

RCG NA NS&EA AND RCG BALTIC 2020 REPORT

PART II

Decisions and Recommendations

8-12 JUNE 2020
Virtual meeting



Regional Coordination Group
North Atlantic
North Sea & Eastern Arctic



Regional Coordination Group
Baltic

Recommended format for purposes of citation:

RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020. Regional Coordination Group North Atlantic, North Sea & Eastern Arctic and Regional Coordination Group Baltic. 2020. Part I Report, 110 pgs. Part II Decisions and Recommendations, 7 pgs. Part III, Intersessional Subgroup (ISSG) 2019-2020 Reports, 154 pgs. (<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 two 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).

© 2020 Regional Coordination Groups

1. Table of decisions and recommendations

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision by NC?	Table in WP
Covid 19 + Comm. sampling	NANSEA BALTIC_ 2020_R01	2020	R01	Data gaps because of Covid 19 restrictions	ICES to either provide explicitly guidelines on how to address data gaps OR underscore clearly in the 2021 data call that imputation should not be done	ICES	By end of 2020, in time for WG's	Due to Covid19, there may be gaps in sampling data and countries need advice on how to deal with this in the stock assessments	Section 5.1.4 of the report	NO	NO
Catch and Effort Overviews	NANSEA BALTIC_ 2020_D01	2020	D01	Annual RDB catch and effort overview – approve sharing and Data Policy exemptions	NC's to approve whether the overviews can be made available to WGs that have been pre-approved for access to aggregated RDB data and agree on the process	NC's (NA NS&EA and Baltic region)	30/09/2020	The RDB catch and effort overviews offer valuable information for ICES WGs and the ICES annual fisheries overview. Although all graphs are following the RDB data policy, the combination of some is violating the second rule (i.e. only the same aggregated variables should be used in the same document). Graphs can still be shared given an approval by NCs. For this approval, RCG proposes to set up a process where the overviews are sent to the respective NCs and ask for approval. That would give MS the possibility to object or re-upload data that were missing up to this point. Two ways are proposed for this. Further details can be found in section 5.2.1.1. of the report.	RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 report PART I Section 5.2.1, Annex 3 (SCRDB group list) and Annex 4 (review data policy) RDB Catch and Effort Overviews for Baltic, NA and NSEA regions are available in ICES sharepoint under RCG NA NS&EA -> 04.working documents -> SG - Overviews	YES	NO
Catch and Effort Overviews	NANSEA BALTIC_ 2020_R02	2020	R02	Update RDB Data policy	WGRDBESGOV to adjust and update the Data policy and data guidelines	WGRDBESG OV	Before 2021	The RDB Data policy is yet not covering all possible aggregation variables of the RDB data (census and sampling data). The RDB catch and effort overviews offer some new combinations that can be used to specify and update the policy to make it either more flexible or adding the missing parameter.	RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 report PART I Section 5.2.1 and Annex 4 (review data policy) RDB Catch and Effort Overviews for Baltic, NA and NSEA regions are available in ICES sharepoint under RCG NA NS&EA -> 04.working documents -> SG - Overviews	NO	NO
Catch and Effort Overviews	NANSEA BALTIC_ 2020_R03	2020	R03	Implement Upload-logs as standard tool into RDBES	WGRDBESGOV to set up a standardized way for the Upload logs as integral part of the Uploading process of the RDBES	WGRDBESG OV	Before 2021-22?	The Upload-logs are important documents that support the understanding and reading of the census and sampling data overviews. Yet they are stand-alone Excel sheets with only a few standardized fields. Integrating them in the upload process will improve their usage and make the content available during the analysis of the data.	RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 report PART I Section 5.2.1, Annex 5 (Citation suggestion)	NO	NO
Metier Issues	NANSEA BALTIC_ 2020_D02	2020	D02	Codes for metiers and reference lists that shall be used by Member States	NC's to approve whether the new codes for metiers and reference lists will be used and implemented by MS	NC's (NA NS&EA and Baltic region)	30/09/2020	The suggested métier list is standardized and harmonized codes (especially on mesh-size ranges) which will allow to avoid overlapping as well as apply similar methods and criteria on assigning metiers for fishing activities by Member States. A general workflow for assigning métiers was developed and set up a public repository on GitHub for storing reference lists, scripts, métier descriptions and documentation of procedures. R-script for assigning métiers to transversal data was developed and tested by ISSG.	RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 report PART I Section 5.2.2. Feedback from the ISSG on "Metier issues"	YES	7B

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision by NC?	Table in WP
Data quality	NANSEA BALTIC_2020_R04	2020	R04	Advice for completing Table 5A in the national workplans	MS should take notice of the advice made for completing Table 5A: - Provide direct links to relevant documentations where possible, - Ensure any links provided are correct and work, - Ensure the documents referenced are reasonably recent (>2014), - Provide the date when the documentation was written or updated, - Provide explanations of why this is good/best practice e.g. give explicit references to any expert group reports that define the practices that are being followed, - Double-check whether "NA" is a legitimate answer to a particular question.	MS	31/12/2020	The Data Quality group has developed indicators based on Table 5A. When calculating these indicators a number of common issues have been identified - if these were resolved then the information presented in Table 5A would be more useful.	RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 report PART III Section 4 ISSG Data Quality report	NO	7B
SCRDB	NANSEA BALTIC_2020_D03	2020	D03	Approve changes to the RDB/RDBES Data Policy	Approve the proposed changes to the RDB/RDBES Data Policy. These changes are: i) minor changes to the text, ii) allow NCs to pre-approve access to detailed data for selected ICES expert groups, iii) minor change to the aggregation guidelines	NC's (NA NS&EA and Baltic region)	30/09/2020	ii) A recommendation was made by the RCGs to the RDB Steering Committee to create a process whereby countries could pre-approve access to detailed data for selected users. iii) During the 2020 RCG meeting it was noticed that the current aggregation rules do not cover all of the variables used in the RCG Effort & Catch Overview reports - these missing variables should be added to the guidelines.	Revised RDB Data Policy (with tracked changes) on the RCG SharePoint. -> 02. Background documents -> 20_Data_Policy_RDB_RDBES-DEC2019_revised.docx The SCRDB 2019 report can also be consulted: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Expert%20Group%20Report/EOSG/2020/SCRDB%20Report%202019.pdf	YES	NO
SCRDB	NANSEA BALTIC_2020_D04	2020	D04	Approve the "Conditions for detailed RDBES data use" document	Approve the "Conditions for detailed RDBES data use" document	NC's (NA NS&EA and Baltic region)	30/09/2020	A recommendation was made by the RCGs to the SCRDB to produce a document that people within ICES expert groups who have been given access to detailed RDB/RDBES data could sign to say they have read and agree to abide by the conditions of using the data.	The "Conditions for detailed RDBES data use" document can be found on the RCG SharePoint. -> 02. Background documents -> 20_RDBES_DataAccess.docx The SCRDB 2019 report can also be consulted: http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Expert%20Group%20Report/EOSG/2020/SCRDB%20Report%202019.pdf	YES	NO
Surveys	NANSEA BALTIC_2020_D05	2020	D05	Renewal cost-sharing agreements for surveys	To discuss, amend and conclude on renewal of the cost-sharing agreements for both the IESNS and WHB survey.	relevant NCs and MS.	30/09/2020	The current cost-sharing agreement for IESNS ends in 2020 while the agreement for the WHB survey needs revision to reflect the outcomes of the UK leaving the EU. Also, Spain is not included in the agreement, this should be reflected in the new agreement as well.	RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 report PART I Section 5.4.1 Feedback from the ISSG & SG 'Surveys' and Restructuring WGs survey'	YES	7C

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision by NC?	Table in WP
Surveys	NANSEA BALTIC_2020_R05	2020	R05	ICES to setup a Workshop on a "pilot FIRMOG" in 2021	ICES to setup a Workshop on a "pilot FIRMOG" in 2021 to focus as a test case on proposed changes for the International Bottom Trawl Survey (IBTS), using the analyses already been conducted on the IBTS (WGISDAA, WKNSIMP...) and prepare a suggestion for changes that can be brought into the RCG for decisions. The Workshop will elaborate on the ideas from ICES WKREO. The outcome of the workshop to be put forward into the RCGs for making decision on proposed changes. The decided changes to be reflected in National or Regional workplans.	ICES	end of 2020	Multiple initiatives (e.g. EU project JMP and ICES WKPIMP, WGISUR, WKNSIMP...) have considered options for developing more holistic and integrated ecosystem surveys, developing guidance and recommendations on both scientific theory and practical implementation. However, largely due to a lack of a coherent international organisational mechanism, only a small portion of this work has found its way to routine survey implementation.	RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 Report PART I section 5.4.1.1 WKREO report (http://ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Expert%20Group%20Report/EOSG/2020/WKREO%20Report%202019.pdf)	NO	NO
Surveys	NANSEA 2020_R06	2020	R06	Revision of the survey effort and coverage of the IBWSS	RCG NA NS&EA recommends ICES WGIPS to review the survey effort and coverage of the IBWSS and evaluate the impact of a 10% and 20% reduction in survey effort by Ireland and The Netherlands on the data quality of the survey indices. ICES to add this request to the ToRs of WGIPS for their work programme 2021; WGIPS to review and to summarise the results of their evaluation for the RCG NA NS&EA technical meeting in June 2021.	ICES WGIPS	01/06/2021	Since the 2017 implementation of the DCF recast, the participation by MS to surveys based on TAC shares has become mandatory for surveys listed in the EU-MAP. Currently, two surveys are subject to cost-sharing; the International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Seas (IESNS, also known as ASH) and the International Blue Whiting Spawning Stock survey (IBWSS). The EU part of the IBWSS is being carried out by Ireland and The Netherlands. As part of a multilateral agreement, Denmark, Germany, France and the United Kingdom contribute to the ship time cost with financial contributions proportional to their relative TAC share. Since 2019, Spain is also contributing ship time to the survey, however this is outside the multilateral agreement. The IBWSS will continue to be a mandatory survey under the new EU-MAP from 2022 onwards. In order to develop new task sharing agreements for the IBWSS including cost contributions under the next EMFAF programme, the RCG NA NS&EA recommends an evaluation of the current EU survey effort including the effect of the additional survey effort by Spain since 2019 and the impact of a potential reduction of survey effort by Ireland and Netherlands by 10% and 20%, respectively.	RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 Report PART I section 5.4.1.1 (cost sharing agreements)	NO	7C
RWP	NANSEA BALTIC_2020_D06	2020	D06	Draft RWP - agree to non binding test run and endorse elements for test run	NC's to approve that a draft RWP is submitted to STECF in October 2020 for a non binding test run and to endorse the elements that were selected for the test run being table 1a on landing's overviews, 1g&1h on surveys, 7a on coordination, 7b on recommendations and 7c on existing bilateral agreements.	NC's (NA NS&EA and Baltic region)	30/09/2020	A RWP will have the same binding force as a NWP, so there is the need to have a learning phase by all involved (Member states, RCGs, DGMARE and STECF) on the agreement, submission, review and formal approval of an RWP. It is proposed to test a RWP in 2020 as a not legally binding document to learn how to deal with this new process. The ISSG RWP in collaboration with other relevant ISSGs has developed a test RWP with proposed elements of regional coordination to submit to STECF in October 2020 for review, feedback and lessons learned. This process will greatly support the subsequent preparation of the actual RWP in 2021. The elements included are table 1a on landing's overviews, 1g&1h on surveys, 7a on coordination, 7b on recommendations and 7c on existing bilateral agreements.	RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 Report PART I Section 5.4.2 ToR 4 Development and implementation of Regional Workplans; links to proposed tables of the RWP are embedded in the text. RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 Report PART III Section 11 on the ISSG on development of draft Regional Work Plan 2020-Answers to the questionnaire on the priorities for all NA NS&EA and Baltic ISSG	YES	NO

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision by NC?	Table in WP
RWP	NANSEA BAL TIC_ 2020_R07	2020	R07	Draft RWP - RCG recommends a non binding test run to be reviewed at STECF for feedback and lessons learned on the process of RWP submission	RCG NA NS&EA and RCG Baltic recommend for the Commission to accept a test RWP at STECF 2020 as non legally binding for review, feedback and lessons learned on the process.	DGMARE/ STECF	31/10/2020	A RWP will have the same binding force as a NWP, so there is the need to have a learning phase by all involved (Member states, RCGs, DGMARE and STECF) on the agreement, submission, review and formal approval of an RWP. It is proposed to test a RWP in 2020 as a not legally binding document to learn how to deal with this new process. The ISSG RWP in collaboration with other relevant ISSGs has developed a test RWP with proposed elements of regional coordination to submit to STECF in October 2020 for review, feedback and lessons learned. This process will greatly support the subsequent preparation of the actual RWP in 2021. The elements included are table 1a on landing's overviews, 1g&1h on surveys, 7a on coordination, 7b on recommendations and 7c on existing bilateral agreements.	RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 Report PART I Section 5.4.2 ToR 4 Development and implementation of Regional Workplans; links to proposed tables of the RWP are embedded in the text. RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 Report PART III Section 11 on the ISSG on development of draft Regional Work Plan 2020-Answers to the questionnaire on the priorities for all NA NS&EA and Baltic ISSG	NO	NO
RWP	NANSEA BAL TIC_ 2020_R08	2020	R08	Draft RWP- RCG recommends PGECON to review NWP template tables 3a, 3b, 3c (socioeconomic data collection) and 5b (quality) for feedback	PGECON to review NWP template tables 3a, 3b, 3c (socioeconomic data collection) and 5b (quality) for feedback on structure and content as well as required changes to support the documentation of regional coordination of socioeconomic data collection towards a RWP.	PGECON	end of 2020	The ISSG RWP reviewed each table of the NWP template and identified how the regional working elements/agreements fit into the structure. If there was information that couldn't be captured in the current format, it was considered whether it needed to be linked to other or additional tables. The agile document with the tables and a textbox word document is in Google Doc for review and adjustment. PGECON is invited to review the tables relevant to socio economic data collection (NWP template tables 3a, 3b, 3c (socioeconomic data collection) and 5b (quality)) for feedback on structure and content as well as required changes to document regional coordination of socioeconomic data collection towards a RWP.	RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 Report PART I Section 5.4.2 ToR 4 Development and implementation of Regional Workplans; links to proposed tables of the RWP are embedded in the text. RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 Report PART III Section 11 on the ISSG on development of draft Regional Work Plan 2020-Answers to the questionnaire on the priorities for all NA NS&EA and Baltic ISSG	NO	NO
Small pelagics in Baltic	NANSEA BAL TIC_ 2020_D07	2020	D07	All MS in the Baltic area should take part of this ISSG	All RCG Baltic MS should take part of the ISSG work as all MS are exploiting the small pelagic fishery in the area.	NC's (Baltic region)	30/09/2020	The aim is to come up with the regional sampling plan for small pelagic fishery in Baltic sea. To agree on common sampling protocol(s), proper sampling sizes, sampling intensities etc that will fulfill the end-user needs.	RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 Report PART III Section 7 ISSG Case study of fisheries for small pelagics in the Baltic	YES	NO
Stomach sampling	NANSEA BAL TIC_ 2020_R09	2020	R09	Ensure administrative/technical and financial support for regionally coordinated stomach sampling	COM to start supporting regionally coordinated stomach samplings	EC	as soon as possible	Fundamental changes in natural versus fishing mortality are occurring in European waters, given e.g. reductions in fishing mortality, recovery of fish and non-fish populations, and complex environmental effects of global warming on our coastal-marine ecosystems. Stomach data presently used are often 20 years old (e.g. from the 1990s in the North Sea) or older and the lack of contemporary information on 'who eats who' and how the food webs have changed over time makes it increasingly difficult to provide adequate scientific advice. To ultimately improve the quality of natural mortality estimates and thus the ICES advice, regionally coordinated stomach samplings are urgently needed.	RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 Report PART I Section 5.4.10 Feedback from ISSG & SG 'Regionally coordinated stomach sampling'.	NO	NO

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision by NC?	Table in WP
	NANSEA BAL TIC_ 2020_D08	2020	D08	ISSG proposed to work during season 2020-2021	The list of RCG ISSGs suggested by RCG NA NS&EA and RCG Baltic to be confirmed to take place during season 2020-2021.	NC's (NA NS&EA and Baltic region)	30/09/2020	<p>During the second year of the new 3-year term of RCG NA NS&EA and of RCG Baltic the work under each ToR has been carried out by designated inter sessional subgroups (ISSG). The work done in ISSG have proved to be very productive and beneficial for the regional coordination.</p> <p>Work in ISSG needs experts and manpower (approximately 1 week of work / ISSG and person). The ISSG work force the MS to switch from working with a national focus to work with a more regional focus which is in line with idea of EU-MAP.</p>	RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 Report PART I Section 5.5.1.	YES	7A