

# RCG LDF Report 2019

## **Regional Co-ordination Group for Long Distance Fisheries**

Instituto Español de Oceanografía  
Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Spain  
2-4 July 2019



**Regional Coordination Group**  
Long Distance Fisheries

Recommended format for purposes of citation:

RCG. 2019. Regional Coordination Group Long Distance Fisheries. 56 pg. (<https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/rcg>)

The material in this report may be reused using the recommended citation. The RCG may only grant usage rights of information, data, images, graphs, etc. of which it has ownership. For other third-party material cited in this report, you must contact the original copyright holder for permission. For citation of datasets or use of data to be included in other databases, please refer to the latest RCG and ICES data policy on the ICES website. All extracts must be acknowledged. For other reproduction requests please contact the authors.

This document is the product of a Regional Coordination Group under the auspices of the Expert Group on Fisheries Data Collection (EC - DCF) and does not necessarily represent the view of the EU Expert Group (NCs).

## Table of Contents

1.	Executive summary .....	4
2.	Introduction .....	5
2.1	General .....	5
2.2	Legal requirements .....	5
2.2.1	Background of RCG LDF .....	5
2.2.2	Establishment of RCG LDF .....	6
2.3	Terms of Reference .....	6
2.4	Structure of the report.....	6
2.5	Participants and agenda.....	7
2.6	Response to 2019 data call .....	7
2.7	Preparation of 2020 data call.....	9
3.	Review of EU Long Distance Fisheries activities (ToR 3) .....	10
3.1	CECAF area .....	10
3.2	SPRFMO area .....	18
3.3	Other areas.....	18
4.	Review progress in regional co-ordination since the 2018 RCG (ToR 1) .....	20
4.1	Follow-up of the 15 <sup>th</sup> Liaison Meeting.....	20
4.2	Feedback STECF EWG 19-05 .....	20
5.	Feedback from end users and 2018 state-of-play (ToR 2) .....	21
5.1	CECAF AND JSCs of SFPAs .....	21
5.2	SPRFMO.....	27
5.3	SPRFMO observer requirements .....	28
5.4	State-of-play 2018 data collection.....	29
5.4.1	SPRFMO .....	29
5.4.2	CECAF .....	29
6.	Regional data collection and the EU MAP revision (ToR 4) .....	32
6.1	Response to consultation document on EU MAP revision.....	32
6.2	Consider future mechanisms to continue strengthening regional cooperation including funding.....	32
6.3	Ranking of métier to find out whether any of the NPs need to be modified for 2020	33
6.4	RDB updates and fisheries overviews.....	34
6.4.1	Updates to RDB references.....	34
6.4.2	Fisheries overviews .....	35
6.5	Rules of procedures for future RCG work.....	35
6.6	Time frame for RCG LDF actions .....	35
7.	Future data collection set up in CECAF/SPRFMO (ToR 5) .....	37
7.1	Data collection of small pelagics in SPRFMO area from 2019 onwards .....	37
7.2	Data collection of small pelagics in CECAF area.....	37
8.	Any other business (ToR 6) .....	38
8.1	Surveys, studies and pilot projects.....	38
8.2	Call for tenders for studies in support of the CFP.....	38
8.3	Chairmanship, timing and venue of the RCG LDF meeting in 2020 .....	38
8.4	Draft ToR 2020.....	39
9.	Recommendations.....	40
10.	Glossary .....	42
11.	Annexes .....	43
11.1	Annex 1 – Agenda.....	43
11.2	Annex 2 – Landings by species by area reported by MS .....	46

## 1. Executive summary

---

The 2019 RCG LDF meeting was held from July 2 to 4 at the Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Spain 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 2018, the outcomes of the 15<sup>th</sup> 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 2018 data provided by MS through the Regional Database (RDB).

As done during the previous years, all EU non-landlocked countries were addressed through a data call. The main difference was that the 2019 was to be addressed through the Regional Database as hosted by ICES in support of RCG work. The response provided improved insight in the coverage of the data the RCG LDF is using, especially as a first try to produce standardised fisheries overviews was carried out. The results need some fine-tuning to completely fulfil RCG LDF needs, but the overviews have proven to be very informative and an efficient route to compile tables commonly used by the RCG. The wish to use the RDB stems from the RCG wish to standardise data provisions for the MS as well as 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. Some references in the database are not yet complete, the RCG LDF provided a list of proposed updates to the database to facilitate future uploads.

In order to check whether there were any substantial changes in the fishing pattern in the CECAF area in 2018 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 (renewed) NPs for 2020 and beyond in respect of the long distance fisheries in the area of competence.

RCG LDF established its rules of procedures 2018 and the appropriateness of the RoPs was discussed. Pending the anticipated harmonisation of the RoPs across the RCGs, the RoPs weren't updated this year. Apart from the harmonisation, future updates require the inclusion of Portugal, updated references to the relevant regulations and editorial updates.

Overall the group made four recommendations:

- RCG LDF recommends MS to continue to update their historical data prior to the 2020 Data call. Addressed at all MS uploading data.
- RCG LDF recommends to fund the RDB work for the RCG LDF in future agreements between the Commission and ICES. Addressed at Commission and ICES.
- RCG LDF recommends to have a participant in the intersessional RCG subgroup on fisheries and sampling overviews. Addressed to the RCG subgroup.
- RCG LDF recommends to facilitate combined area data uploads in the regional database. Addressed to the RDB steering group.

The next RCG LDF meeting is planned for July 2020, and Portugal kindly offered to host this meeting in the Azores. From 2020 onwards the meeting will be chaired by Irek Wójcik (Poland). Post-meeting consultation of the relevant NCs revealed no objection to the proposal by the RCG to elect Irek as the new chair for this group.

## 2. Introduction

---

### 2.1 General

The 2019 RCG LDF meeting was held from July 2 to 4 at the Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Spain, addressing its Terms of Reference set for the 2019 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.

RCG LDF much appreciated the excellent facilities, hospitality and organisation offered by IEO, 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. ICES Datacentre, in particular Henrik Kjems-Nielsen is thanked for all RDB work carried out in preparation of this meeting and to facilitate the upload of RCG LDF data for the first time. Furthermore, the help of Marta Surka (NMFR, Poland) was greatly appreciated by the RCG as the fisheries overviews provided by her were of great help to the group.

### 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. By 2020, the current regulation will administratively be transformed into different decisions without any modifications to the actual obligations.

## **2.2.2 Establishment of RCG LDF**

During the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 2019:

### **Terms of Reference – RCG LDF 2019**

- 1. Review progress since 2018 following up the 15th 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 2019 RCG LDF data call**
  - Data compilation, providing overviews of fisheries
  - Consider EU wide responses
  - Consider future inclusion of emerging fisheries
- 4. Regional data collection and the EU MAP revision**
  - Consider new DCF and EU-MAP, Work Plan and the implications including thresholds, cost sharing, regionalisation.
  - Discuss future EU-MAP revision
  - Consider future mechanisms to continue strengthening regional cooperation incl funding
  - Discuss data collection and dissemination in relation to scientific committees
- 5. Future data collection set up in CECAF/SPRFMO**
- 6. AOB**
  - place and date of the next RCG LDF
  - new chair
  - review RoPs if needed

## **2.4 Structure of the report**

ToR addressed by the 2019 RCG LDF meeting 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 stemming from this group are summarised in section 9

## 2.5 Participants and agenda

The following persons participated to the RCG LDF meeting in 2019.

Name	Email address	Organisation	Mandate
Begoña Sotillo de Olano	begona.sotillo@ieo.es	Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Centro Oceanográfico de Tenerife (ES)	NA
Catalina Perales Raya (part-time)	catalina.perales@ieo.es	Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Centro Oceanográfico de Tenerife (ES)	NA
Christine Röckmann	Christine.Rockmann@ec.europa.eu	European Commission, DG MARE, unit C3	NA
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
Gustavo González-Lorenzo	gustavo.gonzalez@ieo.es	Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Centro Oceanográfico de Tenerife (ES)	NA
Kay Panten	kay.panten@thuenen.de	Thünen-Institut for Seafisheries in Bremerhaven (DE)	NA
Lídia Gouveia	lidia.gouveia@madeira.gov.p	Research Service of the Madeira Fisheries Directorate (PT)	NA
Maksims Kovšars	maksims.kovsars@bior.gov.lv	Fish Resources Research Department in Riga (LV)	NA
Ricardo Sousa	ricardojorgesousa@gmail.com	Research Service of the Madeira Fisheries Directorate (PT)	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
Zeneida Romero Romero	zeneida.romero@ieo.es	Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Centro Oceanográfico de Cádiz (ES)	NA

The agenda of the meeting is included in Annex 1.

RCG LDF builds upon long standing, and often specialist, experience of its participants. Given the pivotal role of the RCG in EU Data Collection outside European waters, continued contributions by its experts is crucial for a successful continuation of the RCG work. In line with article 7.2.c (EU Reg 2017/1004) national correspondents are expected to coordinate the attendance of experts to relevant groups. Thus, it is expected that NCs pay attendance to this issue, in particular for the participants to the RCG. Moreover, as the RCG set up evolved into an expert meeting followed by an NC decision making meeting, even more need arises for the experts to attend.

## 2.6 Response to 2019 data call

As in previous years, prior to the 2019 annual RCG LDF meeting and in line with the continued 2015 recommendation to address future data calls to all non-landlocked MS, the 2019 data call was sent to all National Correspondents of these MS. From 2019 onwards the data call will request to upload

the data into the RCG Regional Database (RDB), hosted and maintained by ICES in Copenhagen. The call was launched at May 20<sup>th</sup> and in line with Regulation 2017/1004 of May 17<sup>th</sup>, 2017, the response deadline was 2 months later. A request for an active response indicating the absence of long distance fisheries was also included 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. Shifting the data delivery from Excel sheet to the RDB posed some challenges for MS not routinely uploading data to the RDB. As a result, some data had to be re-uploaded to the RDB during the meeting. This was not considered as a major issue as the work could be completed in time. Data can be updated throughout the year and MS are encouraged to do so where applicable. (see section 2.7)

*Table 2-1 Overview of 2019 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	Yes	No	No
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greece	Yes	Yes	No
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

Greece was the only MS not responding to the call with data while having (some) activity in West Africa taking place (demersal, crustaceans) thus the data would be very welcome to complete the picture of EU fisheries in the region. E.g. only 2 vessels active in the region doesn't exclude a MS from delivering data, despite being a small fraction of a nation's fleet and activities. 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.



## 2.7 Preparation of 2020 data call

As in 2019, RCG LDF wishes to prepare the 2020 data at an earlier stage prior to the meeting, facilitating both a timely upload as well as preparatory work (e.g. producing complete fisheries overviews). The actual deadlines should be set in line with the dates of the RCG LDF in 2020 and the provisions in the current DCF (1 month response time).

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 2020 data call will request data from 2014 onwards (unless provided earlier), but will invite MS to deliver/update older data to the RDB when possible. Also, the 2020 call shall stress that data stemming from private agreements under direct authorization should be included as well.

Moreover, MS are encouraged to update and upload data when required prior to the RCG Data call. This will allow for a less stressful upload and once done, only last year's data needs to be uploaded, which should be a routine job by then. Also, it is anticipated that ICES Data centre will have more time available for addressing issues in the second half of the year, compared to the first half due to all the working groups that take place. MS are invited to inform the chair on successful updates and to provide upload logs to the chair.

<b>Recommendation 2019-1 : Updating national data to the RDB</b>	
<b>RCG-LDF 2019 Recommendation</b>	RCG LDF recommends that MS continue to update historical data as well as most recent data prior to the 2020 RCG LDF data call.
<b>Follow-up actions needed</b>	MS to update their data and promote set up of routine procedures to provide data to the RDB.
<b>Responsible persons for follow-up actions</b>	NCs of all RCG LDF MS.
<b>Time frame (Deadline)</b>	Prior to the RCG LDF 2020 data call.

Section 6.4 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		
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".

\*Note that the fishing ground where the EU is operating in Angola (FAO 47 1.1, 47.1.2 and part of 47.1.3) is considered in CECAF area of competence, as *de facto* situation.

#### FISHING GROUND "WEST AFRICA"

The information below describes the general types of fisheries in the relevant West African CECAF areas by MS (2018) 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 2018 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 RCG 2018.

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:

#### Morocco

The last FPA Morocco-UE expired in July 2018. A new SFPA has been signed, which it is still pending on its publication. Thus, EU fisheries in Morocco are expected to be re-opened in the following months.

#### 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 SFPA EU-Guinea-Bissau expired in November 2017 and no fisheries have been conducted since then. A new SFPA has been signed and EU fisheries are expected to be re-opened in a short term.

Table 3.1 General types of fisheries in relevant CECAF areas by MS (2018 data)

FISHING GROUNDS	FISHERY	AREA	COUNTRIES
West Africa	Small pelagic	Morocco and/or Mauritania	Lithuania, Latvia, Germany, Netherlands, Spain
	Small pelagic	Morocco	Spain
	Demersal fish		Spain
	Crustaceans	Mauritania	Spain, Greece
	Demersal fish		Spain
	Demersal fish	Senegal	Spain
	Crustaceans	Guinea	Spain*
	Crustaceans	Congo	Spain*
Demersal fishery	34.1.3.1, 34.3.3	Italy	
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. Data from Angola 2018, not available at the RDB, as the RDB did not allow uploading information from this métier in FAO 47.

The following tables, based on the data from 2014 to 2018 provided to the RCG LDF by MS, show the main fishing activities in relation to fishing effort and total landings.



LLS_DEF_6_0_0	493								493
LLS_DEF_0_0_0	85								85

MÉTIER 2016	DEU	DNK	ESP	ITA	LTU	LVA	NLD	POL	TOTAL
OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0	20607	3164			71942	47742	21722	30464	195642
OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0			20796						20796
OTB_DEF_>=70_0_0			10395	371					10766
OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0			2171						2171
PS_SPF_0_0_0			692						692
LLS_DEF_6_0_0			310						310

MÉTIER 2017	DEU	DNK	ESP	ITA	LTU	LVA	NLD	POL	TOTAL
OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0	23145				41119	48730	10328	12531	135854
OTB_MCF_>=70_0_0			17453						17453
OTB_DEF_>=70_0_0			12674	1362					14036
OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0			3931						3931
LLS_DEF_0_0_0			2587						2587
PS_SPF_0_0_0			1674						1674
LLS_DEF_6_0_0			196						196

MÉTIER 2018	DEU	DNK	ESP	ITA	LTU	LVA	NLD	POL	TOTAL
OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0	23583		739		32107	62320	19078		137826
OTB_DEF_>=70_0_0			19320	1180					20500
OTB_CRU_>=40_0_0			2617						2617
LLS_DEF_0_0_0			2130						2130
PS_SPF_0_0_0			728						728
LLS_DEF_6_0_0			51						51

It is worth noting the increasing trend of landings from the métier OTB\_DEF\_>=70\_0\_0 since 2014. Oppositely, landings decreased for the shrimper trawlers (OTB\_CRU\_>=40\_0\_0) and cephalopod-fish trawlers (no landings) from 2017 to 2018, due to the end of the SFPA with Guinea-Bissau in November 2017 and for artisanal purse seiners (PS\_SPF\_0\_0\_0) and longliners (LLS\_DEF\_6\_0\_0) due to the closure of the fisheries in Morocco, at the end of the SFPA in July 2018. Landings from pelagic trawlers (métier OTM\_SPF\_>=40\_0\_0) kept at the same level than in 2017.

The summary of landing statistics in the West African waters of the CECAF area, covering data from 2014 to 2018 is given in Table 3.4 below. After the important decrease observed in 2015, followed by an increase in 2016, a decreasing trend is observed from 2016 to 2018. 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 2016 to 2018. Data provided through the RDB. Rows in grey are not updated in 2019 due to unavailability of all necessary data in RDB.

Year	Total EU landings (t)
2014	281169
2015	90302
2016	230377
2017	199991
2018	163852

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 métiers provide however insights in possible shifts in fishing activities.

Table 3.5 Percentage of average effort of different métiers operating in the CECAF area (West Africa) (period 2016-2018). Métiers are comparable to previous reports. Métiers included in the 90% threshold are marked in bold.

Métier	% Effort
<b>OTB_CRU &gt;=40_0_0</b>	<b>44.0</b>
<b>OTM_SPF &gt;=40_0_0</b>	<b>16.7</b>
<b>OTB_DEF &gt;=70_0_0</b>	<b>13.6</b>
<b>OTB_MCF &gt;=70_0_0</b>	<b>11.7</b>
<b>LLS_DEF_6_0_0</b>	<b>6.1</b>
LLS_DEF_0_0_0	4.4
PS_SPF_0_0_0	3.5

Table 3.6 Percentage of average landings (period 2016-2018) of different métiers operating in the CECAF area (West Africa). Métiers are comparable to previous reports. Métiers included in the 90% threshold are marked in bold.

Metier	% Landings
<b>OTM_SPF &gt;=40_0_0</b>	<b>84.1</b>
<b>OTB_DEF &gt;=70_0_0</b>	<b>12.5</b>
OTB_CRU >=40_0_0	1.6
LLS_DEF_0_0_0	1.3
PS_SPF_0_0_0	0.4
LLS_DEF_6_0_0	0.03

According to the métier ranking, some changes were observed for 2018 as compared to previous years within the same métiers (Tab. 3.5 & 3.6). With regard to métier ranking for landings, the métier OTM\_SPF >=40\_0\_0, targeting small pelagics, has slightly increased. The métier OTB\_DEF >=70\_0\_0, targeting demersal fish, increased by about 2% whereas the métier OTB\_MCF >=70\_0\_0, targeting mixed demersal fish, decreased by about 4%. All three métiers together constitute more than 90% threshold of métiers to be selected for sampling. In case of métier ranking for effort (Tab. 3.5), five métiers were selected for sampling, including four demersal métiers targeting crustaceans, cephalopods and demersal fish and one métiers 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. Other métiers targeting both small pelagics and demersal species were also included in previous years due to their relevance in CECAF fisheries and their inclusion in

respective FPAs fishing opportunities. 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*). See under 5.1 for additional suggestions e.g. regarding *A. varidens*.

In addition, the proportion of *Penaeus* spp, *Sepia* spp and *O. vulgaris* fished by Italy and of *O. vulgaris* fished by Greece 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, when the new SFPA is implemented and the EU fishery reinitiated, the fishery data should be reviewed for potential sampling of these stocks by Italy and/or Greece.

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

Main stocks commonly exploited by the countries	Average 2016-2018			
	ES	IT	GR	PT
<i>Parapenaeus longirostris</i>	1127	0	0.3	16
<i>Penaeus</i> spp	192	33	0	0
<i>Sepia</i> spp	114	120	0	0
<i>Octopus vulgaris</i>	403	91	83	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 commonly exploited by the countries	Share (%) 2016-2018			
	ES	IT	GR	PT
<i>Parapenaeus longirostris</i>	98.6	0.0	0.03	1.4
<i>Penaeus</i> spp	85.4	14.6	0.0	0.0
<i>Sepia</i> spp	48.9	51.1	0.0	0.0
<i>Octopus vulgaris</i>	69.9	15.8	14.3	0.0

## FISHING GROUND "CANARY"

Effort and landings of the Canary Islands metiers are included in Tables 3.9 and 3.10, respectively. Cells in grey are not updated in 2019 due to unavailability of all necessary data in RDB

Table 3.9 Effort (fishing days) by metiers for the Canary Islands. 2014-2018.

Country	Métier (level 6)	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
ESP	PS_SPF_10_0_0	2716	3462	3403	4068	2693
	MIS_DES_0_0_0	29206	28775	28833	29102	32328

Table 3.10 Landings (tons) by metiers for the Canary Islands. 2014 to 2018.

Country	MÉTIER (level 6)	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
ESP	PS_SPF_10_0_0	1965	2165	2406	2780	1897
	MIS_DES_0_0_0	1079	1063	1030	1599	2380

An increase in effort and landings was observed for the metier of demersal artisanal fisheries MIS\_DES\_0\_0\_0 from 2017 to 2018.

## FISHING GROUND "MADEIRA"

The bio-geographical conditions of the archipelago of Madeira, e.g. narrow insular shelf, oligotrophic waters and steep incline of the slope, have always imposed severe limitations on fishing, since the small biomass of the populations of the available fishing species, particularly in the neritic zone (to a depth of around 200m) forced the Madeira fishing fleet, operating inside the Madeira Economic Exclusive Zone (CECAF 34.1.2), to concentrate on exploiting deepwater species and/or migratory resources.

In 2018, concurrent samplings were developed according the Portuguese Work Plan for data collection for the fisheries. Monthly sampling were conducted for the métiers LLD\_DWS\_0\_0\_0 (benthopelagic species targeting *Aphanopus* spp.), LLS\_FIF\_0\_0\_0 (demersal fishes targeting Sparidae and Serranidae), PS\_SPF\_16\_0\_0 (small pelagic fish targeting *Trachurus picturatus* and *Scomber colias*) and MIS\_MOL\_0\_0\_0 (limpets *Patella aspera* and *Patella candei*) by the artisanal fleet in Madeira archipelago. One of the most important targeting species were the black scabbard fish with 38% (*Aphanopus* spp.), and the small pelagic fish (*Trachurus picturatus* and *Scomber colias*) with 8%, apart from tuna that represented 50% of the total landings.

Concerning the métier MIS\_MOL\_0\_0\_0 targeting limpets, monthly sampling was only conducted from April to November in order to comply with the regional legislation in force (e.g. closed season from December to March).



Table 3.11 Effort (fishing days) by metiers for Madeira. 2014-2018.

Country	Métier	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
PT	LLD_DWS_0_0_0	3110	3074	2821	2991	2640
	FPO_FIF_30_0_0	65	80	84	108	85
	LHP_FIF_0_0_0	302	439	567	545	563
	LLS_FIF_0_0_0	816	834	732	1229	1472
	MISC_FIF_0_0_0	16	5	7		
	LHP_MOL_0_0_0			6	36	23
	LLS_MOL_0_0_0			8	5	
	MISC_MOL_0_0_0	498	819	654	650	581
	LHP_SPF_0_0_0	15	17	40	4	21
	LLS_SPF_0_0_0	18				
	MISC_SPF_0_0_0	29	57	96		
	PS_SPF_16_0_0	499	555	588	479	533
	FPO_CRU_30_0_0			2	9	

Table 3.12 Landings (tons) by metiers for Madeira. 2014-2018.

Country	Métier	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
PT	LLD_DWS_0_0_0	1983	1918	1965	2252	2232
	FPO_FIF_30_0_0	1	2	2	3	1.74
	LHP_FIF_0_0_0	4	6	9	12	20
	LLS_FIF_0_0_0	28	31	24	47	76
	MISC_FIF_0_0_0	0.10	0.23	0.02	0	0
	LHP_MOL_0_0_0	0	0	0.10	1.86	1.20
	LLS_MOL_0_0_0	0	0	0.32	0.16	0
	MISC_MOL_0_0_0	73	150	119	108	79
	LHP_SPF_0_0_0	0.43	0.24	0.95	0.05	0.33
	LLS_SPF_0_0_0	0.44	0	0	0	0
	MISC_SPF_0_0_0	0.60	0.75	1.41	0	0
	PS_SPF_16_0_0	516	772	953	473	432
	FPO_CRU_30_0_0	0	0	0	0.03	0

A considerably effort increase is observed for the metier LLS\_FIF\_0\_0\_0 from 2016 to 2018, maybe related to the high economic value of the target species. A decrease in effort and landings was observed in the metier MIS\_MOL\_0\_0\_0 (Limpets), during 2018, probably due to adverse sea conditions near coastal areas. No fishery was reported for the métiers MIS\_SPF\_0\_0\_0, LLS\_SPF\_0\_0\_0, MIS\_FIF\_0\_0\_0, LLS\_MOL\_0\_0\_0 and FPO\_CRU\_30\_0\_0 in 2018. 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 SPRMFO webpage<sup>1</sup> 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 SPRMFO 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 SPRMFO). 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, *i.e.* 29654 tonnes. In 2018 only one vessel (LTU flag) was active in this area with total catch of 10235 tonnes.

Table 3.13 SPRFMO small pelagic fishery effort (fishing days) by country from 2012 to 2018.

COUNTRY	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
NLD			109	89		214	
DEU			80		36		
LIT		150		92		177	177 <sup>*)</sup>
POL					39		

<sup>\*)</sup> days at sea reported to the RDB in 2018 (data for previous year represent fishing days)

Table 3.14 SPRFMO small pelagic fishery total landings (tons) by country from 2012 to 2018.

COUNTRY	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
NLD			10475	17740		13637	
DEU			10932		9936		
LIT		10342		11296		16017	10235
POL					2891		

An overview of species fished by EU MS in the SPRFMO area in 2018 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 2018. Data marked with asterix (\*) are extracted from RDB and show days at sea. Total amount of effort do not include numbers in grey

AREA	COUNTRY	Metier (level 6)	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
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		
	IRL	OTM_SPF_32-69_0_0						
	LTU	OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0			283*	20*		
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 2018.

AREA	COUNTRY	Metier (level 6)	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
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		24942	41426	20429	37802	27072
	IRL	OTM_SPF_32-69_0_0						746
	LTU	OTM_SPF_>=40_0_0			21008	1140		
Total			31301	62434	21569	37802	27818	
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 void 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 in 2018 is presented in Annex 2.

## **4. Review progress in regional co-ordination since the 2018 RCG (ToR 1)**

---

### **4.1 Follow-up of the 15<sup>th</sup> Liaison Meeting**

The RCG reviewed the report from the 15<sup>th</sup> 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.

The 2018 RCG LDF did not yield any recommendation to be put up for discussion at the LM.

### **4.2 Feedback STECF EWG 19-05**

The STECF EWG 19-05 on "Preparation of the evaluation of the list of mandatory surveys at sea" was held in Brussels from 13 to 17 May 2019. This meeting was follow-up of the preparatory meeting held in Varese in May 2018. The results of this group were briefly presented to inform the meeting on ongoing work to revise (parts of) the EU MAP. The rationale of the meeting was to review the list of surveys which was last revised in 2007.

The evaluation is end-user driven and the starting point is not the survey itself but the target stocks. The EWG reviewed all surveys through a Decision Support Tool (DST, in the form of a flow chart, combined with supporting databases) as developed in 2018. The evaluation yielded a list of surveys to be included in the future list of mandatory surveys. Only a few modifications were done to the current list, however, it is important to stress that all surveys have undergone the evaluation, thus the existing surveys are included again for a reason, rather than a simple copy/paste from the old table. No surveys currently fall under the remit of RCG LDF.

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

### 5.1 CEEAF AND JSCs of SFPAs

#### CEEAF

The CEEAF scientific Subcommittee (SSC) met in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire, 23 - 26 October 2018. The recommendations of the last four assessments Working Groups (WGs) were adopted by the SSC. The stocks exploited by the EU are assessed in three CEEAF WGs: Small Pelagics-North (June 2018), Demersal Resources-North (June-2017) and Demersal resources-South (September 2017). The EU MS that are CEEAF 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 fishing information and biological samplings from the EU fleets are summarized for the three above mentioned WGs affecting.

#### FAO Working Group on the assessment of small pelagic fish off northwest Africa, 2018<sup>2</sup>

Axis requiring corrective action or reinforcement	General recommendations concerning the Working Group	Specific recommendations 2018/2019
Fishery statistical and biological data	The WG reiterates its recommendation of paying particular attention to collection systems of commercial catch statistics and fishing effort. Each stock and fishery should be monitored by appropriate biological sampling programs established by fishing zones, covering the entire fishing season, all fleets and métiers, and also considering by-catch.	Intensifying biological samplings in different countries in the subregion, especially on length frequencies of <b>Sardinella, Anchovy</b> (zone South) and Ethmalosa.
Species biology and ecology	Studies on stocks biology and ecology to better understand their spatial and temporal dynamics,	Species biology and ecology
	Strengthening the aging programs of main species.	

<sup>2</sup> FAO. 2019. Report of the FAO Working Group on the Assessment of Small Pelagic Fish off Northwest Africa. Banjul, the Gambia, 26 June–1 July 2018. FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Report No. R1247. Rome. 319 pp.

Main recommendations affecting stocks exploited by the EU in Morocco (artisanal purse seiners and pelagic trawlers) and Mauritania (pelagic trawlers) were:

**Sardine (*Sardina pilchardus*)**

- Strengthen the reading of the sardine age for the different fisheries and re-start the exchange of otoliths between the countries of the region.
- Continue the analysis of length frequencies in order to use structural models for future assessments.
- Ensure and strengthen sardine biological samplings by fishery and fleet.

**Sardinella (*Sardinella aurita* and *Sardinella maderensis*)**

- Undertake at least one sampling per month and per landing site in the whole sub-region. The minimum sampling rate is one sample (minimum 100 individuals) per 1 000 tonnes of catches.
- Re-start studies on the growth and age reading of round sardinella.

**Horse mackerel (*Trachurus trachurus* & *Trachurus trecae*)**

- Continue explorations in 2018 to implement structural models and encourage biological studies to improve the biological parameters used as input into assessment models.
- Strengthen the revision of the identification of different species of horse mackerel to better separate these species in catches, including for the Canary Islands.
- Ensure boarding of observers on fishing vessels in the North West Africa area to ensure biological sampling of catches.
- Improve sampling on the fishing segments not covered so far.

**Mackerel (*Scomber colias*)**

- Strengthen and extend the biological sampling of mackerel in all operational fleets at the sub-regional level and during all seasons,
- Strengthen collection and reading of otoliths to determine size-age keys by fishery and / or area and promote exchanges between countries to improve age reading.

**Anchovy (*Engraulis encrasicolus*)**

- Intensify sampling at the different segments of the anchovy fishery, particularly in Mauritania.
- Conduct and extend age reading of anchovy by fishery in all areas.
- Construct a time series for length frequencies in Zone C (from 26°N to the southern limit of the species in the area, this is to the border Senegal-Guinea Bissau).

**RCG response:** main recommendations have been followed since the end of 2018, when the new program of observers onboard pelagic trawlers, coordinated by Poland, was implemented. Two fishing trips per quarter are planned to be sampled by observers. One fishing trip was covered in 2018 and two in 2019, so far, all of them on Dutch vessels operating in Mauritania. The RCG recommends effort should be made to have evenly distributed sampling trips. It also needs a quantification of the CECAF general recommendation of "Intensifying biological samplings".

In addition, Spain continued sampling anchovy and sardine of the stock North–Morocco until the end of the SFPA in July 2018. Once the fishery is reopened after the signature of the new SFPA, length and biological samplings will be reinitiated.

**FAO/CECAF WG on the assessment of demersal resources – subgroup north (2017)<sup>3</sup>**

Axis requiring corrective action or reinforcement	General recommendations	Specific recommendations
Statistical and biological data on fisheries	Improve the data collection system	
Biology and ecology of species	Carry out studies on the growth of the main stocks, stock identity, etc.	<p>Bioecological studies of the main species should be carried out in the countries of the region.</p> <p>Continue work on the analysis of croakers and growth aspects, and explore partnership options with the IEO to extend the work to other countries and species.</p>

Some recommendations affecting the data collection of stocks exploited by the EU were:

**Black hake (*Merluccius polli* and *Merluccius senegalensis*)**

These recommendations affect the EU black hake fishery developed in Morocco, Mauritania and Senegal.

- Providing more detailed information on the lengths discarded and the estimated discards in order to incorporate them in the assessments.
- Improve the monitoring of catch, effort and length for black hake as a target and bycatch species for all Spanish fleets operating in Mauritania and Senegal.
- Coordination between IEO (Spain) and IMROP (Mauritania), CRODT (Senegal) and FD (The Gambia) to develop the observers methodology to be used would improve efficiency.

**RCG response:** Spain continues to meet the requirements in relation to discards, length and biological samplings of black hakes, through the DCF. Coordination of IEO and coastal States institutions in relation to observers Protocols is expected as an output of the Specific Contract No12 "Study on improvement for the analysis and exploitation of observer reports in EU fisheries from NW African waters" (see section 8.1).

**Demersal fish north**

*Pagellus bellottii*, *P. acarne*, *Pagellus spp*, *Dentex macrophthalmus*, *Pagrus caeruleostictus*, *Sparus spp*, *Arius spp.*, *Pseudolithus spp.*, *Plectorhynchus mediterraneus* and *Epinephelus aeneus*– Some of these species are fished as bycatch by the EU demersal fleets.

- Strengthen the collection and provision of bio-ecological data of main stocks (length frequencies, sex-ratio, age, zone and period of reproduction).

**RCG response:** Spain continues to meet the requirements in relation to length sampling of these bycatch species of demersal fisheries in Morocco, Mauritania and Senegal, either as retained bycatch species (concurrent sampling) or discarded species.

---

<sup>3</sup> FAO. 2018. Report of the FAO/CECAF Working Group on the Assessment of Demersal Resources – Subgroup North. Tenerife, Spain, from 6 to 15 June. CECAF/ECAF Series . No. 18/78. Rome, FAO.

### **Shrimps (*Parapenaeus longirostris* and *Penaeus notialis*)**

These recommendations affect the EU shrimper fisheries carried out in Mauritania.

Deep water rose shrimp (*Parapenaeus longirostris*)

- Continue and extend the biological sampling programme of catches to the main landing ports and onboard shrimp trawlers;
- Regularly update the biological parameters of this species;

Southern pink shrimp (*Penaeus notialis*)

- Improve knowledge of the biology of this species.
- Continue the biological sampling programme for Mauritanian catches.

**RCG response:** Spain continues to meet the requirements in relation to length and biological samplings of *P. longirostris* and *P. notialis*, as target species of the Spanish shrimper fleet in Mauritania. Considerable catches of *A. varidens* (high commercial value) in Mauritania, so its sampling should be added

### **FAO/CECAF WG on the assessment of demersal resources – subgroup south (2017)<sup>4</sup>**

General recommendations:

- To improve data collection and analysis for priority species or species groups.
- To improve species identification and the system of data collection by species, carry out sampling so that the species can be better separated in catches and catch statistics in order to improve knowledge on the species composition of species groups (*Sparidae*, *Dentex* spp, *Pseudolithus* spp, coastal shrimps etc).

The specific recommendations affecting the data collection of stocks exploited by the EU were:

#### **Demersal fish south, Subgroup 1**

*Pseudolithus elongatus*, *Pseudolithus* spp., *Galeoides decadactylus*, *Pomadasys* spp., *Arius* spp., *Cynoglossus* spp. and *Sparidae*- Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Cape Verde, Sierra Leone, and Liberia.

Some of these species are fished as bycatch of the EU demersal fleet in Guinea-Bissau and other fleets from EU MS that might fish in other countries with private authorizations.

The work carried out revealed important gaps in current knowledge about the stocks in these areas. In order to address these, CECAF recommended to:

- Resume the collection of biological data by sampling on board the demersal industrial fisheries vessels, giving priority to the main species, so as to obtain a complete catalogue of the basic biological parameters.
- Intensify sampling for length frequencies and species composition of catches including bycatch in all the main fisheries.

**RCG response:** Spain will continue to meet the requirements in relation to length sampling of these bycatch species of demersal fisheries in Guinea-Bissau, either as retained bycatch species (concurrent sampling) or discarded species, once the new SFPA is in force and the fishery re-opened and through the DCF.

**Shrimp South- Southern pink shrimp (*Penaeus notialis*) & Deepwater rose shrimp (*Parapenaeus longirostris*)-** Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana,

---

<sup>4</sup> **FAO. 2019.** Report of the FAO/CECAF Working Group on the Assessment of Demersal Resources – Subgroup South. Libreville, Gabon, 6–15 September 2017. CECAF/ECAF Series. No. 18/79. Rome, Italy.



Benin, Nigeria, Cameroon, Equatorial Guinea, Sao Tome and Principe, Gabon, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Angola.

These recommendations affect EU shrimp fleets operating in Guinea-Bissau through SFPA and Spanish shrimpers fishing in waters off Guinea, Congo and Angola through direct authorizations.

- For Angola, monthly size and biological sampling of this species on board vessels are recommended.
- Sampling of biological parameters should be initiated for the countries where this is not done.

**RCG response:** Spain will continue to meet the requirements in relation to length and biological samplings of *P. longirostris* and *P. notialis*, as target species of the Spanish shrimp fleet in Guinea-Bissau once the new SFPA is in force and the fishery re-opened and through the DCF. In addition, Spain has initiated in 2018 a program of observers onboard shrimp trawlers in Angola.

**Cephalopods- Octopus (*Octopus vulgaris*), cuttlefish (mainly *Sepia hierredda*) and squid (*Loligo vulgaris*)-** Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone, Liberia, C. Ivoire, Ghana, Benin, Nigeria, Cameroon, Equatorial Guinea, Sao Tome and Principe, Gabon, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Angola.

These recommendations affect EU cephalopods-fish trawlers operating in Guinea-Bissau through SFPA or in others coastal states through direct authorizations and other EU demersal trawlers catching these species as bycatch.

- To conduct biological studies on cuttlefish throughout the subregion. Specifically, information is needed on monthly mean weight in catches, biometric relationships (length-weight, mantle length-total length), monthly maturity indices and length at first maturity.

**RCG response:** Spain will contribute to meet the requirements in relation to length and biological samplings of *O. vulgaris* and *S. hierredda*, as target species of the Spanish cephalopod-fish fleet in Guinea-Bissau, once the new SFPA is in force and the fishery re-opened and through the DCF.

### **JSCs of SFPA**

In addition, 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, three data calls were transmitted and properly responded by the most relevant MS in 2018 (for the JSCs of Morocco, Mauritania and Senegal) and other one were launched in 2019 for the last JSC EU-Mauritania, held in June 2019. The information requested mainly concerns the fishery statistics, length frequency distributions and biological information of main exploited stocks.

The following specific recommendation, by fishing category, potentially affecting in some degree the Data Collection from EU fleets, were made by the JSCs in 2018:

### **JSC EU-Morocco<sup>5</sup>**

---

<sup>5</sup> *Cervantes, A. ; Faraj A. ; Enthoven L. (eds.) 2018. Rapport de la Réunion Scientifique Conjointe annuelle relative à l'Accord de pêche signé entre le Royaume du Maroc et l'Union européenne. Madrid, Espagne, 24-26 septembre 2018. Rapports des Comités Scientifiques Conjointes. Bruxelles, 88 p. et Annexes. [https://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/report-2018-meeting-joint-scientific-committee-eu-morocco-fisheries\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/report-2018-meeting-joint-scientific-committee-eu-morocco-fisheries_en)*

## **Fishing Category No. 2 - Small-scale fishing in the north**

This fishery is carried out by artisanal bottom set-longliners targeting scabbardfish, sparidae and other demersal species. A re-inforcement of the target species monitoring was recommended.

**RCG response:** length samplings of target species in main landing ports is recommended to Spain.

## **Fishing Category No. 4 - Demersal fishing**

This category allows bottom trawlers and logliners to fish mainly black hakes. Main recommendations related to the Data Collection were: i) to continue the studies on discards of black hake and other species, to increase the number of fishing trips with observers, especially for the freezer fleet and to develop a joint observer program between INRH and the EU research centers (including IEO); ii) to continue the separation of the two species of black hake in the catch reports, to allow a separate assessment of each stock in the future.

**RCG response:** Spain continues to meet the requirements in relation to discards, length and biology of black hakes, through the DCF. This also includes the separation of the two species of black hakes in catches. Development of joint observer programs between IEO and INRH is expected to be initiated through the development of the Specific Contract No12 "Study on improvement for the analysis and exploitation of observer reports in EU fisheries from NW African waters" (see section 8.1).

## **Fishing Category No. 6 - Industrial pelagic fishing**

This allows EU pelagic trawlers to fish for small pelagic in South Morocco. A close monitoring of the fisheries, due to the state of sardinella and horse mackerel was recommended.

**RCG response:** a close monitoring of the EU fisheries is expected through the implementation of the new program of observers onboard pelagic trawlers, coordinated by Poland.

## **JSC EU-Mauritania<sup>6</sup>**

### **Fishing Category No. 1 - Vessels fishing for crustaceans other than spiny lobster and crab.**

The JSC recommended identifying funding to conduct an in-depth study of the available observers data for the EU fleet. It also recommended to organize a workshop IEO - IMROP in 2019, for the standardization of data collection strategies between the two parties and to define a joint protocol for observers onboard and data analysis.

**RCG response:** one of the outputs of the Specific Contract No12 "Study on improvement for the analysis and exploitation of observer reports in EU fisheries from NW African waters" (see section 8.1) is the production of an inventory and analysis of the metadata available from observers onboard the EU fleet. In addition, an international Workshop will be held through this project with the aim of standardizing observer protocols between the EU and coastal States. This will be carried out at in the fourth quarter of 2019 and will be a first step for further collaboration between IEO and IMROP in establishing joint observer protocols and data analysis methods.

**Fishing Category No. 2 and 2 bis - Black hake (non-freezer) trawlers and bottom longliners (2) and freezer trawlers (2bis).** Due to the high black hake-bycatch produced by pelagic trawlers, the JSC recommended that data from this pelagic fishery and from other fisheries that incidentally catch black hake are provided and monitored by observers onboard and through landings sampling. It was also recommended to continue the studies of separation of the two species of black-hake in

---

<sup>6</sup> Bouzouma M., Cervantes, A. et Roux O. (eds.) 2018. Rapport de la Réunion annuelle du Comité Scientifique Conjoint relatif à l'Accord de pêche signé entre la République islamique de Mauritanie et l'Union européenne. Nouakchott, Mauritanie, 18 au 21 septembre 2018. Rapports des Comités Scientifiques Conjointes. Bruxelles, 94 pp. [https://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/report-2018-meeting-joint-scientific-committee-eu-mauritania-fisheries\\_mt](https://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/report-2018-meeting-joint-scientific-committee-eu-mauritania-fisheries_mt)

the catches and to develop and implement a harmonized sampling protocol to differentiate the two species for a separate assessment of the stocks.

**RCG response:** bycatch of black hake by EU pelagic fishery will be monitored through the new program of observers onboard pelagic trawlers, coordinated by Poland. Spain continues separating the two species of black hakes in catches.

**Fishing Category No. 3 - Vessels fishing for demersal species other than black hake with gear other than trawls.** The JSC reiterated the need to collect data on Atlantic pomfret (*Brama brama*) in order to conduct stock assessments of this species.

**RCG response:** the IEO information and sampling network will be extended in 2020, to collect length information on *B. brama* fished in Mauritania and landed in the port of Vigo (Spain).

**Fishing Category No. 6 - Pelagic freezer trawlers.** The JSC emphasized the need of data collection for stocks assessments. There is virtually no sampling of catches by observers at sea and sampling of landings is well below the minimum required. Both sampling programs need to be strengthened in the short term.

**RCG response:** the new program of observers onboard pelagic trawlers, coordinated by Poland was implemented in 2018 and 2019 on Dutch vessels operating in Mauritania.

Update recommendations could be available from the last JSC EU-Mauritania, held in Tenerife - 11 - 14 June 2019. The report is has just been finalized and is publically available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/report-2019-meeting-joint-scientific-committee-eu-mauritania-fisheries\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/report-2019-meeting-joint-scientific-committee-eu-mauritania-fisheries_en).

### **JSC EU-Senegal<sup>7</sup>**

This SFPA allows a black hake fishery under the fishing Category "Deep-water demersal species". The availability of 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 was recommended by the JSC, together with length distributions from all the fleets and for retained catches and discards. For that, the JSC recommended to reinforce the data collection through logbooks and through the implementation of programs of observers onboard hake trawlers.

**RCG response:** although some fishing trips were observed in Senegal by the IEO observer program onboard Spanish black hake trawlers, most observed trips occurred in Mauritania, which is, by far, the main fishing ground of the Spanish fleet in West Africa.

## **5.2 SPRFMO**

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

The 2019 RCG LDF reviewed the SPRMFO's data collection requirements (called Data Standards). There were no changes in SPRMFO Data Standards adopted in May 2018 (CMM 02-2018 Conservation and Management Measure on Standards for the Collection, Reporting, Verification and

---

<sup>7</sup> Fall M., Cervantès A., Sow F. N., Fernández-Peralta L., Thiam N., Balguerías, E., Sano B.-S., Jouffre D., Diédhiou A. et des Clers, S. 2018. Rapport de la réunion annuelle du Comité Scientifique Conjoint relatif à l'Accord de pêche signé entre la République du Sénégal et l'Union européenne. Dakar, Sénégal, 11-13 juillet 2018. Rapports des Comités Scientifiques Conjoints. Bruxelles, 71p. + Annexes. [https://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/report-2018-meeting-joint-scientific-committee-eu-senegal-fisheries\\_fr](https://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/report-2018-meeting-joint-scientific-committee-eu-senegal-fisheries_fr)

Exchange of Data), published on Organization's webpage<sup>8</sup>. Thus, from the perspective of EU fishing activity, the 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.

Final version of the "Conservation and Management Measure Establishing the SPRFMO Observer Programme" (CMM 16-2019)<sup>9</sup> was adopted at the 7th SPRFMO Commission Annual Meeting in January 2019 and it entered into force 27 May 2019.

Although the final version of the SPRFMO Observer Programme (OP) has been significantly simplified in relation to the aforementioned working versions of the document, the RCG LDF is still of the opinion that the requirements laid out for the OP go 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 prescriptive, resulting in a very high administrative burden, huge paper load and unavoidable workload to justify that SPRFMO's Member provides sufficiently trained observer, particularly in the light of the fact that share of EU catch of a key species (Chilean jack mackerel) in total catch for that stock is insignificant (<4% in 2016, <6% in 2017). Share of the EU in the total TAC in 2018 and 2019 equals to 6,1% only.

Examples of some important provisions that will have a direct impact on data collection by EU observers are provided below as an extract from the adopted OP:

*"9. To fulfil their obligations under the Convention and the relevant CMMs adopted by the Commission, Members and CNCPs shall only deploy observers sourced from a national observer programme or service provider accredited according to the provisions of this CMM.*

*23. Each Member, CNCP or service provider seeking to accredit its observer programme under the SPRFMO OP shall submit to the Secretariat and the Accreditation Evaluator, at any time, all the relevant information and documentation to fulfil the standards provided for in Annex 3, including manuals, guides and training materials .....*

*24. Members and CNCPs are encouraged to inform the Secretariat and the Accreditation Evaluator a year in advance of their intention to pursue accreditation under the SPRFMO OP.*

*53. Members and CNCPs may continue using their own non-accredited national observer programme or service provider to meet observer coverage requirements until 31 December 2023. From 1 January 2024 Members and CNCPs shall only deploy observers from national observer programmes or service providers accredited under the SPRFMO"*

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.sprfmo.int/assets/Fisheries/Conservation-and-Management-Measures/2018-CMMs/CMM-02-2018-Data-Standards-8March2018.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.sprfmo.int/assets/Fisheries/Conservation-and-Management-Measures/2019-CMMs/CMM-16-2019-5Mar2019.pdf>

One of the remaining 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 maintains its 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 OP is difficult to implement.

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 was amended in 2018 with its extension for 2019-2020.

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 Conservation and Management Measure for *Trachurus murphyi*).

In 2018 only one EU vessel was engaged in the Chilean jack mackerel fishery in the SPRFMO area. Polish observers collected data during two fishing trips in 2018, with one observer placed on board the vessel from mid-March till end of April and two observers from beginning of May till mid-June.

Also in 2019 only one EU vessel was engaged in the Chilean jack mackerel fishery in the SPRFMO area. 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 2019 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 10 fishing trips. Polish observers collected data already during two fishing trips in 2019, with observers placed on board from end of March till mid-May and from mid-May till end of June.

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**

#### **Madeira**

Under the 2018 Portuguese Data Collection Plan, monthly concurrent samplings on shore were performed for the main métiers operated by the local fleet in Madeira waters. Stock specific landing sampling for deep water species, mainly targeting *Aphanopus* spp. (LLD\_DWS\_0\_0\_0) covered 74 trips and 7557 individuals. In the metier PS\_SPF\_16\_0\_0 (small pelagic fish, directed to *Scomber*

*colias* and *Trachurus picturatus*) 39 trips were sampled and 7720 specimens were measured. Concerning the demersal fish targeting mainly Serranidae and Sparidae (LLS\_FIF\_0\_0\_0 and LHP\_FIF\_0\_0\_0) sampling were performed on 80 trips and 6975 specimens were measured. Regarding the limpets harvesting (MIS\_MOL\_0\_0\_0) 2958 individuals were sampled from 12 trips.

### **Canary Islands**

In 2018, for the metier PS\_SPF\_10\_0\_0 (artisanal fleet targeting small pelagics in Canary Islands) one fishing trip per month was sampled at sea (concurrent sampling) . In addition, monthly stock-specific samplings at the main landing places were carried out by IEO sampling network for the species *Scomber colias*, *Trachurus* spp., *Sardinella aurita* and *Sardina pilchardus*.

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 2018 (concurrent samplings). Moreover, monthly length samplings of most landed species were carried out by the IEO information and sampling network.

### **West Africa**

Until the end of 2017, data collection of small pelagics 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), the new multilateral agreement was concluded upon shortly after the 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 operator of the 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<sup>10</sup>.

Despite the efforts made, placement of observers on board the EU vessels operating in the CECAF area was possible only in December 2018, mainly due to lack of space on the vessels.

In 2019, by the time of the 2019 RCG LDF meeting, biological data were collected by Polish observers during two fishing trips in Mauritanian waters in the first quarter on board the Dutch vessel.

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 (five months in 2018 until the end of the SFPA in July 2018). Monthly length samplings (both concurrent and anchovy-stock specific samplings) were carried out. Landing samples for biological sampling were obtained only in four and three of these five months of activity, respectively for anchovy *Engraulis encrasicolus* and for sardine *Sardina pilchardus*.

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

---

<sup>10</sup> <http://dcf.mir.gdynia.pl/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Manual-for-scientific-observers-on-EU-pelagic-trawlers-in-CECAF.pdf>

carried out in 2018 in Guinea-Bissau, due to the closure of the EU fishing activity in this fishing ground following the expiry of the SFPA at the end of October 2017.

For the métier OTB\_CRU\_>=40\_0\_0 (shrimper trawlers), four fishing trip were sampled in Mauritania in 2018, covering the four quarters and 10 months from January to December, during a total of 208 fishing days. This represented 5% coverage of the total effort and 4% of the fishing trips observed.

For the metier OTB\_DEF\_>=70\_0\_0 (black hake trawlers), 13 fishing trips, carried out in 107 fishing days, were sampled in 2018, 12 conducted in Mauritania and one in Morocco. This represent a sampling coverage of 6% of the 219 fishing trips carried out by this fleet in both 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 and the EU MAP revision (ToR 4)

---

### 6.1 Response to consultation document on EU MAP revision

Early 2019, the Commission prepared a consultation document regarding the “Consultation of end users on the potential revision of EU-MAP biological data and socio-economic data”. This document provided a set of questions to be addressed by end users, but these questions were addressed at the RCGs as well. The RCG for North Sea, Baltic and North Atlantic addressed these questions through a dedicated subgroup meeting in May 2019. RCG LDF reviewed this response and added specific comments for LDF related issues. RCG LDF did not consider the questions regarding socio-economics, recreational/small scale fisheries. For the other questions (See RCG NANSEA report for full response) agreed to the response as provided earlier except additions to the response regarding question 4 and 5 respectively:

**Question 4: Should Tables 1A and 1C be combined in the EU-MAP revision? Given that stocks in both tables have end-user defined sampling requirements is it necessary to separate them?]**

RCG LDF agreed to the combined RCG response that it makes more sense to keep the tables separately as Table 1A and 1C originate from different sources and serve different purposes. The regional approach of 1A doesn't fit the special arrangements of 1C that form the basis for this table. The arrangements might require e.g. specific temporal and spatial resolutions while this would be difficult to include clearly in 1A. There should be no overlap on a species X area basis between the tables to avoid conflicting requirements. The priority as set in Table 1C should be taken out, thus aligning table 1C with the new version of 1A.

RCG LDF proposes to include the following species under table 1C. *Brama brama*, *Aphanopus carbo*, *Aphanopus intermedius* and *Aristeus varidens*. Also, *Scomber japonicus* should be corrected to the updated name *Scomber colias*.

**Question 5: Should Table 1B be revised to cover only species in or EEZ not covered by ICCAT IOTC WECAF CECAF SIOFA? [Can RCG LDF to reply/contribute for the revision of the table (preferably at species level)?]**

RCG LDF again agreed to the response provided by the other RCGs that the table should be revised to ensure all EU/RFMO/Local management requirements are covered. For the LDF purposes table 1B should be updated to include *Aphanopus carbo* and *Aphanopus intermedius*. Also, *Sardinella maderensis* should be updated into *S. aurita*.

### 6.2 Consider future mechanisms to continue strengthening regional cooperation including funding

Over the years, RCG LDF has proven to be a successful body to accommodate for regional cooperation, align national activities and effectuate cost-efficient data collection in various regions. Building upon the Regulation (REGULATION (EU) 2017/1004) that 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.” RCG LDF will of course continue its activities.

However, the group discussed various options regarding the setup of the meeting (e.g. to meet biennially while having intersessional work in between) while keeping the regulation in mind. Given that the RCG LDF plays a pivotal role in connecting various expertise, transfers specific regional knowledge and already is organized in a compact and efficient manner, RCG LDF concluded to continue its current setup. The group also foresees to play a role in the upcoming revision of the EU-MAP, thus requiring a regular meeting of the group rather than exchanging thoughts and views by correspondence only.

Funding of RCG work is not (yet) considered to be a problem. The main funding problem affecting the RCG work is the lack of funding for RDB work, both at the RDB level as well as the RDB activities specifically undertaken to facilitate RCG LDF work. Currently the RDB work for RCG LDF is not



included in the agreement between the Commission and ICES. RCG LDF recommends to include this work in future agreements, next to facilitating the general RDB work on development, maintenance and governance as this work needs to be covered financially as well.

<b>Recommendation 2019-2 : Funding of RDB work for RCG LDF</b>	
<b>RCG-LDF 2019 Recommendation</b>	RCG LDF recommends that, in line with the arrangements for RDB work for other RCGs, the RDB activities by ICES to facilitate RCG LDF work are funded through the agreement between the Commission and ICES
<b>Follow-up actions needed</b>	Include the costs in future agreement between Commission and ICES.
<b>Responsible persons for follow-up actions</b>	Commission representatives and ICES
<b>Time frame (Deadline)</b>	When agreement is renewed

RCG LDF will seek contact with the pan-regional, intersessional RCG subgroup on fisheries and sampling overviews to strengthen pan-regional cooperation and to provide a direct link between the RCG LDF and this group. Poland already has a participant in this group that could be asked to also represent RCG LDF in this group.

<b>Recommendation 2019-3 : RCG LDF participation to intersessional RCG subgroup on fisheries and sampling overviews</b>	
<b>RCG-LDF 2019 Recommendation</b>	RCG LDF to seek contact with the intersessional RCG subgroup on fisheries and sampling overviews as organised by RCG Baltic and RCG NANSEA ensure a direct link between this subgroup and the RCG LDF.
<b>Follow-up actions needed</b>	Contact sub group chair (Nuno Prista) to discuss and conclude on the participation of a RCG LDF representative. It is anticipated that the current Polish participant to the subgroup can extend its task to include the RCG LDF representation.
<b>Responsible persons for follow-up actions</b>	Chair RCG LDF
<b>Time frame (Deadline)</b>	After LM 2019

### **6.3 Ranking of métier to find out whether any of the NPs need to be modified for 2020**

In order to check whether or not the fisheries over the last three years have had similar pattern as in previous periods or whether there were significant changes to that pattern and to evaluate whether or not to amend future National Work Plans, the group performed the ranking of métiers using effort (days at sea) and landings data for 2016-2018 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 current work plans 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 2020-2022.

## 6.4 RDB updates and fisheries overviews

### 6.4.1 Updates to RDB references

During the RCG LDF, it became apparent that some references to areas, metiers and ports were missing from the RDB, thus hampering complete uploads. ICES SCRDB is requested to discuss these omissions and to update the references or RDB were applicable.

#### *Area codification*

The RDB is structured to upload data for a single "Area Code". However, fisheries information in CECAF area is usually registered in Spanish logbooks by countries which share more than one "Area Code" (ex: Morocco is 34.1.1 + 34.1.31 + 34. 1. 32, Mauritania is 34.1.32 + 34. 3. 11, Senegal is 34.3. 11 + 34. 3. 12 or Angola is 47.1.1, 47.1.2, 47.1.3). Therefore information uploaded might be uncompleted (ex: fishing in Mauritania was allocated to a single area -34.1.3- while part of it might correspond also to 34.3.1).

<b>Recommendation 2019-4 : Facilitate combined area upload.</b>	
<b>RCG-LDF 2019 Recommendation</b>	SC-RDB to discuss and seek a solution to facilitate future uploads for combined areas in the RDB
<b>Follow-up actions needed</b>	Contact SCRDB and put request on agenda for December meeting
<b>Responsible persons for follow-up actions</b>	Chair RCG LDF
<b>Time frame (Deadline)</b>	After LM 2019

#### *Ports*

The following ports could not be uploaded in the RDB:

- *Madeira ports*

In the RDB harbour code list from the 2019 LDF data call only two landing ports are reported for the archipelago of Madeira, namely Funchal and Porto Santo. However, there are missing three more landing ports, that should be included, namely Paúl do Mar (PTPMR), Porto Moniz (PTPMZ) and Caniçal (PTCNL).

Following the proposed updates mentioned above, ICES is requested to incorporate these proposals to facilitate future uploads of RCG LDF data.

- *Canary ports*

The following ports from the Canaries were not included in the RDB Harbour LOCODE list and as informed by ICES, this only could be done through the EU Master Data Register. Thus, the following ports had to be allocated to 'ES999' for 'Spain - Unknown' to upload their corresponding fishing information.

<b>OCODE</b>	<b>NAME</b>
ES AIC	Arico
ES NNC	San Nicolás
ES CUT	Morro del Jable
ES IDL	Icod de los Vinos
ES VDH	Hierro
ES ZFJ	Guía de Isora
ES PPS	Puerto de Playa de Santiago

- *West African ports*

Information of Spanish landings in Pointe Noire in Congo (CG PNR) could not be uploaded in the RDB as the code of this port was not included in the RDB Harbour LOCODE list.

#### *Metier-fishing area*

Currently the metier OTB\_CRU>=40\_0\_0 is missing for area 47.1.1, 47.1.2 & 47.1.3 (Angola) in the RDB.

### **6.4.2 Fisheries overviews**

Based on the RDB data and based on the work done by intersessional RCG subgroup on fisheries and sampling overviews the RCG explored the option to use standardized fisheries overviews to produce the yearly overview tables and to get more information out of the data available through maps and more detailed analysis. The very detailed overviews provide a lot of useful information, but some tweaking of the overviews might be required to address the RCG needs. The current overviews already provide good additional insights, but over the course of 2019, the intersessional subgroup will be asked to finetune the overviews. The main point of focus are to get insight in trends over the last three years, splitting the overviews by designated regions and e.g. focus on some main species of direct relevance for DCF work, while grouping other species of lesser relevance.

### **6.5 Rules of procedures for future RCG work**

[include Portugal, update regulations, align with other RCGs after LM?]

Article 9.5. of EU Regulation 2017/1004 stipulates that RCGs shall draw up and agree on rules of procedures for their activities. Based on this article, the Rules of Procedure for the RCG LDF were established on 9<sup>th</sup> of July 2018 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 of the 2018 RCG LDF report.

RCG LDF briefly discussed the appropriateness of the current RoP and the need to adapt these. As Portugal is now a member of the group, the RoP shall be ratified by Portugal as well. Also, the RoP should reflect the latest updates in the regulations. Given the indications from other RCGs that (renewed) harmonisation of the RoPs is required to align the RoPs for different regions (thus resulting in potentially conflicting rules) RCG LDF decided not to amend its RoPs, pending a decision at the LM whether or not to align the RoPs. If not, an updated set of RoPs will be drafted for the 2020 meeting.

### **6.6 Time frame for RCG LDF actions**

Based on the Rules of Procedures currently relevant for the RCG LDF, the following general milestones are considered current for organizing the RCG work, including the data call and organisational aspects. In practice, due to day-to-day issues and practicalities, not all deadlines can be met. However, given the nature of the work, participants (heavily) being involved in other groups, shifting time-lines due to external factors, some flexibility is required to be able to organize this meeting.

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	Any organisation or individual

	(11.2). Note that SPRFMO and CEEAF have a standing invitation to the RCG LDF (11.7)	
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. Future data collection set up in CECAF/SPRFMO (ToR 5)**

---

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

Following the 2018 RCG LDF, the standing multi-lateral agreement for sampling small pelagics in SPRFMO waters covering for 2017-2018 was extended to 2020. RCG LDF didn't flag any particular issue regarding this agreement.

### **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 2019.

A "Study on improvement for the analysis and exploitation of observers' reports in EU fisheries from NW African waters" is being developed by a Consortium of European Institutions (IEO, MRAG, WMR and CEFAS), as the Specific Contract No 12 of the Framework Contract EASME/EMFF/2016/008 for the "Provision of scientific advice for fisheries beyond EU waters". It is a one year study, started in February 2019. Its main objectives are: i) to scrutinise and analyse the available information from observers onboard EU fleets operating in NW Africa, both in DG MARE and MS, in order to maximise the use of this information and ii) to analyse the information available to identify strengths and weaknesses in data coverage, with a view to establishing standardised observer manuals. A Workshop to standardize observer methodologies will be organised, involving the attendance of experts from the Consortium and scientists from the relevant institutions of coastal States with SPPA. An invitation to other EU relevant stakeholders is envisaged, including NMFRI-Poland, as the coordinating institution of the new Multilateral Agreement for the DCF of EU pelagic trawlers in the CECAF waters, and the chairman of the RCG-LDF. Due to the relationship with the work coordinated by the RCG-LDF and to avoid any overlapping, it is expected that the chairman of this RCG will closely follow the development of the manual for pelagic trawlers, in order to ensure consistency with the work to be performed by NMFRI observers.

### **8.2 Call for tenders for studies in support of the CFP**

No specific call for tender was addressed during the RCG.

### **8.3 Chairmanship, timing and venue of the RCG LDF meeting in 2020**

During the 14<sup>th</sup> LM in 2017, a draft working schedule for all RCGs was laid out for 2018 and 2019. The 2019 LM is expected to set up a new general working schedule for the upcoming years. It is anticipated that, in order to ease the coordination workload prior to setting the new multi-annual work plans and revision of the EU-MAP, all RCGs are will take place in June/early July.

The 2020 RCG LDF is expected to be held in June/July as well. Most likely, the dates will be 25<sup>th</sup>-27<sup>th</sup> of June. The meeting will be chaired by Irek Wójcik (Poland). Post-meeting consultation of the relevant NCs revealed no objection to the proposal by the RCG to elect Irek as the new chair for this group.

Regarding the venue of the next RCG LDF meeting, Portugal invites the group to visit Funchal in the Azores for its next meeting. The RCG appreciated the invitation by Portugal to host the meeting.

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

<b>Year</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Chair</b>
2019	Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Spain	Sieto Verver (The Netherlands)
2018	Riga, Latvia	Sieto Verver (The Netherlands)
2017	Copenhagen, Denmark Hamburg, Germany	Sieto Verver (The Netherlands)
2016	Vilnius, Lithuania	Sieto Verver (The Netherlands)
2015	Hamburg, Germany Cádiz, Spain	Irek Wójcik (Poland)
2014	IJmuiden, The Netherlands	Irek Wójcik (Poland)
2013	Constanza, Romania	Irek Wójcik (Poland)
2012	Madrid, Spain	Irek Wójcik (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 2020**

Pending future developments and decisions within the DCF realm and pending the outcomes of LM 2019, the following ToRs are proposed for RCG LDF 2020.

Draft Terms of Reference – RCG LDF 2020

1. Review progress since 2019 following up the 16th 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 2019 proposed 4 recommendations to be put forward to the NC decision making meeting in September 2019.

From section 2.7:

<b>Recommendation 2019-1 : Updating national data to the RDB</b>	
<b>RCG-LDF 2019 Recommendation</b>	RCG LDF recommends that MS continue to update historical data as well as most recent data prior to the 2020 RCG LDF data call.
<b>Follow-up actions needed</b>	MS to update their data and promote set up of routine procedures to provide data to the RDB.
<b>Responsible persons for follow-up actions</b>	NCs of all RCG LDF MS.
<b>Time frame (Deadline)</b>	Prior to the RCG LDF 2020 data call.

From section 6.2:

<b>Recommendation 2019-2 : Funding of RDB work for RCG LDF</b>	
<b>RCG-LDF 2019 Recommendation</b>	RCG LDF recommends that, in line with the arrangements for RDB work for other RCGs, the RDB activities by ICES to facilitate RCG LDF work are funded through the agreement between the Commission and ICES
<b>Follow-up actions needed</b>	Include the costs in future agreement between Commission and ICES.
<b>Responsible persons for follow-up actions</b>	Commission representatives and ICES
<b>Time frame (Deadline)</b>	When agreement is renewed

<b>Recommendation 2019-3 : RCG LDF participation to intersessional RCG subgroup on fisheries and sampling overviews</b>	
<b>RCG-LDF 2019 Recommendation</b>	RCG LDF to seek contact with the intersessional RCG subgroup on fisheries and sampling overviews as organised by RCG Baltic and RCG NANSEA ensure a direct link between this subgroup and the RCG LDF.
<b>Follow-up actions needed</b>	Contact sub group chair (Nuno Prista) to discuss and conclude on the participation of a RCG LDF representative. It is anticipated that the current Polish participant to the subgroup can extend its task to include the RCG LDF representation.
<b>Responsible persons for follow-up actions</b>	Chair RCG LDF
<b>Time frame (Deadline)</b>	After LM 2019



From section 6.4:

<b>Recommendation 2019-4 : Facilitate combined area upload.</b>	
<b>RCG-LDF 2019 Recommendation</b>	SC-RDB to discuss and seek a solution to facilitate future uploads for combined areas in the RDB
<b>Follow-up actions needed</b>	Contact SCRDB and put request on agenda for December meeting
<b>Responsible persons for follow-up actions</b>	Chair RCG LDF
<b>Time frame (Deadline)</b>	After LM 2019

## 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
CRODT	Centre de Recherches Océanographiques de Dakar-Thiaroye (Senegal)
CFP	Common Fishery Policy (EU)
CR	Control Regulations (EU)
DCF	Data Collection Framework (follow up of DCR)
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EFMM	European Fisheries and Maritime Fund
EU-MAP	Multi Annual Programme for Data Collection
EWG	STECF Expert Working Group
FD	Fisheries Department (The Gambia)
ICES	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea
IMROP	Mauritanian Institute for of Oceanographic Research and Fisheries
INRH	Institut National de Recherche Halieutique (Morocco)
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)
NMFRI	Polish National Marine Fisheries Research Institute
OP	Operational Programme
RCG	Regional Coordination Group
RCM	Regional Coordination Meeting
RDB	Regional Data Base (of the RCM)
RFMO	Regional Fisheries Management Organization
SFPA	Sustainable Fisheries Partnership Agreement
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 2019)

IEO, Santa Cruz de Tenerife

Tenerife, Spain

2-4 July 2019

### 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 10:30 & 16:00

Lunch 13:00

### Work Plan

#### **Tuesday, 2<sup>th</sup> July 2019**

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

10:00 – 18:00 : Plenary session

- Welcome, introduction, organization & house rules
- Discuss ToRs, adopt agenda, appoint rapporteurs
  
- **ToR 1 Review progress since 2018 following up the 15th Liaison Meeting report (Sieto)**
  - Follow-up of recommendations / output RCM LDF 2018
  - Review of the outputs of the 15th Liaison Meeting
  - Participation to the SCRDB
  
- ➔ **ToR 2 Review feedback and recommendations from data end users (Eva Irek)**
  - *Discuss feedback CECAF groups (Eva)*
  - *Discuss feedback SPRFMO (Irek)*
  
- ➔ **ToR 5 Future data collection set up in CECAF/SPFRMO (Irek)**
  - *Current experiences in both areas [no need to set up new arrangements]*

- *CECAF future data needs (Eva/Christine)*

**→ ToR 4: Regional data collection and the EU MAP revision (Eva/Christine)**

- Briefly present outcomes of STECF EWG 19-05 on surveys (Sieto)
- Revision of EU MAP and outstanding questions to LDF (Christine)
- SC 12 presentation (Eva)
- Future of RCG LDF (continue yearly meeting? 3 year workplan? Regional sampling plan needed? Subgroups?)

14:30 – 18:00 : “subgroup” session

**Wednesday, 3<sup>th</sup> July 2019**

9.00 – 18.00 : “subgroup” session

**→ ToR 3 Analyse data from 2019 RCG LDF data call (Kay/Max/Romas/Eva)**

- Review and assess fisheries overviews based on RDB output.
- Complete overviews on the catch statistics
- Compile tables (if needed) and update report text
- Overview required regional coordination in light of new EU MAP
- Provide data table update if needed for RDB (Romas)
- Propose setup and additional overviews in fisheries overviews based on needs
- Share and comment on experience RDB upload

**→ ToR 6 (Sieto/Irek)**

- Review RoP if needed

**→ ToR 4 (Sieto/Irek)**

- discuss future DCF requirements/amendments (incl SPRFMO response)
- propose set up RCG LDF

**Thursday, 4<sup>th</sup> July 2019**

9:00 – 13:00 : Plenary session

**→ Discuss outcomes and conclusions ToR 3,4,6**

**→ Report assemblage and reading – continued**

**→ ToR 6 AOB:**

- place and date of the next RCG LDF
- New chair

→ Adoption of the draft report

**Closure of the meeting**

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

Species	DEU	ESP	ITA	LTU	LVA	NLD
Alectis alexandrinus (ALA)		9				
Aphanopus carbo (BSF)		<1				
Aristaeomorpha foliacea (ARS)			11			
Aristeus antennatus (ARA)			<1			
Aristeus varidens (ARV)		452				
Arnoglossus spp. (RGX)		30	123			
Auxis rochei (BLT)	14	<1		19		
Auxis thazard (FRI)						232
Balistes capriscus		42				
Balistidae (TRI)		7				
Beryx decadactylus (BXD)		<1				
Beryx spp. (ALF)		<1				
Boops boops (BOG)		<1				
Brachydeuterus auritus (GRB)		1				
Brachyura (CRA)		<1				
Brama brama (POA)	3	2089		55		
Brotula barbata (BRD)		195				
Caranx crysos (RUB)		<1				
Caranx hippos (CVJ)		2				
Carlarius heudelotii		21				
Centrolophidae (CEN)		26				
Chaceon maritae (CGE)		150				
Cynoglossus senegalensis (YOE)		10				
Cynoglossus spp (YOX)		73				
Citharus linguatula (CIL)			2			
Conger conger (COE)		1				
Crustacea (CRU)			<1			
Dasyatis pastinaca (JDP)		<1				
Dentex angolensis (DEA)		4				14
Dentex dentex (DEC)		<1	2	57		
Dentex gibbosus (DEP)		1				
Dentex macrophthalmus (DEL)		42	<1			
Dentex spp (DEX)		262				
Dicologlossa cuneata (CET)		1	8			
Dicologlossa hexophthalma (DHZ)		5				
Diplodus bellottii (DHQ)			<1			
Diplodus spp (SRG)		<1				
Drepane africana (SIC)		12				
Engraulis encrasicolus (ANE)		113				<1

Ephippion guttifer (EFG)		6			
Epinephelus aeneus (GPW)		7	60		
Epinephelus marginatus (GPD)			2		
Epinephelus spp (GPX)		1			
Erythrocles monodi (EYO)		<1		1	
Eucinostomus melanopterus (MFF)		19			
Euthynnus alletteratus (LTA)		<1			
Gadiformes (GAD)		<1			
Galeoides decadactylus (GAL)		113			
Galeorhinus galeus (GAG)		<1			
Gastropoda (GAS)		20			
Gephyroberyx darwinii (GXW)		33			
Helicolenus dactylopterus (BRF)		77			
Hippoglossus hippoglossus (HAL)			<1		
Hoplostethus atlanticus (ORY)		10			
Ilisha africana (ILI)		11			
Katsuwonus pelamis (SKJ)					1
Labridae (WRA)			18		
Lepidopus caudatus (SFS)		29			
Lichia amia (LEE)		39		135	5
Lithognathus mormyrus (SSB)					35
Loliginidae (SQZ)		<1			
Loligo vulgaris (SQR)		10			
Lophiidae (ANF)		134			
Lophius budegassa (ANK)		10			
Lophius spp (MNZ)		358	25		
Lophius vaillanti (MVA)		176			
Merluccius merluccius (HKE)		1	3	188	
Merluccius senegalensis (HKM)		246			
Merluccius spp (HKX)		15290			
Mollusca (MOL)			<1		
Mugil cephalus (MUF)		5			11
Mugilidae (MUL)				16	
Mullus barbatus (MUT)		355	103		
Mullus surmuletus (MUR)			51		
Muraena helena (MMH)		<1			
Mustelus mustelus (SMD)			12		
Mustelus spp (SDV)		1			
Octopus vulgaris (OCC)		97	273		
Ommastrephidae (OMZ)		1			
Osteichthyes (MZZ)		235			3575
Pagellus acarne (SBA)		10			
Pagellus bellottii (PAR)		285			
Pagellus bogaraveo (SBR)		8			
Pagellus erythrinus (PAC)		43			

Pagellus spp (PAX)		3				
Pagrus caeruleostictus (BSC)		1				
Pagrus pagrus (RPG)		23				
Palinurus elephas (SLO)		<1				
Pandalidae (PDZ)		315	<1			
Panulirus regius (LOY)		<1				
Parapenaeus longirostris (DPS)		1032				
Penaeus kerathurus (TGS)		<1	99			
Penaeus spp (PEN)		219				
Phycis phycis (FOR)		4				
Phycis spp (FOX)		<1				
Plectorhinchus mediterraneus (GBR)		3				
Plesionika spp. (XKX)			3			
Pleuronectiformes (FLX)		<1				
Polyprion americanus (WRF)		2				
Pomadasys incisus (BGR)		21				<1
Pomadasys jubelini (BUR)		16				
Pontinus kuhlii (POI)		38				
Psettodes bennettii (PSB)		11				
Pseudolithus senegalensis (PSS)		4				
Pseudupeneus prayensis (GOA)		1				
Raja clavata (RJC)		<1				
Raja miraletus (JAI)		98				
Rajidae (RAJ)		80				
Sarda sarda (BON)	14	<1		749		40
Sardina pilchardus (PIL)	21496	602		1023	4486	15614
Sardinella aurita (SAA)	1396	11		1583	4177	1491
Sardinella maderensis (SAE)				313	354	
Schedophilus ovalis (HDV)		1				
Scyliorhinus canicula (SYC)		<1				
Scomber japonicus (MAS)	562	1		12994		1352
Scomber scombrus (MAC)					21435	
Scomber spp (MAZ)		1				
Scorpaena porcus (BBS)			<1			
Scorpaena scrofa (RSE)		<1				
Scorpaena spp (SCS)		38				
Sepia officinalis (CTC)		60	359			
Sepia spp (IAX)		1				
Sepiola rondeleti (CTR)		<1				
Synaptura cadenati (YNY)		1				
Solea senegalensis (OAL)		<1				
Solea solea (SOL)		1	24			
Soleidae (SOX)		2				
Sparidae (SBX)		30				
Sparisoma cretense (PRR)		<1				



Sphyraena sphyraena (YRS)		6			
Sphyraena spp. (BAR)		<1			
Spicara spp. (PIC)		1			
Spondyliosoma cantharus (BRB)					5
Squaliformes (SHX)		89			
Stromateus fiatola (BLB)		<1		2	
Thunnini (TUN)				821	
Todarodes sagittatus (SQE)		269			
Trachinotus ovatus (POP)		<1			
Trachinotus spp. (POX)		<1			
Trachyscorpia cristulata (TJX)		34			
Trachurus murphyi (CJM)					279
Trachurus spp (JAX)	37	280			
Trachurus trachurus (HOM)	61	719		13948	28294
Trichiuridae (CUT)				197	
Trichiurus lepturus (LHT)		6			
Umbrina canariensis (UCA)		25			
Umbrina cirrosa (COB)			<1		
Zenopsis conchifer (JOS)		164			
Zeus faber (JOD)		193		6	

*Landings by species (tons) in Canary Islands (CECAF area). Data from 2018.*

<b>Species</b>	<b>ESP</b>
Abudefduf luridus (AUU)	<1
Acanthocybium solandri (WAH)	58
Acantholabrus palloni (AKL)	<1
Aetomylaeus bovinus (NA)	<1
Anthias anthias (AHN)	<1
Aphanopus carbo (BSF)	<1
Argyrosomus regius (MGR)	<1
Aristaeopsis edwardsiana (NA)	1
Atherina boyeri (ATB)	<1
Auxis (NA)	<1
Auxis rochei (BLT)	<1
Auxis thazard (FRI)	1
Balistes capriscus (NA)	46
Balistidae (TRI)	<1
Belone belone (GAR)	<1
Beryx decadactylus (BXD)	4
Beryx splendens (BYS)	71
Bodianus scrofa (IVD)	8
Boops boops (BOG)	8
Brachyura (CRA)	<1
Brama brama (POA)	1
Brotula barbata (BRD)	<1

Campogramma glaycos (VAD)	<1
Cancer bellianus (KCB)	<1
Caranx rhonchus (HMY)	<1
Carcharias taurus (CCT)	<1
Centrolabrus trutta (JCN)	<1
Centrophorus granulosus (GUP)	<1
Chaceon affinis (KEF)	<1
Chelidonichthys lastoviza (CTZ)	<1
Chelidonichthys lucerna (GUU)	<1
Chelon labrosus (MLR)	1
Chromis limbata (HZL)	1
Conger conger (COE)	30
Coryphaena equiselis (CFW)	1
Coryphaena hippurus (DOL)	<1
Deania hystricosa (SDH)	<1
Dentex (NA)	<1
Dentex canariensis (DEN)	<1
Dentex dentex (DEC)	7
Dentex gibbosus (DEP)	118
Dentex macrophthalmus (DEL)	7
Dentex maroccanus (DEM)	2
Dicentrarchus labrax (BSS)	1
Dicentrarchus punctatus (SPU)	<1
Dicologlossa cuneata (CET)	<1
Diplodus (NA)	<1
Diplodus annularis (ANN)	<1
Diplodus cervinus (SBZ)	7
Diplodus puntazzo (SHR)	4
Diplodus sargus (SWA)	20
Diplodus vulgaris (CTB)	10
Enchelycore anatina (AWM)	5
Engraulis encrasicolus (ANE)	4
Epigonus telescopus (EPI)	1
Epinephelus (NA)	<1
Epinephelus aeneus (GPW)	<1
Epinephelus marginatus (GPD)	29
Galeorhinus galeus (GAG)	2
Gephyroberyx darwinii (GXW)	<1
Gymnothorax maderensis (AGD)	2
Gymnothorax unicolor (AGK)	7
Halobatrachus didactylus (BHD)	<1
Helicolenus dactylopterus (BRF)	17
Heptranchias perlo (HXT)	<1
Heterocarpus ensifer (HKF)	<1
Heteropriacanthus cruentatus (HTU)	2
Hexanchus griseus (SBL)	<1

<i>Illex coindetii</i> (SQM)	<1
<i>Illex illecebrosus</i> (SQI)	<1
<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i> (SMA)	<1
<i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i> (SKJ)	792
<i>Kyphosus sectatrix</i> (KYS)	1
Labridae (WRA)	<1
<i>Lepidocybium flavobrunneum</i> (LEC)	1
<i>Lepidopus caudatus</i> (SFS)	<1
<i>Lepidorhombus</i> (NA)	<1
<i>Lichia amia</i> (LEE)	<1
<i>Lithognathus mormyrus</i> (SSB)	5
<i>Liza aurata</i> (MGA)	<1
<i>Loligo forbesii</i> (NA)	<1
<i>Loligo vulgaris</i> (SQR)	8
<i>Lophius</i> (NA)	<1
<i>Lophius piscatorius</i> (MON)	<1
<i>Maja squinado</i> (SCR)	1
<i>Makaira nigricans</i> (BUM)	<1
<i>Merluccius</i> (NA)	<1
<i>Merluccius merluccius</i> (HKE)	37
<i>Microchirus azevia</i> (MIA)	<1
<i>Mora moro</i> (RIB)	1
<i>Mugil cephalus</i> (MUF)	1
Mugilidae (MUL)	<1
<i>Mullus barbatus</i> (MUT)	<1
<i>Mullus surmuletus</i> (MUR)	14
<i>Muraena augusti</i> (MWK)	22
<i>Muraena helena</i> (MMH)	19
Muraenidae (MUI)	1
<i>Mustelus mustelus</i> (SMD)	1
<i>Mycteroperca fusca</i> (MKF)	11
<i>Naucrates ductor</i> (NAU)	<1
<i>Oblada melanura</i> (SBS)	4
<i>Octopus vulgaris</i> (OCC)	29
<i>Ommastrephes bartramii</i> (NA)	<1
<i>Pagellus</i> (NA)	<1
<i>Pagellus acarne</i> (SBA)	9
<i>Pagellus bellottii</i> (PAR)	<1
<i>Pagellus bogaraveo</i> (SBR)	1
<i>Pagellus erythrinus</i> (PAC)	31
<i>Pagrus</i> (NA)	<1
<i>Pagrus auriga</i> (REA)	16
<i>Pagrus pagrus</i> (RPG)	96
<i>Palinurus mauritanicus</i> (PSL)	<1
<i>Parapristipoma octolineatum</i> (GRA)	12
<i>Paromola cuvieri</i> (OLV)	<1

Patella ulyssiponensis (LQY)	3
Pegusa lascaris (NA)	<1
Phycis (NA)	<1
Phycis phycis (FOR)	21
Pisces (NA)	19
Plagusia depressa (UIS)	<1
Plectorhinchus mediterraneus (GBR)	1
Plesionika edwardsii (LKW)	17
Plesionika narval (NA)	45
Pollachius pollachius (POL)	<1
Polymixia nobilis (PXV)	2
Polynemidae (THF)	<1
Polyprion americanus (WRF)	1
Pomadasys incisus (BGR)	3
Pomadasys jubelini (BUR)	<1
Pomatomus saltatrix (BLU)	2
Pontinus kuhlii (POI)	1
Portunidae (SWM)	<1
Promethichthys prometheus (PRP)	2
Pseudocaranx dentex (TRZ)	63
Raja (NA)	<1
Ruvettus pretiosus (OIL)	4
Salmo salar (SAL)	<1
Sarda sarda (BON)	19
Sardina pilchardus (PIL)	248
Sardinella aurita (SAA)	77
Sardinella maderensis (SAE)	47
Sarpa salpa (SLM)	37
Schedophilus ovalis (HDV)	1
Sciaena umbra (CBM)	<1
Scomber colias (VMA)	1115
Scomber japonicus (MAS)	<1
Scomber scombrus (MAC)	<1
Scophthalmus rhombus (BLL)	<1
Scorpaena notata (SNQ)	<1
Scorpaena porcus (BBS)	1
Scorpaena scrofa (RSE)	4
Sepia elegans (EJE)	<1
Sepia officinalis (CTC)	1
Seriola (NA)	2
Seriola dumerili (AMB)	18
Seriola rivoliana (YTL)	7
Serranus (NA)	1
Serranus atricauda (WSA)	12
Serranus cabrilla (CBR)	18
Serranus scriba (SRK)	3

Solea solea (SOL)	1
Solenocera membranacea (SKM)	<1
Sparisoma cretense (PRR)	223
Sparus aurata (SBG)	<1
Sphyraena (NA)	1
Sphyraena sphyraena (YRS)	<1
Sphyraena viridensis (BVV)	42
Spondyliosoma cantharus (BRB)	26
Squalus acanthias (DGS)	<1
Stephanolepis hispidus (FIK)	29
Sthenoteuthis pteropus (OFE)	<1
Stromateus fiatola (BLB)	<1
Synaphobranchus kaupii (SSK)	<1
Synodus synodus (DYZ)	<1
Taractichthys longipinnis (TAL)	<1
Thunnus alalunga (ALB)	58
Thunnus albacares (YFT)	34
Thunnus obesus (BET)	17
Thunnus thynnus (BFT)	34
Trachinotus ovatus (POP)	8
Trachinus draco (WEG)	<1
Trachurus picturatus (JAA)	402
Trachurus trachurus (HOM)	9
Trichiurus lepturus (LHT)	<1
Trisopterus luscus (BIB)	<1
Umbrina canariensis (UCA)	3
Umbrina cirrosa (COB)	<1
Umbrina ronchus (UMO)	1
Xiphias gladius (SWO)	<1
Zenopsis conchifer (JOS)	1
Zeus faber (JOD)	2

*Landings by species (tons) in Madeira (CECAF area). Data from 2018.*

<b>Species</b>	<b>PRT</b>
Gymnothorax unicolor (AGK)	<1
Alepocephalus bairdii (ALC)	<1
Seriola spp (AMX)	3
Abudefduf luridus (AUU)	<1
Gymnothorax spp (AXZ)	<1
Bodianus spp (BDY)	<1
Thunnus obesus (BET)	1
Thunnus thynnus (BFT)	<1
Pomadasys incisus (BGR)	<1
Pomatomus saltatrix (BLU)	<1
Boops boops (BOG)	<1
Spondyliosoma cantharus (BRB)	<1

Helicolenus dactylopterus (BRF)	<1
Aphanopus carbo (BSF)	2210
Sphyræna viridensis (BVV)	<1
Beryx decadactylus (BXD)	<1
Beryx splendens (BYS)	<1
Conger conger (COE)	1
Diplodus vulgaris (CTB)	<1
Centroscymnus spp (CZI)	<1
Dentex gibbosus (DEP)	51
Coryphaena hippurus (DOL)	1
Synodus synodus (DYZ)	<1
Centracanthus cirrus (EHI)	<1
Epigonus telescopus (EPI)	<1
Phycis phycis (FOR)	7
Auxis thazard (FRI)	1
Galeorhinus galeus (GAG)	3
Epinephelus marginatus (GPD)	<1
Centrophorus granulatus (GUP)	<1
Centrophorus squamosus (GUQ)	9
Trigla spp (GUY)	<1
Schedophilus ovalis (HDV)	<1
Merluccius merluccius (HKE)	<1
Heteropriacanthus cruentatus (HTU)	<1
Chromis limbata (HZL)	2
Trachurus picturatus (JAA)	201
Zeus faber (JOD)	<1
Cancer bellianus (KCB)	<1
Kyphosus sectatrix (KYS)	<1
Lepidocybium flavobrunneum (LEC)	4
Patella spp (LPZ)	79
Scomber japonicus (MAS)	223
Muraena spp (MDZ)	<1
Mycteroperca fusca (MKF)	<1
Muraena helena (MMH)	1
Mugil cephalus (MUF)	<1
Mullus surmuletus (MUR)	<1
Nesiarchus nasutus (NEN)	3
Phorcus atratus (OAW)	<1
Octopus vulgaris (OCC)	<1
Apogon imberbis (OGT)	<1
Ruvettus pretiosus (OIL)	1
Ommastrephidae (OMZ)	2
Pagellus erythrinus (PAC)	<1
Sardina pilchardus (PIL)	7
Brama brama (POA)	<1
Pontinus kuhlii (POI)	1
Trachinotus ovatus (POP)	<1

Promethichthys prometheus (PRP)	<1
Sparisoma cretense (PRR)	1
Polymixia nobilis (PXV)	<1
Mora moro (RIB)	<1
Pagrus pagrus (RPG)	10
Scorpaena scrofa (RSE)	1
Sardinella maderensis (SAE)	<1
Pagellus acarne (SBA)	1
Pagellus bogaraveo (SBR)	<1
Oblada melanura (SBS)	<1
Diplodus cervinus (SBZ)	<1
Dalatias licha (SCK)	<1
Raja spp (SKA)	<1
Katsuwonus pelamis (SKJ)	<1
Sarpa salpa (SLM)	<1
Isurus oxyrinchus (SMA)	<1
Mustelus mustelus (SMD)	<1
Sphyrna zygaena (SPZ)	<1
Todarodes sagittatus (SQE)	<1
Loligo vulgaris (SQR)	<1
Diplodus sargus (SWA)	<1
Xiphias gladius (SWO)	2
Taractichthys longipinnis (TAL)	1
Balistes carolinensis (TRG)	3
Pseudocaranx dentex (TRZ)	<1
Polyprion americanus (WRF)	1
Serranus atricauda (WSA)	5
Scyllarides latus (YLL)	<1

*Landings by species (tons) in SPRFMO area. Data from 2018.*

<b>Species</b>	<b>LTU</b>
Brama australis (BRU)	290
Cubiceps caeruleus (UBA)	208
Scomber japonicus (MAS)	117
Trachurus murphyi (CJM)	9620

*Landings by species (tons) in 41 (Atlantic, Southwest) area. Data from 2018.*

<b>Species</b>	<b>GBR</b>
Genypterus blacodes (CUS)	10
Illex argentinus (SQA)	222
Loligo gahi (SQP)	4183
Merluccius hubbsi (HKP)	155
Patagonotothen breviceuda (NOT)	27
Raja montagui (RJM)	1
Salilota australis (SAO)	<1

*Landings by species (tons) in 47 (Atlantic, Southeast) area. Data from 2018.*

<b>Species</b>	<b>IRL</b>	<b>POL</b>
Actinopterygii		5
Beryx spp (ALF)		16
Brama japonica (BPQ)		42
Dentex spp (DEX)		82
Loliginidae (SQU)		32
Merluccius merluccius (HKE)		442
Sardina pilchardus (PIL)		<1
Scomber scombrus (MAC)		568
Thyrsites atun (SNK)		81
Trachurus spp (JAX)	746	
Trachurus trachurus (HOM)		25802
Zeus faber (JOD)		2