

PGECON 2019 Executive Summary

Introduction

The Planning Group on Economics Issues (PGECON) was established as a subgroup of the Commission Expert Working Group on Data Collection according to Commission Decision (2016)3301 to assist the Commission in the implementation of the Data Collection Framework (DCF). The PGECON 2019 meeting was held in Ljubljana, Slovenia, during the week of the 6th-10th May 2019 with 41 experts (Annex I) representing 24 Member States, DG MARE, ICES and the JRC. The meeting was opened by the PGECON chairs.

List of Recommendations and Conclusions

Recommendation Reference	Recommendations/Conclusions
TOR 1 – SECFISH Project Results	
1.1	PGECON recommends accepting the conclusions from the SECFISH project where appropriate. It was also agreed to share the deliverables publicly on the DCF website.
1.2	Work Package 2: Harmonization of methodologies for sampling design and estimation methods for fleet and aquaculture economic data collection. It was agreed that each MS should try to follow the suggested procedure. MS experience with the handbook can be presented at PGECON 2020. A Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) subgroup workshop should take place to define the process of quality assessment and assurance and revise the guidelines of the methodological report (with reference to the Handbook). Then as outcome, PGECON could provide recommendations and guidelines to AR evaluation EWG how to improve quality evaluation of DCF data and to complement the currently existing quality evaluation procedures.
1.3	Work Package 3: Development and implementation of common methodologies to disaggregate economic variables by activity and area. It was suggested to hold a second workshop on disaggregation of economic variables to complete follow up work from the workshop at this meeting.
1.4	Work Package 4: Methodologies for estimation of intangible assets in EU fisheries. It was agreed that the work from this work package should be incorporated into the planned PGECON workshop on PIM method that is planned for October 2019.
1.5	Work Package 5: Origin and sources of raw material in the EU seafood processing industry. PGECON recommends that the collection of raw material should remain optional and should be carried out as planned in the national work plan. If collected, the raw material data can be included in the national chapter of Economic Report on the EU processing industry.
TOR 2 – PGECON Governance and Rules of Procedure	

Recommendation Reference	Recommendations/Conclusions
2.1	PGECON status should be placed as an agenda point on the National Coordination Meeting to discuss and decide if PGECON should have same status as the RCGs.
2.2	Following recommendations from PGECON 2018 a draft RoP was created. This was reviewed and updated during PGECON 2019 and should be reviewed by DG MARE. The final draft, regardless of PGECON status, should be adopted at PGECON 2020.
ToR 3 - Freshwater Aquaculture in Maritime and Landlocked Countries	
3.1	PGECON should specifically consider (marine + freshwater) aquaculture sessions in the PGECON meetings' agenda, separated from fisheries.
3.2	A workshop on aquaculture data collection is recommended before the data call in 2020 to discuss a range of issues, including, and not limited to, environmental variables, segmentation, data reporting structure etc. All of these are listed in the extended recommendation in the report.
ToR 4. PGECON Workshop Results 2019	
PGECON workshop (WS) on social variables and review of the 2019 socio-economic data call	
4.1	The Guidance Document updated following the work during the workshop should be maintained as a living document and made accessible to all MS. However, the section on Fish Processing needs to be revised and updated.
4.2	PGECON 2019 discussed how to include new segments with thresholds to report low activity vessels to avoid distortions in performance results. It was agreed that MS can use the GEO indicator in the data call templates to split low activity vessels and use a threshold in next data call.
4.3	STECF EWG meetings on the Annual Economic Report of the EU fisheries and Social data in the EU Fisheries Sector should not be held at the same time, or if they are that experts are not requested to split their time between the meetings.
ToR 5. Processing	
5.1	Considering the dates of proposed data calls, MSs data collection calendars, dates for EWGs and MS concerns to be able to provide data for a 2019 EWG report based on 2017 data, the group proposed that the date for the fish processing data call should be from mid of October to mid of November 2019. This would result in an EWG meeting in late November/early December. These dates will need to be approved by STECF.
5.2	There was a clear indication from the group, supported by the results of WP5 SECFISH, that data collection on raw material should remain voluntary.
ToR 6 - Recommendations for the revision of the Multiannual Union Programme	
6.1	PGECON should administer a live guidance document tracking all variable definitions, amendments, clarifications etc. to make it easier for MS to understand variable definition evolution.
6.2	Economic data collection in fleet: There is no need for revisions to any definitions. Specifically, there is no need to change, at this moment, the definitions to 'active fleet' or 'fleet segment' or the text under Chapter III Data requirements 5(a).

Recommendation Reference	Recommendations/Conclusions
6.3	Economic data collection in fleet: Reinstate FTE into Table 5a so to reflect the data call which still requires FTE as part of the economic data (separate to the social data).
6.4	Economic data collection in fleet: Divide 'Engaged Crew' into 'Paid' and 'Unpaid'. The division of employment into paid and unpaid will give clarity to the figures provided by MS.
6.5	Economic data collection in fleet: Include a footnote under Table 5B to reinstate the definition of the dominance criteria from EU Dec. 93/2010: 'The dominance criteria shall be used to allocate each vessel to a segment based on the number of fishing days used with each gear. If a fishing gear is used by more than the sum of all the others (i.e. a vessel spends more than 50 % of its fishing time using that gear), the vessel shall be allocated to that segment. If not, the vessel shall be allocated to the following fleet segment: (a) 'Vessels using Polyvalent active gears' if it only uses active gears; (b) 'Vessels using Polyvalent passive gears' if it only uses passive gears; (c) 'Vessels using active and passive gears'.
6.6	<p>Economic data collection in fleet: at present, no changes to Table 5B should be made. However, there was discussion about the utility of the current fleet segmentations definition and while PGECON does not recommend a change to these, at present, it does recommend a workshop to investigate alternate methods of segmentation as defined by 'fisheries' rather than dominant gear. The following terms of reference are proposed for this WS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group vessels by characteristic types of fisheries (based on expert knowledge), • Analyse the cost structure of vessels grouped accordingly, • Compile principles for grouping vessels (e.g. targeted stocks, targeted species groups, pursuing typical fishing patterns over the year), • Apply different approaches to MS fleets to investigate if fleets can be thoroughly covered, • Compare applicability of different approaches to different regions.
6.7	Data collection in aquaculture: No revision is currently needed for Table 9 in the revised EU-MAP. Segmentation itself is clear, but more guidance for MS is needed on how to allocate production and economic variables into the EU-MAP segments. Currently it is too early to give an official recommendation by PGECON, but a footnote to Table 9 could be added referring to recommendations by aquaculture EWG and PGECON.
6.8	Data collection in aquaculture: to include FTE national (annual data collection) in Table 7 in the new EU-MAP and to make "number of hours worked by employees and unpaid workers" from the Table 7 optional.
6.9	Data collection in aquaculture: adding a new heading to EU-MAP Chapter III: 7 "Social and economic data on fish processing, to enable the assessment of the social and economic performance of the Union fish processing sector". The Chapter III.7 should include the definition referring to the definition provided under DCF (Chapter 4, section B.4 of COMMISSION DECISION 2010/93/EU) "The population shall refer to enterprises whose main activity is defined according to the EUROSTAT definition under NACE Code 15.20: 'Processing and preserving of fish and fish products'", currently NACE code 10.20." Only number of firms and turnover for the secondary activity companies should be

Recommendation Reference	Recommendations/Conclusions
	reported. For enterprises that carry out fish processing, not as a main activity, only number of firms and turnover should be reported.
6.10	<p>Data collection in fish processing: the segmentation on fish processing should be provided in new EU-MAP Chapter III under new heading 7. The definition of size classes should be in line with the Eurostat definition for SBS. The recommendation comes from the discrepancy with DCF and first EUMAP definitions where the first class was <=10 employees while in Eurostat (SBS regulation) the first class is <9 employees (enterprises with 10 employees are included in the second class).</p> <p>Considering that EUMAP is based on the recommendation of alignment with Eurostat and some MS use SBS we suggest using the same size classes. A reference to size classification of SBS 11 11 0 according to commission regulation (EC) 251/2009 (from STECF 13-31 (EWG 13-15) recommendation) should be added. The segmentation in the EU-MAP guidelines table 3C should be revised accordingly (COM 2016/1701).</p>
6.11	Data collection in fish processing: to make “number of hours worked by employees and unpaid workers” optional in the table 11.
6.12	Social data collection: continue using the current frequency - every three years starting in 2018 when first data was collected for 2017 until further experience has been gained from both end users and experts.
6.13	Social data collection: no revision needed in the table 6 and 11 but the pilot study should be deleted from the new EU-MAP text (Chapter III 5 (b); 6 (b)) and the text box for the pilot study in the new EU-MAP guidelines should be revised accordingly (COM 2016/1701). The pilot study results should be included in the new EU-MAP on the ongoing basis.
6.14	<p>Social data collection: the option for two types of age categories for variable "Employment by age" in fish processing Table 11 should be provided for MS. The Table 11 does not require the revision but in the document for definitions the two types of age categories should be included. In the first instance MS should use PGECON age categories and, only as a second option, to align with other EU standards (Eurostat LFS). Otherwise, MS should justify different choices.</p> <p>Age categories for Fisheries should be broken down further and updated in PGECON definitions. The age category '40-64' should be broken down, at least, by '40-54' and '55-64'. The variable "Employment by education level" should be optional in the table 6 and table 11 and where possible for those MS reporting this a variable on Vocational/Technical training should be included.</p>
6.15	The collection of raw material should remain optional and be carried out as planned in the national work plan. The recommendation is based on the outcome from the SECFISH project and the discussion at the PGECON meeting. If collected, the raw material data can be included in the national chapter of Economic Report on the EU processing industry
6.16	PGECON recommendations on economic data for recreational fishery: PGECON agreed that any outcome from the results of the SECFISH project on recreational fishery (WP7) should be consulted as there was not enough expertise at the meeting to address this issue.

Recommendation Reference	Recommendations/Conclusions
6.17	<p>PGECON recommendation on new data collection: to request biologists to take into consideration the possibility of including biological data collection for freshwater commercial and recreational fisheries under the EU-MAP biological sections as optional. The inclusion of biological data is requested by landlocked MS based on pilot study results, showing that the quantitative and qualitative information received could in turn improve the analysis of the freshwater aquaculture sector. Especially sound data on fish biomass are of interest for the aquaculture sector that produces stocking/restocking material and economically rely on this activity. In fact, freshwater fish biomass data serve as an important demand indicator for the production of native species' fingerlings /juveniles in freshwater aquaculture.</p>
6.18	<p>PGECON recommendation on environmental data for aquaculture: the purpose of the data collection should be clarified and decision to keep or delete Table 8 Environmental variables for the aquaculture sector from the new EU-MAP should be discussed.</p>
6.19	<p>PGECON recommends: quality assurance framework and methodological report with reference to handbook should be included under the new EU-MAP Chapter III (5,6,7). The EU-MAP format for submission of WP should be revised accordingly (COM 2016/1701). The table 5B should be deleted from EU-MAP guidelines (COM 2016/1701) as it does not provide the comprehensive information about quality.</p> <p>PGECON recommends making a revision under Annex 1 Methodology in the Methodological document "Methodologies for the socio-economic data described in EU-MAP Ad hoc Contract Commitment No SI2 725 694 Ref. Ares (2016)22440332 - 26/05/2016.</p> <p>PGECON (Zagreb 2016) considered that it is not feasible to obtain a complete and fully defined document on methodologies for calculation and collection of each economic variable through a (short) ad hoc contract. Therefore, PGECON suggested to implement the following procedure:</p>
ToR 7 – PGECON Calendar 2019-2020	
7.1	<p>The following meetings and chairs were decided for the remaining meeting in 2019 and for workshops in 2020. It was decided that the other workshops identified could take place in parallel to other workshops and/or could be run as specific extended ToR at PGECON 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshop on Capital Value estimations and PIM & Intangible assets. 7-10 October 2019, Salerno, Italy. Chairs: Evelina Sabotela, Jarno Virtanen. • PGECON 2020, May 2020, Bulgaria. Hosted by Simona Nicheva and Kolyo Zhelev. Chaired by Arina Motova, Monica Gambino • Workshop on fleet and aquaculture segmentations. TBC. • Workshop on aquaculture topics. TBC. • Quality Assurance Framework Subgroup Workshop. TBC.

List of participants

Annex I - List of PGECON 2019 participants

No.	Name	Institution	Member State	Email address
1	Claudia Winkler	JOANNEUM RESEARCH	Austria	claudia.winkler@joanneum.at
2	Grohsebner Christoph	Federal Ministry for Sustainability and Tourism, DCF National Correspondent	Austria	christoph.grohsebner@bmnt.gv.at
3	Katrien Verlé	ILVO	Belgium	katrien.verle@ilvo.vlaanderen.be
4	Simona Nicheva	Executive Agency for Fisheries and Aquaculture	Bulgaria	simona.nicheva@iara.government.bg
5	Kolyo Zhelev	Executive Agency for Fisheries and Aquaculture	Bulgaria	kolyo.zhelev@iara.government.bg
6	Svjetlana Visnić	Ministry of Agriculture	Croatia	svjetlana.visnic@mps.hr
7	Rasmus Nielsen	Department of Food and Resource Economics, University of Copenhagen	Denmark	rn@ifro.ku.dk
8	Jeppe Strandgaard Herring	Statistics Denmark	Denmark	JHR@dst.dk
9	Julie Kellner	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)	End User	julie.kellner@ices.dk
10	Janek Lees	Estonian Marine Institute	Estonia	janek.lees@ut.ee
11	Natacha Carvalho	JRC	EU	natacha.carvalho@ec.europa.eu
12	Annette Hurrelmann	European Commission, DG MARE, C3 scientific advice and data collection	EU	annette.hurrelmann@ec.europa.eu

13	Heidi Pokki	Natural Resources Institute Finland (Luke)	Finland	heidi.pokki@luke.fi
14	Jarno Virtanen	Natural Resources Institute Finland	Finland	jarno.virtanen@luke.fi
15	Minne Marie-Dominique	Ministry of Agriculture and Food	France	marie-dominique.minne@agriculture.gouv.fr
16	Jörg Berkenhagen	Thünen Institute of Sea Fisheries	Germany	joerg.berkenhagen@thuenen.de
17	Ralf Döring	Thünen Institute of Sea Fisheries	Germany	ralf.doering@thuenen.de
18	Tobias Lasner	Thünen-Institute of Fisheries Ecology	Germany	tobias.lasner@thuenen.de
19	Stavroula Ntavou	Fisheries Research Institute of Kavala	Greece	ntavou@inale.gr
20	Irene Tzouramani	Agricultural Economics Research Institute	Greece	tzouramani@agrerigr
21	Christos Danatskos	Fisheries Research Institute of Kavala	Greece	chris_dane@yahoo.com
22	Angelos Lontakis	Agricultural Economics Research Institute	Greece	alontakis@agrerigr
23	Agnes Irma Gyorgy	Research Institute of Agricultural Economics	Hungary	gyorgy.agnes@aki.gov.hu
24	Brian Burke	Bord Iascaigh Mhara	Ireland	brian.burke@bim.ie
25	Emmet Jackson (Chair)	BIM	Ireland	emmet.jackson@bim.ie
26	Maria Cozzolino	NISEA	Italy	Cozzolino@nisea.eu
27	Evelina Sabatella	NISEA	Italy	e.sabatella@nisea.eu
28	Isabella Bitetto	COISPA Tecnologia & Ricerca	Italy	bitetto@coispa.it
29	Irina Davidjuka	Scientific Institute of Food Safety, Animal Health and Environment "BIOR"	Latvia	irina.davidjuka@bior.lv
30	Edvardas Kazlauskas	AIRBC	Lithuania	edvardas.kazlauskas@gmail.com
31	Andrius Linauskas	Agricultural Information and	Lithuania	andriuslinauskas@gmail.com

		Rural Business Center (AIRBC)		
32	Irina Jakovleva	Fisheries Service under MoA	Lithuania	irina.jakovleva@zuv.lt
33	Andrew Sciberras	Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture	Malta	andrew.d.sciberras@gov.mt
34	Małgorzata Kieliszewska	NMFRI	Poland	mkieliszewska@mir.gdynia.pl
35	Emil Kuzebki	MIR	Poland	emil@mir.gdynia.pl
36	Suzana Cano	DGRM	Portugal	sfcano@dgrm.mm.gov.pt
37	Loretta Malvarosa	NISEA	Italy	malvarosa@nisea.eu
38	Edo Avdic Mravlje	FRIS	Slovenia	edoavdic@gmail.com
39	Hans Van Oostenbrugge	WUR	The Netherlands	hans.vanoostenbrugge@wur.nl
40	Arina Motova (Chair)	Seafish	UK	arina.motova@seafish.co.uk
41	Matt Elliott	Marine Management Organisation	UK	matt.elliott@marinemangement.org.uk