RCG meeting in which the amendment had been agreed.

