



Regional Coordination Group
on Economics Issues

Regional Coordination Group on Economics Issues

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

1 – 3 September 2021
Virtual Meeting

Supported by



RCG's Secretariat
SECWEB

Co-funded by
the European Maritime
and Fisheries Fund



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Recommended format for purposes of citation:

RCG ECON 2021. Regional Coordination Group on Economic Issues. 2021. Report, 46 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 JRC data policy on the Data collection website. All extracts must be acknowledged. For other reproduction requests please contact the authors.

This document is the product of the 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).

© 2021 Regional Coordination Group

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Contents

Contents	I
Acronyms	2
Executive summary	3
1. Administrative details	5
2. Terms of Reference	6
3. List of Recommendations	7
RCG ECON Annual technical meeting (1 st - 3 rd September)	7
CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS	7
4. Summary of work plan RCGs 2021-2022	17
5. List of Outcomes and Achievements of RCG ECON in this delivery period	19
6. Progress report on ToRs and work plan	20
6.1. ToR 1 FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project -Strengthening EU-MAP data collection by developing Regional Work Plans for the Regional Coordination Groups (RCG)	20
6.1.2 ToR 1: Data deficiency in Small Scale Fisheries	20
6.1.3 ToR 1: Valuation intangibles	21
6.2. ToR 2 SECWEB project -Supporting administrative tasks and online visibility to RCGs	23
6.2.1. ToR 1, topic Implementation of generic tools for support of the RCGs	23
6.3. ToR 3 AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO THE SEGMENTATION OF FISHING FLEETS	25
6.4. ToR 4 QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK	27
6.4.1. ToR 4: Quality Assurance Framework Subgroup Workshop: training session on methodologies in Handbook, virtual training from Finland 4.-6.5.2021	27
6.4.2. ToR 4: Methodological Report as Part of the Work Plan	28
6.5. ToR 5 Social Variables	30
6.5.1. ToR 5: Existing variables for the social data collection: unification of concepts and definitions for fisheries, aquaculture, and fish processing	30
6.6. ToR 6 Feedback from Commission/STECF Update on revision of EU-MAP	32
6.7. ToR 7 Update of Sars-CoV2 effects on data collection	34
6.7.1. ToR 7: Update of Sars-CoV2 effects on data collection	34
6.8. ToR 8 The New Role of RCG ECONObjectives	35
7. Next meetings	37
Annex I: List of Participants	39
Annex II: Agenda for ECON 2021	44



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Acronyms

AER	Annual Economic Report
COM	Commission
DCF	Data Collection Framework
DG MARE	Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries
ECON	Economic issues
EWG	Expert Working Group
ICES	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea
ISSG	Intersessional Subgroup
JRC	Joint Research Centre
Med & BS	Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea
MRF	Marine Recreational Fishery
MS	Member State
NAFO	Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organisation
NANSEA	North Atlantic, North Sea and Eastern Arctic
NEAFC	North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission
NWP	National Work Plan
PGECON	Planning Group on Economic Issues
PIM	Perpetual Inventory Method
PCU	Price per Capacity Unit
QAF	Quality Assurance Framework
RCG	Regional Coordination Group
RDB	Regional Database
RoP	Rules of Procedures
RSP	Regional Sampling Plan
RWP	Regional Work Plan
SCICOM	Science Committee
SG	Subgroup
SSF	Small Scale Fisheries
STECF	Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries
WG	Working Group
WP	Work Plan



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Executive summary

The Regional Coordination Group on Economic Issues (RCG ECON) was established as an expert group to assist the Commission in the implementation of the (DCF) Data Collection Framework concerning the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector and support for scientific advice regarding the Common Fisheries Policy.

The RCG ECON 2021 meeting was held from 1st to 3rd September online with application of the ZOOM virtual meeting platform, with 55 experts (Annex I) representing 25 Member States and DG MARE.

Considering that the meeting was organised for the first time in the new Regional Coordination Group format the new role of RCG ECON was presented and an overview had been given about the evolution process and the change of status of PGECON from a subgroup of Commission expert working group on data collection to a pan regional RCG. The process was described from the beginning when it was started in 2017 to the final decision reached during the PGECON annual meeting in 2020. The new role of the RCG ECON as a coordination body of economic and social data collection activities in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors of the EU Member States was clarified to the participants. Another important role as a new responsibility and challenge that was mentioned for RCG ECON is preparation of the draft Regional Work Plan.

The updates from the SecWeb project were presented about the supporting administrative tasks and online visibility of RCGs. Also, the several updates from the FishNCo project concerning Capital value and Capital costs estimations, valuation intangibles and level of ambition for regional coordination were presented and discussed during the RCG ECON meeting. The RCG ECON group proposal was in the frame of FishNCo project, to develop and circulate to the National Correspondents and relevant MS experts as well as other chairs of RCGs the questionnaire about potential data collection issues that could be solved by increased international cooperation, and list of possible issues about Capital costs and Capital value estimations. Still in relation to FishNCo activities concerning the collections of social variables, the RCG ECON will facilitate communication with NCs in relation to the development of national and community profiles.

The feedback from the *workshop on An Alternative Approach to the Segmentation of Fishing Fleets* was presented to the RCG ECON. Several proposals were made by the experts during the meeting regarding the alternative segmentation application and use in the analysis. Thus far the clusters which are a result of the alternative segmentation tool are not yet discussed with regional fisheries experts; the harmonization of a potential alternative segmentation requires a clear agreement on a regional level. Most case studies from the segmentation workshop refer to the NANSEA area, thus it appears advisable to start with that region. Further work on alternative approach application to the fleet segmentation for economic data analysis was recommended by the group, collaboration with other RCGs and the new workshop was proposed for March 2022.

Quality assurance framework for the Regional Work Plan and Quality Assurance Methodological Report inclusion in the National Work Plan was recommended by the RCG ECON group after the presentation of the feedback from a *workshop on Quality Assurance Framework*. The group discussed the usefulness of a forum for sharing experiences of applying the statistical methods suggested in the Handbook and comparing different data collection strategies and estimation methods between MS.

The preliminary results were presented to the RCG ECON from a *workshop on Social Variables*. Main discussion was focused on National and Community profiles for social data which were recommended by STECF after the previous social EWG meetings. Ad-hoc case studies were recommended by the RCG ECON group to start tracking down what data is available and which methodological issues or technical challenges MS may face.

During the DG MARE presentation about the new EU MAP updates, few issues were raised by economists in relation to the new National Work Plan templates concerning the inclusion in the tables of variables for inactive

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

vessels. The group agreed to include two economic variables from EU MAP table 7 for inactive vessels in the WP table 5.2: Value of physical capital and Consumption of fixed capital.

The round table discussion was held about the negative effect of Sars-CoV2 on data collection and as a result there were no major issues or problems reported by the group.

The RCG ECON 2021 justifications and recommendations in relation to all issues mentioned above can be found in section three of the report, as well as the detailed description and objectives provided in section six. All recommended activities are planned for implementation till the end of 2022.

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

I. Administrative details

Regional Coordination	Regional Coordination Group on Economic Issues (RCG ECON)
Year of Appointment with the current cycle	1
Reporting year within the current cycle (1,2 or 3)	1
Chair(s)	Irina Davidjuka, Monica Gambino

Meeting venue	Meeting dates
Virtual Meeting (Covid-19 restrictions)	1 – 3 September 2021

2. Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the meeting were drafted in advance of the meeting by the chairs with consultation from DG MARE and session moderators.

1. FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project - Strengthening EU-MAP data collection by developing Regional Work Plans for the Regional Coordination Groups (RCG)
2. SECWEB project - Supporting administrative tasks and online visibility to RCGs.
3. Results from Workshop on AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO THE SEGMENTATION OF FISHING FLEETS
4. Results from Workshop on QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK
5. Results from Workshop on SOCIAL VARIABLES
6. EU MAP revision
7. Update of Sars-CoV2 effects on Data Collection
8. New Role of RCG ECON
9. Next steps in RCG ECON work and possible needs for subgroups or workshops.

The detailed agenda is reported in ANNEX II.

3. List of Recommendations

RCG ECON Annual technical meeting (1st - 3rd September)

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Capital value and capital cost estimations	
Recommendation I	Comparative analysis on capital value and capital cost estimation. Inventory of issues with PIM.
TOR I	FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project -Strengthening EU MAP data collection by developing Regional Work Plans for the Regional Coordination Groups (RCG).
Justification	Unsolved issues on estimation methodology of capital value and capital cost and application of the PIM should be listed and described. Inconsistencies among MS still exist; it is necessary to understand if these issues are due to real differences in the national economic contexts or to methodological discrepancies. Therefore, it is important to investigate the reasons why the discrepancies exist and to compare methods used for Capital Value estimation between MS. In the investigated reasons for discrepancy two options should be mentioned: - Methodological reasons (approach may be corrected). - Special issues (issues not related to the quality that should be explained by MS experts in WP).
Follow-up actions needed	1. Dual analysis: - Capital Value per capacity unit from AER data, to be estimated from official data. - Price per capacity unit should be asked for by the Member States (by questionnaire). 2. Inventory of issues with PIM: - Questionnaire for MS with inventory of issues with implementation of PIM. - Based on outcomes, develop a living document (a sort of Q&A section) including a list of all unsolved issues and/or problems experienced by MS in the application of PIM. Objective of exercises: - Harmonisation of Price per capacity unit. - Harmonisation of methodology for estimation of Capacity value and Capital costs.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	1.1 FishNCo: Design questionnaire on price per capacity assumptions. 1.2 RCG ECON chairs to send out the questionnaire to NC. 1.3 FishNCo: Analyse results 1.4 FishNCo: Present results at RCG ECON May 2022 2.1 FishNCo: Design questionnaire on estimation methods implemented 2.2 RCG ECON chairs to send out the questionnaire to NC 2.3 FishNCo: Analyse results and develop Q&A 2.4 FishNCo: Present at RCG ECON May 2022

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Time frame (Deadline)	2022
Comments	According to the GUIDANCE DOCUMENT FOR THE FISHING FLEET, the methodological framework for the estimation of consumption of fixed capital should be coherent with the one applied for the estimation on the value of physical capital. 1. Application of the perpetual inventory method (PIM, cross reference: https://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=2055). The key parameters to be considered in order to estimate the consumption of fixed capital within the PIM methodological framework are the asset service life (that determines the economic depreciation rates), the retirement distribution and the depreciation function. The depreciation functions that can be applied in a PIM are arithmetic (straight-line method) or geometric (degressive method). 2. Alternative methods based on company surveys. These alternative methods may be used if the derived estimates reflect the actual definition of net capital stock (depreciated replacement value of the vessel including on-board equipment with a useful lifetime of more than one year). In case the PIM is not used, MS should explain. RCG clarified that the concept of capital value has to be interpreted under the economic perspective and MS can apply alternative methods for the estimation of tangible capital but only if the derived estimates reflect the actual definition of net capital stock.

Valuation intangibles	
Recommendation 2	Facilitate the development of methodology to estimate non-transferable rights and further testing of Guidelines on valuation of transferable intangibles.
TOR I	FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project - Strengthening EU-MAP data collection by developing Regional Work Plans for the Regional Coordination Groups (RCG).
Justification	PGECON 2020 recommended a transition period in which MS explored the possibilities to apply the guidelines for the valuation of the fishing rights in their situation. During this transition period the obligation to gather information on the value of intangible assets should only include the transferable fishing rights. The current DC Regulation does not distinguish transferable from non-transferable fishing rights. And, for non-marketable fishing rights additional data (e.g., vessels' second-hand market values) are necessary to collect. Although the Guidelines on valuation of transferable intangibles are available, there is need for further testing by more Member States and to develop Methodologies for estimation of non-transferable rights in EU fisheries.
Follow-up actions needed	1. Facilitate testing of Guidelines on valuation of transferable intangibles. 2. Develop Methodologies for estimation of non-transferable rights in EU fisheries.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	1.1 RCG ECON facilitated the publication of the Guidelines on the DCF Web page. 1.2 MS apply Guidelines for the valuation of transferable fishing rights. 2.1 MS test methodologies for estimation of non-transferable rights.

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Time frame (Deadline)	2022
Comments	Link to Guidelines for the valuation of intangible assets: https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/10213/994708/Guidelines+on+valuation+of+Fishing+rights.pdf/d978d714-f553-4a56-848b-b63a5f10fbb7

Level of ambition for regional coordination

Recommendation 3	Identification of issues which might be solved by international cooperation.
TOR 1	FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project - Strengthening EU-MAP data collection by developing Regional Work Plans for the Regional Coordination Groups (RCG).
Justification	The population of units from which social and economic information is obtained in the EU is clearly defined by the national fishing fleets and aquaculture sectors. As such, the ambition level in the data collection is in developing a consistent set of definitions and methodologies that are implemented correctly by all MS, resulting in a comparable data set. For some specific fleet segments and types of information international cooperation might enhance the possibilities for data collection and the quality of data, e.g., segments with small amounts of vessels per country, social data of migrant fishermen. There is, however, no clear list of these potential subjects for collaboration.
Follow-up actions needed	Questionnaire about potential data collection issues that could be solved by increased international cooperation.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	FishNCo: Design questionnaire RCG ECON: send out the questionnaire to NC. FishNCo: Analyse results. FishNCo: Present results at RCG ECON May 2022.
Time frame (Deadline)	2022
Comments	The ultimate goal is not to reach the highest level of ambition for economic data collection due to country-specific differences regarding the demands for data collection. There is no added value for a cooperative data collection between MS. In addition, there are also constraints with respect to the privacy regulations regarding data exchange between countries. This type of information also affects data on nationality of crew members.

9

SECWEB Supporting administrative tasks and online visibility to RCGs

Recommendation 4	Contributing to the RCGs' Secretariat set up and operation / Support to the SECWEB project.
TOR 2	SECWEB project - Supporting administrative tasks and online visibility to RCGs
Justification	The RCGs have complex and extensive tasks but they have not been supported by central resources so far. The meetings of the RCGs have been prepared, run

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

	and reported by the elected chairs, which poses a significant amount of effort on them and makes the system vulnerable due to the lack of systematization. In order to increase the effectiveness, the RCGs have further agreed on working procedures which are gathered under a Rules of Procedure document. This provides clearer rules for documents, participation in meetings and observers, however it also puts more responsibility and administration burden on the chairs. Additionally, RCGs are expected to interact with a wide group of end-users. This is difficult since the work of RCGs are largely invisible, resulting in end-users to be either unaware of the actual role of RCGs or to have unrealistic expectations. The recent fishPi2 project (MARE/2016/22) identified the need for robust funding of central resources for RCG work to be effective and consistent. The project elaborated suggestions for a secretariat (to assure consistency and to reduce the burden on the chairs) and a webpage (to increase outreach) and suggested that the costs for such resources, are something that need to be discussed between the NCs and the Commission. Within this context, the SECWEB project is setting up the essential elements to fill those gaps and develop mechanisms to support administrative tasks and procedures. Additionally, enhance visibility under a common branding and a dedicated website. The final aim is to establish a long-term supportive structure.
Follow-up actions needed	1. Provide inputs and updates to feed the RCG's webpage, in particular RCG ECON microsite. 1.1. RCG ECON contents (ISSGs, Achievements, Toolbox, ...) 1.2. Provide ideas/guidance on how to best represent the scope map for RCG ECON. 1.3. Communicate relevant meetings to include in the calendar (https://www.fisheries-rcg.eu/calendar/) 1.4. Use the online questionnaire online questionnaire to provide feedback about the general architecture and contents of the RCG website. 2. Reinforce RCG's visibility and branding 2.1. Make use of the materials and resources available such as: logos, templates for presentations and reports, infographics, leaflets, ... 2.2. Adopt the visual identity defined for the RCG's. Refer to Visual Identity Manual. 2.3. Attract traffic to the RCG's website, spread the word for example including the link in future presentations, in email signature, etc. 3. Foster fluent communication between RCG ECON and the secretariat 4. Engage with consultation processes launched by Secweb project partners. In the short term it is foreseen a consultation process about the stakeholder's database (ILVO) 5. Provide inputs for the Newsletter and any other communication actions.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	1. RCG ECON chairs in communication with RCG's secretariat 2. RCG ECON chairs and participants 3. RCG ECON (mainly chairs)/ RCG's secretariat 4. RCG ECON /ILVO (partner in charge of the DB)/ RCG's secretariat 5. RCG ECON participants, channelled through chairs/ RCG's secretariat

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Time frame (Deadline)	1. First deadline: 14th Sep (for NC's Decision meeting). 2. Continuous. 3. Continuous. 4. Early October. Specific deadlines to be confirmed with the consultation processes. 5. Ongoing. Specific deadlines to be confirmed for each action.
Comments	In case of doubts about where to find templates or any other materials you can reach us by email at: secretariat@fisheries-rcg.eu

Alternative segmentation application	
Recommendation 5	Additional analyses on alternative, fisheries-based approach and methodology development.
TOR 3	Feedback from ISSG "AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO THE SEGMENTATION OF FISHING FLEETS "
Justification	1. Six case studies have been published in the context of the first workshop on alternative segmentation. It would be desirable to get further feedback on the developed tool from a broader basis of national fleets. 2. Thus far the clusters which are a result of the alternative segmentation tool have not yet been discussed with regional fisheries experts. The harmonization of a potential alternative segmentation requires a clear agreement on a regional level. Most case studies from the segmentation workshop refer to the NANSEA area, thus it appears advisable to start with that region. 3. The results of the first WS on the alternative segmentation, including the developed tool, were promising. Feedback from participants indicated the need for further elaboration, for example regional aspects, cost structure, fleet activity indicators and different length classes, and the benefits of introduction of further determinants. Also, it has to be investigated if the alternative approach fulfils the initial hypothesis that the results are vessel groups which are more homogeneous in terms of cost and revenue structure than under the current segmentation.
Follow-up actions needed	1. MS are invited to apply the alternative segmentation approaches and give feedback. 1.a) MS that have not yet executed the alternative segmentation tool developed in the ISSG "AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO THE SEGMENTATION OF FISHING FLEETS" are encouraged to perform the exercise and share their results. 1.b) <i>when applicable</i> MS, who has developed alternative /complementary fleet segmentation methods, to present own methods appropriated for them 1.c) RCG ECON chairs to collect and compile the results and make them available for the workshop 2. Joint meeting with RCG (preferably NANSEA) or related ISSG to analyse and harmonize the results of the alternative, fisheries-based approach and investigate

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

	whether the result is comprehensive and in line with the fisheries taking place in the related regions 3. WS on alternative segmentation. TORs: - Analyse the cost and revenue structure of alternative segments. - Compare results with the level of homogeneity of current fleet segments. - Investigate the potential and the effect of introducing further determinants for the clustering (as suggested during 1st WS). The WS will take into consideration the advice from RCG (NANSEA) on appropriate vessel grouping
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	1.a) MS perform the exercise and report their results to the RCG ECON chair. 1.b) Where available, MS describe and report alternative /commentary methods of segmentation to the RCG ECON chairs. 1.c) RCG ECON chairs provide NCs of the necessary information (links to reports and methods) 2. FishNCo contacted RCG NANSEA to set up collaboration (preferably through joint ISG) to further analyse the outcome of the alternative segmentation approach and investigate whether the result is comprehensive and in line with the fisheries taking place in the related regions. 3.1 RCG ECON and WS chairs set up a workshop. 3.2 FishNCo facilitates additional analysis and method development.
Time frame (Deadline)	May 2022
Comments	Link to the report: https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/other-meetings?p_p_id=110_INSTANCE_YliNT1qXsG0u&p_p_lifecycle=0&p_p_state=normal&p_p_mode=view&p_p_col_id=column-2&p_p_col_count=1&_110_INSTANCE_YliNT1qXsG0u_struts_action=%2Fdocument_library_display%2Fview_file_entry&_110_INSTANCE_YliNT1qXsG0u_redirect=https%3A%2F%2Fdatacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu%2Fdocs%2Fother-meetings%2F-%2Fdocument_library_display%2FYliNT1qXsG0u%2Fview%2F891027%3F_110_INSTANCE_YliNT1qXsG0u_topLink%3Dhome%26_110_INSTANCE_YliNT1qXsG0u_keywords%3D%26_110_INSTANCE_YliNT1qXsG0u_advancedSearch%3Dfalse%26_110_INSTANCE_YliNT1qXsG0u_cur%3D2%26_110_INSTANCE_YliNT1qXsG0u_delta%3D20%26p_r_p_564233524_resetCur%3Dfalse%26_110_INSTANCE_YliNT1qXsG0u_andOperator%3Dtrue&_110_INSTANCE_YliNT1qXsG0u_fileEntryId=1406965 Link to the R packages: https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/other-meetings?p_p_id=110_INSTANCE_YliNT1qXsG0u&p_p_lifecycle=0&p_p_state=normal&p_p_mode=view&p_p_col_id=column-2&p_p_col_count=1&_110_INSTANCE_YliNT1qXsG0u_struts_action=%2Fdocument_library_display%2Fview_file_entry&_110_INSTANCE_YliNT1qXsG0u_redirect=https%3A%2F%2Fdatacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu%2Fdocs%2Fother-meetings%3Fp_p_id%3D110_INSTANCE_YliNT1qXsG0u%26p_p_lifecycle%3D0%26p_p_state%3Dnormal%26p_p_mode%3Dview%26p_p_col_id%3Dcolumn-

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

[2%26p_p_col_count%3D1&_110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u_fileEntryId=1406988](#)

Quality assurance framework

Recommendation 6	Preparation of a draft Regional Work Plan on socioeconomic data collection strategies and statistical methods of data estimation
TOR 4	ISSG "QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK " (new requirements for the WP: Quality Annex 1.2)
Justification	The group discussed the usefulness of a forum for sharing experiences of applying the statistical methods suggested in the Handbook and comparing different data collection strategies and estimation methods between MS.
Follow-up actions needed	The results from the QAF workshop will be utilized in the process of compiling the Regional Work Plan for economic data collection as part of the FishNCo project running 2021-2022.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	FishNCo: facilitate the development of the Regional Work Plan template FishNCo: present results at RCG ECON May 2022
Time frame (Deadline)	2021/2022
Comments	Link to the report: https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/other-meetings?p_p_id=110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u&p_p_lifecycle=0&p_p_state=normal&p_p_mode=view&p_p_col_id=column-2&p_p_col_count=1&_110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u_struts_action=%2Fdocument_library_display%2Fview_file_entry&_110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u_redirect=https%3A%2F%2Fdatacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu%2Fdocs%2Fother-meetings%3Fp_p_id%3D110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u%26p_p_lifecycle%3D0%26p_p_state%3Dnormal%26p_p_mode%3Dview%26p_p_col_id%3Dcolumn-2%26p_p_col_count%3D1&_110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u_fileEntryId=1406825 Link to the R packages: https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/other-meetings?p_p_id=110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u&p_p_lifecycle=0&p_p_state=normal&p_p_mode=view&p_p_col_id=column-2&p_p_col_count=1&_110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u_struts_action=%2Fdocument_library_display%2Fview_file_entry&_110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u_redirect=https%3A%2F%2Fdatacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu%2Fdocs%2Fother-meetings%2F-%2Fdocument_library_display%2FYliNTIqXsG0u%2Fview%2F891027%3F_110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u_topLink%3Dhome%26_110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u_keywords%3D%26_110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u_advancedSearch%3Dfalse%26_110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u_cur%26_110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u_delta%26_110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u_andOperator%3Dtrue&_110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u_fileEntryId=1406874

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Quality Assurance Methodological Report	
Recommendation 7	The Quality Assurance Methodological Report should be used by MS as the reference in the National Work Plan (Annex I.2)
TOR 4	ISSG "QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK " (new requirements for the WP: Quality Annex I,2
Justification	The handbook on sampling design should be used as a reference where applicable – no need for lengthy description of statistical methods and techniques if a reference is made to the Handbook. The reference should be detailed in terms of the number of the chapter/paragraph.
Follow-up actions needed	The quality report should be presented for variables estimated through a sampling scheme and also for variables collected by census. Only for variables derived from official administrative sources (for instance subsidies) there is no need to draft a separate annex I.2 but it is enough to report this information in the relevant tables.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS
Time frame (Deadline)	2021-2023
Comments	The quality report should be reported for each sampling scheme. For instance, if a MS is collecting fleet economic data with a probability sampling for some segments and with a non-probability sampling scheme for other segments, then two different quality reports should be presented for the fleet economic data collection. If within the same sampling scheme, some of the statistical procedures (for instance estimators) are different for some variables, then the Quality report to be presented is only one and differences should be described in the relevant sections of the quality report. Link to the Handbook: https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/guidelines/socioeco/handbook-on-methodology

14

National profiles and refinement of existing social variables	
Recommendation 8	Develop national profiles and analyse the data available.
TOR 5	Feedback from ISSG "SOCIAL VARIABLES "
Justification	Social issues cover a wide range of themes that range from the unification of concepts, definitions of (quantitative and qualitative) variables to the development of the national and community profiles.
Follow-up actions needed	1. Expert panel should be evolved into two mixed groups collaborating between; economic and social: with increased manpower expertise time and costs involved. 2. Ad hoc case studies to start tracking down what data is available and which methodological issues or technical challenges MS may face.

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

	Information which should be clarified in the frame of case studies: • What kind of additional social data are currently available from the data sources outside the Data collection. • The use of additional social data. • Methodological issues or technical challenges for the collection of the additional data and its presentation in current common data analysis.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	1. DG MARE facilitate the meetings and ad-hoc groups (national profiles data) 2.a) FishNCo: develop national profiles and analyse the data available. 2.b) FishNCo: Present results at RCGEcon May 2022 2.c) RCG ECON chairs facilitate communication with NCs
Time frame (Deadline)	2022-2023
Comments	Community profiles have already been developed as pilot studies on a case study basis (see e.g. Delaney and Zbicinski, 2010; NOAA fishing community profiles, available at www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/socioeconomics/fishing-community-profiles). The development of community profiles at an EU level would require additional resources (EWG 20.14) The national profiles would not only provide necessary contextual information for social data analysis, but also useful context information for other types of data, as economic data in the AER national chapters.

15

Update on revision of EU-MAP	
Recommendation 9	For WP/AR submission MS should provide for inactive vessels in Excel templates Table 5.2 Fleet SocEcon two variables from the EU MAP table 7 "Value of physical capital" and "Consumption of fixed capital".
TOR 6	Feedback from Commission/STECF Update on revision of EU-MAP
Justification	COMMISSION DELEGATED DECISION (EU) 2021/1167, CHAPTER II Data collection methods and data requirements; paragraph 5.1 referring to the capital costs and capital value data collection for the inactive vessels ("In the case of inactive vessels, data shall be collected on capital value and capital cost."). However, in the EU MAP Table 7 (Fleet economic) the variables are named "Consumption of fixed capital" and "Value of physical capital". In the WP/AR reports these variables should be listed in the Table 5.2 Fleet SocEcon column "Economic and Social Variables". The same variables are provided in the WP Excel templates 'MasterCodeList'
Follow-up actions needed	For WP/AR submission MS should provide for inactive vessels in Excel templates Table 5.2 Fleet SocEcon two variables from the EU MAP table 7 "Value of physical capital" and "Consumption of fixed capital".
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS
Time frame (Deadline)	WP submission deadline 15 of October 2021

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Comments	Link to legislation: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32021D1167&qid=1630863128507
-----------------	--

Adoption of common Rules of Procedure	
Recommendation 10	RCG ECON 2021 recommends one common RoP for all RCGs.
TOR 8	New Role of RCG ECON
Justification	In regards to the work done by the FishNCo project and RCG Baltic and RCG NANSEA about adaptation and adoption of one common RoP for all RCGs the possibility of adoption of one common RoP for all RCGs should be considered in order to be established a decision-making process regarding the drafting process of the RWP.
Follow-up actions needed	RCGs to consider the possibility of adoption of one common RoP in accordance with the work done by the FishNCo project and RCG Baltic and RCG NANSEA.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCGs, NC
Time frame (Deadline)	2021-2022
Comments	During the RCG ECON 2021 annual meeting was mentioned that one of the tasks under WP2 for Establishing decision-making structure /processes in the FishNCo project aims to propose a common decision-making process on the implementation of RWP in accordance with the RoP and to adapt RoPs of all RCGs in one common RoP.

4. Summary of work plan RCGs 2021-2022

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Alternative Segmentation Application	Organisation on WS	Communication with other RCGs	
	Additional analyses on alternative, fisheries-based approach, and methodology development through: - the organizations of another workshop in 2022, - a joint meeting with RCG (preferably NANSEA) or related ISSG.	Additional analyses on alternative, fisheries-based approach, and methodology development through: - the organizations of a workshop in 2022, - a joint meeting with RCG (preferably NANSEA) or related ISSG.	NA
Quality Assurance Framework	Set-up basic structure of RWP	Set-up basic structure of RWP	
	The results from the QAF workshop can be utilized in the process of compiling the Regional Work plans for economic data collection as part of the FishNCo project running 2021-2023.	The results from the QAF workshop can be utilized in the process of compiling the Regional Work plans for economic data collection as part of the FishNCo project running 2021-2023.	NA
Social Variables	In collaboration with FishNCo project	In collaboration with FishNCo project	
	The analysis should continue in the next period by the organisation of: - expert panel with increased manpower - ad hoc group to start work on the data need for drafting National Profiles and to present the results in the next RCG ECON.	The analysis should continue in the next period by the organisation of: - expert panel with increased manpower - ad hoc group to start work on the data need for drafting National Profiles and to present the results	NA



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Questionnaire for the NCs, RCGs and national experts	In collaboration with FishNCo project		
	The questionnaire distribution to the National Correspondents and relevant MS experts as well as other chairs of RCGs about potential data collection issues that could be solved by increased international cooperation, and list of possible issues about Capital costs and Capital value estimations.	NA	NA



5. List of Outcomes and Achievements of RCG ECON in this delivery period

During the first year of the RCG ECON implementation the work under each ToR has been carried out. Three inter sessional subgroups (ISSGs) were organised before RCG ECON and presented their main outcomes during the RCG ECON meeting. Then recommendations were proposed based on feedback from the RCG group. All results of the discussions, decisions, recommendations, and tasks for the ISSGs were agreed during RCG ECON on pan-regional level.

The RCG ECON 2021 report is composed of one overview of the work done under each ToR (section 6), related recommendations (section 3) and two Annexes with detailed Terms of References (Annex II) and participants contact details (Annex I).

The ISSGs reports can be found under the following link: <https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/other-meetings>

The RCG ECON 2021 report is available under the link: <https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/rcg>

6. Progress report on ToRs and work plan

6.1. ToR I FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project -Strengthening EU-MAP data collection by developing Regional Work Plans for the Regional Coordination Groups (RCG)

6.1.1 ToR I: Capital value and capital cost estimations

Objectives

In order to strengthen EU MAP data collection, the FishNCo project facilitates the Regional Coordination Groups (RCGs) by developing Regional Work Plans. These RCGs include guidelines on methodological issues, which are still occurring in economic data collection. During the first phase of the project a gap-analysis on the RCG ECON report was carried out in order to find outstanding issues and these issues were discussed during the meeting for an action plan for the coming year. One of the issues was the estimation of Capital value and Capital costs.

Achievements

RCG ECON guidelines state that the estimation methodology of value of capital and value of debts must be in line and derived from the perpetual inventory method (PIM). Guidelines on application are available, but further testing and implementation of guidelines is needed.

Inconsistencies among MS still exist; it is necessary to understand if these issues are due to real differences in the national economic contexts or to methodological discrepancies. Therefore, it is important to investigate the reasons why the discrepancies exist and to compare methods used for Capital value estimation between MS (requiring the involvement of National experts).

20

RCG ECON Workplan for 2021 – 2022:

For a more detailed understanding of the issue with Price per Capacity Unit (PCU), and in the frame of the FishNCo project, RCG ECON chairs should send out the questionnaire to National Correspondents.

Recommendation:

- 1) Based on AER data, comparative analysis of the Price per Capacity Unit should be carried out by the FishNCo project by regions and fleet segments in order to flag inconsistencies and outliers.
- 2) A living document (a sort of Question & Answer section) should be created by FishNCo including a list of all unsolved issues and problems experienced by MS in the application where experts explain the reasons for the discrepancy.

6.1.2 ToR I: Data deficiency in Small Scale Fisheries

Objectives

In order to strengthen EU MAP data collection, the FishNCo project facilitates the Regional Coordination Groups (RCGs) by developing Regional Work Plans. These RCGs include guidelines on methodological issues, which are still occurring in economic data collection. During the first phase of the project a gap-analysis on the RCG ECON report was carried out in order to find outstanding

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

issues and these issues were discussed during the meeting for an action plan for the coming year. One of the issues was the data availability for small scale fisheries (SSF).

Achievements

In most EU countries, small scale fisheries (SSF) are treated differently by Control Regulation than larger fishery segments resulting in a shortfall of data available about this fleet segment.

RCG ECON Workplan for 2021 – 2022:

Regional harmonization of transversal variables can be decided by RCGs; the procedure should be clarified in cooperation with the WG on SSF from FishNCo, also taking into account there is table 6 in the new legislation which for most variables requires an agreement on a regional level. There is an opinion that it is still completely unclear how the procedure is supposed to be. Similar footnotes existed already in 93/2010 (“Some adjustments could be proposed by Regional Coordination Meetings”) and 910/2019 (“Collection of these variables for vessels less than 10 metres is to be agreed at marine region level”).

Recommendation:

If agreements have never been made this could mean that in none of the regions the referring (effort) variables are of any interest. It could also mean that no regional body feels in charge of that task.

It was clarified for the collection of the "transversal" variables for vessels <10m, that at least in the MED there was a regional agreement. The RCM MED&BS 2016 recommended MS to collect data about the 'length of the nets' for passive gears, 'number of hooks' and 'number of pots/traps' for all vessel lengths including those smaller than 10m. It would be useful to check during the RCG ECON meeting if this is an issue for the other regions.

21

6.1.3 ToR 1: Valuation intangibles

Objectives

In order to strengthen EU MAP data collection, the FishnNCo project facilitates the Regional Coordination Groups (RCGs) by developing Regional Work Plans. These RCGs include guidelines on methodological issues, which are still occurring in economic data collection. During the first phase of the project a gap-analysis on the RCG ECON report was carried out in order to find outstanding issues and these issues were discussed during the meeting for an action plan for the coming year. One of the issues was the Valuation of intangible assets.

Achievements

The group discussed that, although the Guidelines are available, there is a need for further developing and testing of guidelines, in particular for non-transferable fishing rights. This should, however, be carried out at a national level and further testing of the guidelines can only be done when more information will become available from outcomes of national plans from 2023 onwards. Therefore, no actions will be taken up in the coming year, other than to make the guidelines available for MS and to encourage them to use the guidelines.

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

RCG ECON Workplan for 2021 – 2022:

No proposals for the RCG ECON Workplan 2021-2022.

Recommendation: No recommendations.

6.1.4 ToR 1: Level of ambition

Objectives

In order to strengthen EU MAP data collection, the FishNCo project facilitates the Regional Coordination Groups (RCGs) by developing Regional Work Plans (RWPs). One of the central elements of the RWPs is the level of ambition for regional coordination. This level varies from level 0, no co-ordination to level 5, joint data collection (see scheme below). The objective was to decide on the level of ambition for the economic data collection.

Achievements

The group discussed that the level of ambition should fit the nature of the data collected. The ultimate goal is not to reach the highest level of ambition for economic data collection. As the economic data are gathered from national fleets in the national contexts, data collection programmes may differ in data sources used and methodology. In addition, there are also constraints with respect to the privacy regulations regarding data exchange between countries. Therefore, the overall ambition level for the RWP is to be set at level 2. For some specific variables international cooperation could result in better quality data (e.g. data on employment of foreign crew members). It is not clear yet for which variables/MS this would but would be needed

22

RCG ECON Workplan for 2021 – 2022:

Make an inventory of the data issues in socio economic data collection for the fisheries and aquaculture sector which could be solved by cross border collaboration on data collection.

Recommendation:

The overall ambition level in the RWP is set at level two. An inventory of the potential added value of cross border cooperation will be carried out by FishNCo.

Rapporteur: Hans Van Oostenbrugge

6.2. ToR 2 SECWEB project -Supporting administrative tasks and online visibility to RCGs

6.2.1. ToR 1, topic Implementation of generic tools for support of the RCGs

Objectives

An overview of the SecWeb project was presented by Susana Rivero on behalf of Els Torreele, project coordinator. SecWeb was launched on the 1st of January 2021 and will be running until 31st December 2022.

SecWeb project objectives include developing and setting up an RCG secretariat in support of fluent administrative procedures and establish a long-term script; the development and setup of a dedicated website; promotion of good practices in communication within and among the RCGs, and engaging with all the stakeholders and the general public; and a design of scenarios for funding structures to be put in place for the continued operation of administrative support to RCGs and the update of the content of the website.

Achievements

The framework for a secretariat for RCGs has been set with RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic as case study, including preliminary secretariat procedures and templates. Regular fortnight meetings have been established with project partners and RCG chairs to follow up the activity.

The development of the RCGs website (<https://www.fisheries-rcg.eu/>) is a very important achievement of SecWeb project, with microsites for each RCG, scope maps and much more information that has been developed in consultation with RCGs.

For the implementation and long-term maintenance of the secretariat two main scenarios have been identified, based on experience on previous projects:

- Scenario 1, the general conclusion is that MS will agree to share some costs, but Operational Programmes are already in place and there is no room for significant modifications. Still, MS would be willing to contribute depending on the required amount. Furthermore, some countries would have to face administrative burdens that may pose additional difficulties.
- Scenario 2, getting funding through the new EMFAF 2021-2027. The timing with the funds might not be right. SecWeb partners need to check new regulations and eligibility criteria because participants are not familiar yet with the new fund regulation.

Moreover, upon practical experience, it has been designed a preliminary lay out of the Secretariat activities and services (both currently provided and foreseen for the future).

Additionally, a dissemination and communication plan has been designed to promote RCG's visibility and engagement towards their work. The RCG's website one of the main communication channels along with the secretariat e-mail (secretariat@fisheries-rcg.eu). A Twitter account has been created, although it is not operating yet. A visual identity manual has been established for RCGs, including official logos for RCGs and the RCG's secretariat, and the creation of templates for official RCG

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

documents, such as Technical Meeting reports and presentations. Other communication products like the leaflets, RCGs scope maps are available on the the RCGs website (<https://www.fisheries-rcg.eu/>).

A shared identification of stakeholders is in progress, in cooperation with the RCGs and ISSGs chairs. It will feed the planned stakeholders' database that is meant to be a basic tool for implementing the communication strategy as well as for carrying out consultation processes and stakeholders' workshops.

Workplan for 2021 – 2022

- Develop materials for RCGs accessible on one spot - for different users.
- Update content of the website and assess the convenience/ create a private part at the website for RCG participants.
- Enhance the use of the website within the different RCGs.
- Spread the message on different platforms.
- Build a stakeholder database.
- Reinforce good practices for internal communication.
- Support the organization of meetings and report from meetings.
- Develop contents for press releases and the launch of the RCG's newsletter.
- Draft business scenarios for the long-term sustainability of the secretariat.

24

Recommendation

RCG ECON to engage actively in processes launched by the secretariat and make use of the RCG website to promote RCG's visibility and as a hub for RCG information.

RCG ECON chairs continue to liaise with the secretariat to support meetings and other administrative tasks and to provide feedback to feed the different communication channels established.

Rapporteur: Susana Rivero Rodríguez

6.3. ToR 3 AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO THE SEGMENTATION OF FISHING FLEETS

6.3.1. ToR 3: *Workshop on allocation of Economic Data at disaggregated level as related to the DCF*

Objectives

A summary of the workshop on an alternative approach to the segmentation of the fishing fleet was presented by Jörg Berkenhagen. The basic idea is to investigate options for an alternative fleet segmentation with a closer link to stocks and types of fishing activities and less heterogeneous vessel groups. The current fleet segmentation scheme is based on the vessel length class and the main fishing gear, which are technical parameters of the vessels. This segmentation method is well defined and easily applicable, but it does not adequately represent target fisheries. In addition, the length classes used for the classification often fail to group vessels of similar operational scales properly. Vessels with similar technical parameters are often active in varying fisheries that differ in terms of catch composition, fishing activity, and cost structure. Therefore, PGECON 2019 recommended a workshop to investigate alternate methods of segmentation as defined by 'fisheries' rather than dominant gear.

Achievements

A segmentation tool, based on stocks and main gear, has been developed at the Thünen Institute of Sea Fisheries. The tool was tested at a virtual workshop on fleets of several MS. The results were promising, and further fine-tuning of the approach is suggested. WS participants provided thorough input and suggestions for further improvement. All fleets could be split in stock/catch-based clusters. One problem was seen in the creation of one-vessel-clusters. Further effort is needed to compare these clusters e.g., on the basis of their cost structure.

The results from this workshop will be utilized in the process of further improving the alternative approach to fleet segmentation. Six case studies have been published in the context of the first workshop on alternative segmentation. The results of the including the developed tool, were promising but it would be desirable to get further feedback on the developed tool from a broader basis of national fleet.

Feedback from participants indicated the need for further elaboration, for example regional aspects, cost structure, fleet activity indicators and different length classes, and the benefits of introduction of further determinants. Also, it has to be investigated if the alternative approach fulfils the initial hypothesis that the results are vessel groups which are more homogeneous in terms of cost and revenue structure than under the current segmentation.

Thus far the clusters which are a result of the alternative segmentation tool have not yet been discussed with regional fisheries experts. The harmonization of a potential alternative segmentation requires a clear agreement on a regional level. Most case studies from the segmentation workshop refer to the NANSEA area, thus it appears advisable to start with that region.

RCG ECON Workplan for 2021 – 2022:

1. Joint meeting with RCG (preferably NANSEA) or related ISSG to analyse and harmonize the results of the alternative, fisheries-based approach and investigate whether the result is comprehensive and in line with the fisheries taking place in the related regions

2. Workshop on alternative segmentation. TORs:

- Analyse the cost and revenue structure of alternative segments.
- Compare results with the level of homogeneity of current fleet segments.
- Investigate the potential and the effect of introducing further determinants for the clustering (as suggested during 1st WS).

The WS will take into consideration the advice from RCG (NANSEA) on appropriate vessel grouping

3. MS that have not yet executed the alternative segmentation tool developed in the ISSG "AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO THE SEGMENTATION OF FISHING FLEETS" are encouraged to perform the exercise and share their results in the next workshop.

4. MS, who have developed alternative /complementary fleet segmentation methods, to present own methods appropriated for them in the next workshop

Recommendation:

Additional analyses on alternative, fisheries-based approach and methodology development through:

- the organizations of another workshop in 2022,
- a joint meeting with RCG (preferably NANSEA) or related ISSG.

Rapporteur: Jörg Berkenhagen

6.4. ToR 4 QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK

6.4.1. ToR 4: Quality Assurance Framework Subgroup Workshop: training session on methodologies in Handbook, virtual training from Finland 4.-6.5.2021

Objectives

A summary of the training session on statistical methods in the Handbook was presented by Heidi Pokki. Handbook on sampling design and estimation methods for economic data collection was produced in the SECFISH project in WP2 (2017-2019). PGECON 2019 asked for A Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) subgroup workshop to define the process of quality assessment and assurance and revise the guidelines of the methodological report with reference to the Handbook. This workshop was scheduled for March 2020 in Helsinki, but due to the covid-19 outbreak postponed till 2021. The Quality Assurance Framework Subgroup Workshop: Training session on methodologies in the Handbook was held on 4.5.-6.5.2021 as an online meeting from Helsinki. Professor Juha Heikkinen from Natural Resources Institute Finland (LUKE) went through the teaching in the Handbook in the training, and demonstrated how to apply the statistical methods presented in the Handbook including several practical examples using R.

Achievements

Recommendations from the workshop for statistical methods used for the economic data collection were the following:

- If census data is available, no sampling is needed and not covered in the Handbook.
- If census impossible, prefer probability sampling. If auxiliary data is available, it can improve the efficiency of the estimation and sampling.
- Greatest flexibility is obtained by applying a simple (equal probability) sampling design and attempting for improved efficiency by utilizing auxiliary data in the estimation phase.
- Non-probability sampling is also possible, but it is not a preferred method as only model-based inference is possible (and design-based inference is not possible).

Possible data collection strategies are:

- Census data (data from administrative sources, register data) → No sampling, reporting is straight forward
- Probability sample survey (PSS)
 1. Auxiliary data available, which can be used for sampling and/or for estimation → Stratified sampling (STR), systematic sampling (SYS), probability proportional to size (PPS), balanced sampling (BAL) + regression estimation, ratio estimation
 2. No auxiliary data available → Simple random sampling (SRS) + Horvitz-Thompson estimator (HT)
- Non-probability sample survey (NPS) → only model-based inference is possible.

More detailed description of the sampling and estimation methods can be found in the Handbook.

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

The group discussed the usefulness of a forum for sharing experiences of applying the statistical methods suggested in the Handbook and comparing different data collection strategies and estimation methods between member states in the next RCG ECON.

RCG ECON Workplan for 2021 – 2022:

The handbook on sampling design and estimation methods for economic data collection should be used as a reference where applicable when compiling the national work plans for 2022-2024.

Recommendation:

The results from this workshop can be utilized in the process of compiling the regional work plans for economic data collection as part of the FishNCo project running 2021-2023.

Rapporteur: Heidi Pokki

6.4.2. ToR 4: Methodological Report as Part of the Work Plan

Objectives

Evelina Sabatella presented the new methodological report as part of the Work Plans. The Work Plans and the Annual Reports shall include annexes with quality reports. The templates of these annexes include fields that shall be filled in for the work plan and grey fields to be filled in for the annual report.

The quality report fulfils Article 6(3)(d) of the data collection Regulation (EU) 2017/1004:

- Annex 8 of PGECON 2017
- Table 5B (Confidentiality considerations)
- Handbook on sampling design (Deliverable 2.1 from MARE/2016/22 SECFISH study).

Annex 1.2 fulfils the requirements of the EU MAP referring to data to be collected under chapter II, section 3, 5, 6, 7 of the EU MAP Delegated Decision on socioeconomic data on fisheries, aquaculture, and any complementary data collection of fishing activity and fish processing.

The quality report should be reported for each sampling scheme. For instance, if a MS is collecting fleet economic data with a probability sampling for some segments and with a non-probability sampling scheme for other segments, then 2 different quality reports should be presented for the fleet economic data collection. If within the same sampling scheme, some of the statistical procedures (for instance estimators) are different for some variables, then the Quality report to be presented is only one and differences should be described in the relevant sections of the quality report.

Achievements

The Handbook on sampling design should be used as a reference where applicable (Survey planning, Survey design and strategy, Estimation design, Error checks). No need for lengthy descriptions of

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

statistical methods and techniques if a reference is made to the Handbook. The reference should be detailed in terms of the number of the chapter/paragraph.

RCG ECON Workplan for 2021 – 2022:

No proposals for the RCG ECON Workplan 2021-2022.

Recommendation:

The quality report should be presented for variables estimated through a sampling scheme and also for variables collected by census. Only for variables derived from official administrative sources (for instance subsidies) there is no need to draft a separate annex 1.2 but it is enough to report this information in the relevant tables.

Rapporteur: Evelina C. Sabatella

6.5. ToR 5 Social Variables

6.5.1. ToR 5: Existing variables for the social data collection: unification of concepts and definitions for fisheries, aquaculture, and fish processing

Objectives

A summary of the workshop on social variables, chaired by Leyre Goti and Angelos Lontakis, was presented during the RCG ECON meeting. Issues related to the social variables cover a wide range of themes ranging from the unification of concepts, definitions of (quantitative and qualitative) variables, and the development of national and community profiles. These are the main reasons why EWG 20-14 and EWG 19-04 suggested the implementation of this workshop. Among the main questions about the National/Community profiles were what exactly they should include, who is responsible for collating the data, who for drafting the profile and when it is going to be drafted. As far as the unification of concepts and the existing lack of consistent definitions of social variables among MSs are concerned, the main idea was to thoroughly discuss the social variables and report discrepancies. Another objective of the social WG is the identification of potential uses of social data for research activity and policy making, by presenting selected case studies across the EU.

Achievements

During the workshop long and vivid discussions about the definitions and possible restructuring of several social variables took place. This fact itself reveals the increased heterogeneity and the different perspectives, regarding the definition of the variables and their potential usage (e.g., different end users, policy-making). While for some variables, like the “employment by nationality”, no important issues arise, for some others like “employment by age” and “employee status” very long discussions regarding the most proper categorisation took place. This leads the workshop to acknowledge that more expertise in social sciences is needed.

The clarification of some of the issues discussed during the workshop, such as fisher employment status, and specification of minimum working age (child labour), contribute to the necessary refinement of some of the existing social variables (age and employment status). In addition, other issues such as the definition of SSF among MSs are relevant to the comparability of national disaggregation levels by fishing activity (SSF; LSF, DW). Finally, the clarification of issues such as foreign workers (detached workers) and vocational training involve new grouping in the existing variables (e.g., in the employment status and in the education level), respectively.

However, even if it was accepted by all participants that there is a need for changes in the way that some variables are categorised (e.g., age classes), there was no consensus on the new categorisation, as each of them has pros and cons. This is the main reason why follow-up activities should be organised.

The existence of discrepancies was identified in the different employment categories (especially totals) among the values in social variables and/or between the social and the economic ones. As a possible solution a detailed description of methodologies as well as some degree of regional coordination would be useful to identify the origin of these discrepancies, their effect on the total values of employment and the best methodology to carry out the raising.

The WS understands that the gathering of information for National and Community profiles requires an additional workload. An ad hoc group (e.g., a group defined by FishNCo project) may start tracking down and collating the data that is available per MS (for the obligatory part of the national profiles)

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

and identify possible methodological issues or technical challenges MS may face to feed the national profiles.

Concerning Community profiles, much preparatory work has to be done before their implementation. The WS recognised that they have already been developed on a case study basis which may be used for benchmarking.

The WS also recognises that the data entry table could be made more user-friendly: it would be useful to provide examples on how to fulfil the tables, e.g. from a very simple one with only fishing activity to a more complex one with employee level data (combination of social variables). Concrete uses of employee level data were presented for Greece and Croatia, while no other concrete examples of social data analyses could be identified by the workshop attendees for less disaggregated data. Finally, the workshop encouraged MSs to provide combined social variables and to keep the disaggregation level at least in the fishing activity level, as important differences in the distribution of social variables were identified among activity levels.

RCG ECON Workplan for 2021 – 2022:

1. Expert panel should be evolved into a mixed group with economic and social scientists with increased manpower.
2. Ad hoc group to start tracking down and collate the data that is available per MS (for the obligatory part of the national profiles) and identify possible methodological issues or technical challenges MS may face to feed the national profiles. Ad hoc group to present results at RCG ECON May 2022
3. RCG ECON chairs to facilitate communication with NCs

Recommendation:

The analysis should continue in the next period by the organisation of:

- expert panel with increased manpower
- ad hoc group to start work on the data need for drafting National Profiles and to present the results in the next RCG ECON

Rapporteur: Angelos Liontakis and Leyre Goti

6.6. ToR 6 Feedback from Commission/STECF Update on revision of EU-MAP

6.6.1. ToR 6: Feedback from Commission/STECF and Update of revision of EU-MAP

Objectives

New EU MAP and templates as of 1 January 2022.

Achievements

The COM adopted the new **EU MAP** decisions on 27 April 2021. They were published on 16 July, to entry into force from 1 January 2022. Delegated Decision [\(EU\) 2021/1167](#) Implementing Decision [\(EU\) 2021/1168](#), OJ L 253, 16.7.2021.

There is no big change in data requirements, compared to the current EU MAP and the final draft produced by STECF plenary in November 2019. The most visible relative novelties include:

- More pronounced regional coordination, that will be further expressed in the regional work plans
- Social data collection is integrated into regular data collection
- Freshwater aquaculture data collection becomes mandatory under the same thresholds as marine aquaculture
- Fish processing data collection remains voluntary, with no variables included in the EU MAP.

The **work plan and annual report templates** are at the last stage of the revision. The templates were endorsed by the STECF plenary in July; the COM distributed them in mid-July for the submission of WP by 15 October. The WP will be pre-screened before the STECF assessment in November. The WP/AR template decision will be adopted no sooner than in the fourth quarter of 2021. The novelties include:

- A single document for both WP and AR templates, instead of two different COM decision currently used. The table and text boxes templates will be accessible on the DCF website, together with a guidance document with further explanations.
- The COM aims at having an automated system to report and check the WP/AR and STECF provided already some basis for this automation. First tab of the Excel file includes a Master Code List, predefining values to put in WP/AR tables.
- Similar order of sections in the EU MAP and the WP/AR templates.
- MS should fill in only text boxes and tables that apply to their activities, avoiding the empty pages. This is of special relevance for land-locked countries.
- The templates give some flexibility to interlink national and regional work plans.
- Annex 1.2 replaces Table 5b for sampling quality framework description
- Tables and text boxes 3.1, 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, and 7.1 cover socioeconomic data.

The reports on the pilot studies carried out under the EU MAP 2017-2019 and the extension to 2020-2021 were submitted to the COM in spring 2021. STECF evaluates them and after a STECF plenary session, the evaluation will be published on the STECF website.

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

STECF EWG 21-09 on the evaluation of annual reports and data transmission issues provided an overview of the first two pilot studies, by mid-July. PSI - Relative share of catches of recreational fisheries compared to commercial fisheries and PS2 - Level of fishing and impact of fisheries on biological resources and marine ecosystems.

STECF EWG 21-17 on the evaluation of work plans will do the same for the other two by the end of November. PS3 - Data on employment by education level and nationality and PS4 - Environmental data on aquaculture.

Some links of interest:

- [Report to the EP and the Council on the DCF Regulation \(EU\) 2017/1004 COM\(2020\)664 final](#)
- [Tables and diagrams \(report\) SWD\(2020\)229 final](#)
- [DCF website](#)

RCG ECON Workplan for 2021 – 2022 :

No proposals for the RCG ECON Workplan 2021-2022.

Recommendation:

The RCG ECON group discussion was focused on the Capital costs and Capital value presentation in the National Work Plan for the inactive vessels. According to the EU MAP Delegated Decision (EU) 2021/1167, CHAPTER II; paragraph 5.1 the following requirement for the MS is mentioned - “In the case of inactive vessels, data shall be collected on capital value and capital cost.”. Considering that, it was recommended by the RCG ECON group for the inactive vessels to include in the WVP table 5.2, two economic variables from the EU MAP table 7 (Fleet Economic): Consumption of fixed capital and Value of physical capital. The same variables are provided in the WP Excel templates ‘MasterCodeList’.

Rapporteur: Monika STERCZEWSKA

6.7. ToR 7 Update of Sars-CoV2 effects on data collection

6.7.1. ToR 7: Update of Sars-CoV2 effects on data collection

Objectives

MSs were asked to report effects on data collection of the COV2 crisis, with particular reference to how the situation was going in 2021 and developments in the next programming period.

Achievements

In most MSs, the 2020 data collection is currently in progress and no significant effects on fishery, aquaculture and processing are expected. In particular where data collection is based on administrative data (e.g. The Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark, Estonia, Lithuania, Germany) or it is carried with online questionnaires (Italy, Portugal,) activities continued quite normally. However, if another breakdown would occur, there is the risk that respondents will not have the desirable support (e.g. of associations and accountants in Portugal) to fill in the surveys.

Some MSs as Czech Republic, Greece and Croatia had to change their strategies related to acquisition systems (e.g. switched to online communication), but the adapted methodology in 2021 proved to be as efficient as in the previous years in terms of responses rates or quality of information. Also, in France it is foreseen the integration in the collection of social data with administrative data.

In Austria due to Covid and national security requirements the three current pilot studies (no regular mandatory data collection) were extended and stakeholder interaction had to be carried out online, but no Covid-related effects on data analysis are foreseen. Also, in Ireland for aquaculture there was an opportunity to simplify collection methodology. This scheme and the situation generally gave opportunity for increased contacts between industry and socio-economic research institutes as well as with those serving EU MAP interests.

In 2021, some MSs such as Greece for aquaculture or Croatia for the Small-scale fleet had to reduce the number of field interviews, which were substituted by telephone interviews: the change in the methodology slightly decreased the response rates. In the Netherlands, due to remote work of the administrative staff, the collection of the accounts data was delayed to a small extent, resulting in delayed data submission for the AER data call. A similar situation was experienced also by Portugal, Croatia and France with regards to aquaculture.

However, it has to be considered that the COVID pandemic highly impacted the fishing activities and this will determine more effort in the interpretation of costs data as the economic figures will reflect the anomalous performances of the fleets in 2020. MSs as Italy and France underlined the importance of acquisition and interpretation of qualitative information on the impact of COVID pandemic in 2020, acquired through an ad hoc section of the questionnaire also collecting dedicated financial assistances received by firms.

Rapporteur: Monica Gambino

6.8. ToR 8 The New Role of RCG ECON

6.8.1. ToR 8: the new Role of RCG ECON

Objectives

The new role of RCG ECON was presented by Kolyo Zhelev. He gave an overview of the evolution process of the change of status of PGECON from a subgroup of the Commission expert working group on data collection to a pan regional RCG. The process was described from the beginning in 2017 to the final decision reached during the PGECON annual meeting in 2020. Also, it was described the new role of the RCG ECON as a coordinating body of economic and social data collection activities in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors of the EU Member States. Another very important role is that RCG ECON may prepare draft regional work plans as mentioned not only as a role but also as responsibility and challenge. For further clarifications for all participants', detailed information was provided for the points of the RoP for the recommendations, preparation and endorsement of a draft regional work, and the decision-making. In addition, information was distributed regarding the work done by RCG Baltic and RCG NANSEA in order to adapt their RoPs. Also, it was mentioned that one of the tasks under WP2 for Establishing decision-making structure/processes in the FishNCo project aims to propose a common decision-making process on the implementation of RWP in accordance with the RoP and to adapt RoPs of all RCGs in one common RoP.

Achievements

During the discussion at RCG ECON 2020 annual meeting, Monika Sterczewska from DG MARE provided an additional explanation on the legal differences between PGECON as a Commission expert subgroup and RCG ECON. An explanation was provided that the drafting of a regional work plan is an opportunity for RCG, not an obligation, and brought more information on the process of adoption of the regional work plan (RWP) to the attention of the group.

The difference between recommendations and decisions in the context of RCG ECON work was also discussed. As the main differences were mentioned the binding status of the decisions, something that recommendations do not have, and also was mentioned that decisions should be voted by all relevant NCs while recommendations are the product of the work of the group and there is no need for voting. In addition, all recommendations could be suggested for voting in order to become a decision.

In regard to having one RoP for all RCGs, it was considered that if the aim is to have one RoP for all RCGs, RCG ECON should consider the possibility to adapt RoP according to the final RoPs of RCG Baltic and RCG NANSEA in the process of consultation with all MSs.

The role of the RCG ECON in the drafting process of the RWP and the cooperation with the FishNCo project was mentioned. During the discussion, it was concluded that the drafting process work will be done in close cooperation with NCs and experts from the relevant MS. The region of the region work plan should be EU with the aim to harmonize north and south data collection activities.

RCG ECON Workplan for 2021 – 2022:

In order to have one RoP for all RCGs, RCG ECON should adapt RoP according to the final RoPs of RCG Baltic and RCG NANSEA in the consultation process with all MSs.

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Recommendation:

RCG ECON 2021 recommends one common RoP for all RCGs.

Rapporteur: Kolyo Zelev

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

7. Next meetings

RCG ECON 2022

Preliminary ToRs:

- FishNCo updates/results
- Presentation of Regional WP draft discussions/recommendations/agreement.
- Level of ambition for regional coordination.
- Comparative analysis on capital value and capital cost estimation. Inventory of issues with PIM.
- Develop national and community profiles and analyse the data available.
- Presentation of common RCGs rules of procedure
- SecWeb updates/results
- Results from Workshops/Pilot Studies

Chairs: Irina Davidjuka (Latvia) & Heidi Pokki (Finland)

Dates: preliminary first week of May 2022

Venue: Sofia, Bulgaria (tbd)

Number of days: 3 days

37

Aquaculture WS

Preliminary ToRs:

- Need for more focus on methodological/technical aspects regarding specific challenges of data collection in freshwater aquaculture e.g.:
- Allocation of companies to segments
- Data reporting structure, quality checks
- Harmonization of conversion indices of fry

Chair: Rasmus Nielsen

Dates: preliminary first week of May 2022 (same week with RCG ECON)

Venue: Sofia, Bulgaria (tbd)

Number of days: 2 days

Workshop on Effects of the Alternative Segmentation

Description: The results of the first workshop on the alternative segmentation, including the developed tool, were promising. Feedback from participants indicated the need for further elaboration, i.e., regional aspects, cost structure, benefits of introduction of further determinants. Also, it has to be investigated if the alternative approach fulfils the initial hypothesis that the results are vessel groups which are more homogeneous in terms of cost and revenue structure than under the current segmentation.



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Preliminary ToRs:

- Analyse the cost and revenue structure of alternative segments
- Compare results with level of homogeneity of current fleet segments
- Investigate the potential and the effect of introducing further determinants for the clustering (as suggested during 1st WS)
- The WS will take into consideration the advice from RCG (NANSEA) on appropriate vessel grouping.

Chair: Jörg Berkenhagen

Dates: end of March 2022

Venue: tbd

Number of days: 3 days



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Annex I: List of Participants

NAME		COUNTRY	Institution	Role	email
Irina	Davidjuka	LV	Scientific Institute of Food Safety, Animal Health and Environment "BIOR"	Chair	Irina.Davidjuka@bior.lv
Monica	Gambino	ITA	NISEA	Chair	gambino@nisea.eu
Monika	Sterczewska		EU DG MARE, Unit C3	Presenter	Monika.STERCZEWSKA@ec.europa.eu
Jordi	Guillen		JRC		jordi.guillen@ec.europa.eu
Jarno	Virtanen		JRC		Jarno.VIRTANEN@ec.europa.eu
Raymond	Maes		EU DG MARE, Unit C3		Raymond.Maes@ec.europa.eu
Claudia	Winkler	AT	JOANNEUM RESEARC		Claudia.Winkler@joanneum.at
Els	Torrelee	BE	ILVO	NC	els.torrelee@ilvo.vlaanderen.be
Adelbert	De Clercq	BE	Institute for Agricultural and Fisheries Research - ILVO Marine		Adelbert.DeClercq@ilvo.vlaanderen.be
Sabine	De Peuter	BE	Institute for Agricultural and Fisheries Research - ILVO Marine		sabine.depeuter@ilvo.vlaanderen.be
Simona	Nicheva	BG	IARA	NC	simona.nicheva@iara.government.bg
Kolyo	Zhelev	BG	IARA	Presenter	kolyo.zhelev@iara.government.bg
Myrto	Yoannou	CY	Department of Fisheries and Marine Research - DFMR	NC	mioannou@dfmr.moa.gov.cy
Jiri	Dubec	CZ	Institute of Agricultural Economics and Information	NC	Dubec.Jiri@uzei.cz
Joerg	Berkenhagen	DE	Thunen Institute of Sea Fisheries	Presenter	joerg.berkenhagen@thuenen.de
Leyre	Goti Aralucea	DE	Thunen Institute of Sea Fisheries	Presenter	leyre.goti@thuenen.de

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Cornelia	Kreiss	DE	Thunen Institute of Sea Fisheries		cornelia.kreiss@thuenen.de
Jørgen	DALSKOV	DK	National Institute of Aquatic Resources (DTU)	NC	jd@aqua.dtu.dk
Jeppe Strandgaard	Herring	DK	Statistics Denmark		JHR@dst.dk
Rasmus	Nielsen	DK	Denmark Department of Food and Resource Economics, University of Copenhagen		rn@ifro.ku.dk
Janek	Lees	EE	Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu		janek.lees@ut.ee
Ricard	Buxó de la Peña	ES	Subdirección General de Investigación Científica y Reservas Marinas. Secretaria General de Pesca. Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación.	on behalf of NC	rbuxo@mapa.es
Susana	Rivero Rodríguez	ES	Centro Tecnológico del Mar -Fundación CETMAR	Presenter	srivero@cetmar.org
Miguel Ángel	Ruiz Hiebra:	ES	Subdirección General de Investigación Científica y Reservas Marinas. Secretaria General de Pesca. Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación.		maruiz@mapa.es
Heidi	Pokki	FIN	Natural Resources Institute Finland - LUKE	Presenter	Heidi.Pokki@luke.fi
Joonas	Valve	FIN	Natural Resources Institute Finland - LUKE		joonas.valve@luke.fi
Louise	Véron	FR	Direction des Pêches Maritimes et de l'Aquaculture	NC	louise.veron@agriculture.gouv.fr
Marie-Dominique	MINNE	FR	MINISTÈRE DE L'AGRICULTURE ET DE L'ALIMENTATION, Chargée des statistiques économiques des pêches maritimes		marie-dominique.minne@agriculture.gouv.fr

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Olivier	Guyader	FR	IFREMER		Olivier.Guyader@ifremer.fr
Kostas	Katsafaros	GR	Hellenic Ministry of Rural Development & Food. Directorate General for Fisheries	NC	kkatsafaros@minagric.gr
Angelos	Liontakos	GR	Agricultural Economics Research Institute. Hellenic Agricultural Organization-DEMETER	Presenter	aliontakos@agreri.gr
Christos	Danatskos	GR	FRI-Elgo Dimitra		chris_dane@yahoo.com
Stavroula	Ntavou	GR	Fisheries Research Institute, Kavala-Greece		ntavou@inale.gr
Irene	Tzouramani	GR	Agricultural Economics Research Institute. Hellenic Agricultural Organization-DEMETER		tzouramani@agreri.gr
Michalis	Chatziefstathiou	GR	Hellenic Ministry of Rural Development & Food. Directorate General for Fisheries		mchatzief@minagric.gr
Ivana	Vukov	HR	MPS	NC	ivana.vukov@mps.hr
Ágnes Irma	György	HU	The Institute of agricultural economics -Fisheries Information Group	NC	gyorgy.agnes@aki.gov.hu
Emmet	Jackson	IE	Ireland's Seafood Development Agency - BIM		Emmet.Jackson@bim.ie
Evelina	Sabatella	ITA	NISEA	Presenter	e.sabatella@nisea.eu
Loretta	Malvarosa	ITA	NISEA		malvarosa@nisea.eu
Vilda	Griuniene	LT	Fisheries unit. Ministry of Agriculture. Lithuania	NC	Vilda.Griuniene@zum.lt
Edvardas	kazlauskas	LT	Fisheries unit. Ministry of Agriculture. Lithuania		edvardas.kazlauskas@gmail.com
Jurgen	Mifsud	MT	MINISTRY FOR AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES, FOOD AND ANIMAL RIGHTS GOVERNMENT	NC	jurgen.a.mifsud@gov.mt

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

			FARM GHAMMIERI, MARSA, MALTA		
Andreas	Kotelis	MT	MINISTRY FOR AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES, FOOD AND ANIMAL RIGHTS GOVERNMENT FARM GHAMMIERI, MARSA, MALTA		andreas.kotelis@gov.mt
Andrew	Sciberras	MT	MINISTRY FOR AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES, FOOD AND ANIMAL RIGHTS GOVERNMENT FARM GHAMMIERI, MARSA, MALTA		andrew.d.sciberras@gov.mt
Judy	Cassar	MT	MINISTRY FOR AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES, FOOD AND ANIMAL RIGHTS GOVERNMENT FARM GHAMMIERI, MARSA, MALTA		judy.cassar@gov.mt
Hans	van Oostenbrugge	NL	WUR	Presenter	hans.vanoostenbrugge@wur.nl
Emil	Kuzebski	PL	Sea Fisheries Institute		emil@mir.gdynia.pl
Małgorzata	Kieliszewska	PL	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development		malgorzata.kieliszewska@minrol.gov.pl
Suzana Faria	Cano	PT	Directorate-General for Natural Resources, Safety and Maritime Services		sfcano@dgrm.mm.gov.pt
Inês	Ferreira	PT	Directorate-General for Natural Resources, Safety and Maritime Services		ifferreira@dgrm.mm.gov.pt
Johan	Penner	SE	Agriculture and Fisheries development Unit, Swedish Board of Agriculture		Johan.Penner@jordbruksverket.se
Hanna	Swahnberg	SE	The Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management		hanna.swahnberg@havochvatten.se

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Edo	Avdic	SL	FRIS		edo.avdic@zzrs.si
Julie	Kellner	DK	ICES	observer	julie.kellner@ices.dk
Arina	Motova	UK	Sea Fish	observer	Arina.Motova@seafish.co.uk

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Annex II: Agenda for ECON 2021

Time (CET, Brussels Time)	Duration	Topic	TOR	Presenter	Rapporteur
Wednesday 1 September					
09:00	30 min	testing			
09:30	30 min	Welcome and introduction		RCG chairs	
10:00	90 min	FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project - Strengthening EU-MAP data collection by developing Regional Work Plans for the Regional Coordination Groups (RCG).	I	Hans Van Oostenbrugge	Hans Van Oostenbrugge
11:30	15min	Coffee break			
11:45	75 min	Fish'n'Co	I	Hans Van Oostenbrugge	Hans Van Oostenbrugge
13:00	90 min	LUNCH			
14:30	60 min	New Role of RCG ECON	8	Kolio Zhelev	Kolio Zhelev
15:30	15 min	Coffee break			
15:45	30 min	SECWEB project - Supporting administrative tasks and online visibility to RCGs	2	Susana Rivero Rodríguez	Susana Rivero Rodríguez
16:15	15 min	Summary of the 1 day			
17:00		END OF A DAY			
Thursday 2 September					
09:00	30 min	testing/chat			

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

09:30	30 min	Feedback from ISSG SOCIAL VARIABLES	5	Leyre Goti/ Angelos Liontakakis	Leyre Goti/ Angelos Liontakakis
	30 min	Discussion:			
10:30	30 min	Feedback from ISSG QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK	4	Heidi Pokki/Evelina Sabatella	Heidi Pokki/Evelina Sabatella
	30 min	Discussion:			
11:30	15min	<i>Coffee break</i>			
11:45	75 min	Update of Sars-CoV2 effects on data collection	7	experts	RCG chairs
13:00	90 min	<i>LUNCH</i>			
14:30	30 min	Feedback from ISSG "AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO THE SEGMENTATION OF FISHING FLEETS"	3	Jörg Berkenhagen	Jörg Berkenhagen
15:00	30 min	Discussion			
15:30	15 min	<i>Coffee break</i>			
15:45	30 min	Feedback from Commission Update on revision of EU-MAP	6	COM: Monika STERCZEWSKA	COM /RCG chairs
16:15	45 min	Wrap-up of major outcome of ISSGs		All ISSG and SG chairs	
17:00		<i>END OF A DAY</i>			
Friday 3 September					
09:00	30 min	testing/chat			
09:30	90 min	major outcomes of the RCG Econ		All ISSG & RCG chairs and NC	All ISSG RCG chairs
11:00	15 min	<i>Coffee break</i>			



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

11:15	30 min	RCG 2022 & WS , venues and chairs	9	RCG chairs	RCG chairs
11:45	90 min	Summary		RCG chairs	RCG chairs
13:00		END OF THE MEETING			

