



Regional Coordination Group
on Economics Issues

Regional Coordination Group on Economics Issues

RCG ECON 2022 REPORT

4 – 6 May 2022
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 2022. Regional Coordination Group on Economic Issues. 2022. Report, 63 pgs. and one attached Excel Annex (<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).

© 2022 Regional Coordination Group





RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Contents

Contents	1
Acronyms	2
Executive summary	3
1. Administrative details	5
2. Terms of Reference	6
3. List of Recommendations	7
4. Summary of work plan RCGs 2022-2024	18
5. List of Outcomes and Achievements of RCG ECON in this delivery period	20
6. Progress report on ToRs and work plan	21
6.1. ToR 1 FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Level of ambition for regional coordination	21
6.2. ToR 2 Feedback from: Workshop on Effects of the Alternative Segmentation	23
6.3. ToR 3: Feedback from: Aquaculture Workshop	25
6.4. ToR 4 Issues related to WP implementation and data transmission	27
6.5. ToR 5 FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Presentation of Regional WP draft	33
6.6. ToR 6 FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Comparative analysis on capital value and capital cost estimation. Inventory of issues with PIM	35
6.7. ToR 7 FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: data/information available for the National profiles (collected outside the frames of EUMAP)	37
6.8. ToR 8 SECWEB (MARE/2020/08) project: Supporting administrative tasks and online visibility to RCGs	39
7. Next meetings	41
Annex I: RCG ECON List of Participants	43
Annex II: Agenda for RCG EGON 2022	47
Annex III: Minutes Aquaculture Workshop	51
Attendees	51
Objectives	54
Agenda	54
Specific issues addressed	55
Annex IV: Regional Work Plan draft	61





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
MS	Member State
NA	Not applicable
NANSEA	North Atlantic, North Sea and Eastern Arctic
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
RWP	Regional Work Plan
SBS	Structural Business Statistics
STECF	Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries
WP	Work Plan



Executive summary

The Regional Coordination Group on Economic Issues (RCG ECON) was established in 2021 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. This was the second annual RCG ECON meeting organised.

The RCG ECON 2022 meeting was held from 4th to 6th May online with application of the ZOOM virtual meeting platform, with 53 experts (Annex I) representing 23 Member States, Joint Research Centre, DG MARE and ICES. The meeting agenda started with presenting the level of ambition for regional coordination of economic and social data collection developed under the Fishn'Co project. In the RCG ECON 2021 meeting, the group proposed that Fishn'Co project would develop and circulate a questionnaire among member states about potential data collection issues that could be solved by increased international cooperation. The questionnaire included a list of possible issues about Capital costs and Capital value estimations. RCG ECON facilitated the communication with NCs and the Fishn'Co project to get replies and feedback. The feedback and results from this survey/questionnaire was presented to the group. Based on the replies from the member states, further international cooperation is needed in relation to combination of data on small segments, estimation of employment data for foreign crew, valuation of vessel capacity and social data collected outside the DCF.

Feedback from the two workshops both organised as virtual meetings in 2022 were presented to the group. Recent workshops included an alternative approach to the segmentation of fishing fleets and a workshop on aquaculture. The group discussed if the new alternative way for fleet segmentation based on fisheries/stocks would be more valuable than the operative one stated in the current legislation as for some member states the current segmentation is not sufficient. The work on alternative segmentation continues with a new workshop in autumn 2022. If an alternative segmentation would be used for reporting in the future, a set of rules for setting up the clusters would need to be created to ensure that segments are comparable between member states over time. The aquaculture workshop discussed how the data submission and correction process can be streamlined with the help of JRC to have more time in the STECF aquaculture EWG meetings to prepare the EU overviews and special chapters with a deeper economic analysis. The group also drafted recommendations in regard reviewing the definitions and guidelines, nowcasting and reporting environmental variables.

Issues related to the work plan implementation and data transmission were discussed. For reporting the fishing activity variables, it was recommended to submit fishing activity data in one data call (FDI) instead of current two data calls (fleet economic and FDI) to reduce double reporting and the workload for data calls. The group clarified that COVID payments should be provided under the variable 'Operating subsidies' and not to be combined with 'Other income'. The group agreed that segment clusters should be consistent in time. The member states should apply clustering based on Geo-indicator and Fishery and clustered segments should be in line with the National Work Plan (NWP). Although reporting fish processing variables is not mandatory in the new EUMAP, 16 member states have planned an annual data collection in their National Work Plans. To improve the homogeneous approach to fish processing data collection also in the future, a workshop on fish processing data collection was recommended to discuss definitions, nowcast, challenges identifying the frame population and reporting raw materials. The group also discussed that the quality of methodology for the data collection should be evaluated, in addition to the evaluation done in EWG Work Plan evaluation meetings on the comparability and compliance of NWP Annex I.2.

The draft regional work plan prepared by the Fishn'Co project was introduced to the group. The draft regional work plan includes current guidelines, definitions, methodology and statistical Handbook which are available online (<https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/guidelines/socio-economic-variables>). The group agreed that the regional work plan needs to be developed further with the help of experts from all member states. The chairs



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

of RCG ECON send out draft guidelines to the national correspondents highlighting methodologies and definitions which need further discussion and collect comments from member states. RCG ISSG on regional work plan will be organised to finalize the pan-regional work plan for economic and social data collection.

A comparative analysis carried out in Fishn'Co project on capital value and capital cost estimation and inventory of issues with PIM was presented. The group agreed that methodology and assumptions used when applying the PIM method should be described in the national work plans in Annex 1.2. and the guidelines for drafting the national work plans should be improved. In a workshop on capital valuation, member states should share their approaches on perpetual inventory method and expertise reached so far in order to ensure homogeneity in the estimation among similar regional fleet segments. In addition, the valuation of fishing rights needs further discussion to ensure homogeneity in reporting and to form a common understanding of the current guidelines. The current work in the Fishn'Co project on the data available for national profiles collected outside the EUMAP was also introduced and the work continues until the end of 2022.

Finally, the updates from the SecWeb project were presented about the supporting administrative tasks and online visibility of the RCGs. The RCG ECON 2022 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.





RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

I. Administrative details

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

Meeting venue	Meeting dates
Virtual Meeting (Covid-19 restrictions)	4 – 6 May 2022

The detailed list of participants is reported in ANNEX I





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: Level of ambition for regional coordination.
2. Feedback from: Workshop on Effects of Alternative Segmentation.
3. Feedback from: Aquaculture Workshop.
4. Issues related to WP implementation and data transmission.
5. FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Presentation of Regional WP draft.
6. FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Comparative analysis on capital value and capital cost estimation. Inventory of issues with PIM.
7. FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: data/information available for the National profiles (collected outside the frames of EUMAP).
8. SECWEB updates/results.

The detailed agenda is reported in ANNEX II.



3. List of Recommendations

RCG ECON Annual technical meeting (4th – 6th May)

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

International cooperation in Economic Data Collection	
Recommendation 1	Some issues can be solved by international cooperation.
TOR 1	FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Level of ambition for regional coordination.
Justification	For some specific fleet segments and types of information such as social data, valuation of vessel capacity and fishing rights, international cooperation might enhance the possibilities for data collection and the quality of data.
Follow-up actions needed	In order to investigate the possibilities for international cooperation the following follow-up actions are suggested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small segments: a short study on technical possibilities and legal options with people from JRC would be needed. - Foreign Labour: a workshop with MS representatives could discuss the scale of the issue and ways forward.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Combination of data for small segments - discussed in a small group of experts in the frame of FishNCo project. - Estimation of employment data for foreign crew - all experts discuss in the frame of RCG ECON ISSG (Regional Work Plan). - Other points will come back in other TOR.
Time frame (Deadline)	2022
Comments	Not applicable

Alternative Segmentation application	
Recommendation 2	The alternative approach should be further developed to achieve a consistent and comprehensive procedure which can be tested against the existing procedure with respect to specific criteria, in particular the link to stocks and the homogeneity in cost structure.
TOR 2	Feedback from: Workshop on Effects of the Alternative Segmentation
Justification	The current segmentation has some drawbacks with respect to the link to fisheries. An alternative approach to overcome some of these issues has been

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

	under development. This work in progress has been regarded as promising and WS participants suggested measures for further improvement.
Follow-up actions needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop pre-segmentation protocols: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - introducing vessel characteristics indicator (e.g. size, power, equipment) - grouping gears (regionally) to replace “main gear” as currently used - introducing reasonable target assemblages or métier groups by region ● Continue describing regional, consistent fisheries ● Check effects on cost structure ● Draft set of rules <p>Cooperation with RCG NANSEA</p> <p>Virtual ISSG meeting</p>
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCGs, MS, RCG Chairs
Time frame (Deadline)	September 2022 RCGs ISSG meeting
Comments	Not applicable.

Improvement the data collection reporting and correction of data	
Recommendation 3	JRC should contact experts before the EWG and collaborate to improve the quality of the Annual Economic Report for Aquaculture.
TOR 3	Feedback from: Aquaculture Workshop
Justification	To improve the reporting at the aquaculture EWG, the finalised data should be readily available at the JRC database earlier than what has been the case in the previous meetings. Data issues/errors are first discovered when the experts start working with the data at the meeting. This means that the first part of the meeting or more have been used to correct and re-upload data for the report. The data from each MS feed into the EU overview and species chapters, which cannot be made before all data corrections have taken place. Thus, it is very important that most of these issues are solved before the meeting, allowing experts to analyze data at the EU and species level and making room for deeper economic analysis of the data submitted.
Follow-up actions needed	JRC provides an example of data templates filled in. JRC will prepare an Excel file for each MS with report tables and pointing out potential data issues. JRC offers

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

	help for MS that have more reporting issues regarding the EU economic report. Data will be made available on ftp for experts to check data prior to the meeting.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	JRC
Time frame (Deadline)	Before EWG 22-17 (October 2022)
Comments	Annex III: Minutes Aquaculture Workshop

Guidelines for the aquaculture

Recommendation 4	The additional meeting time in Agenda for EWG 22-17 should be planned for sub-group discussion concerning the aquaculture segmentation and definitions.
TOR 3	Feedback from: Aquaculture Workshop
Justification	The problem encountered when reporting under the EU-MAP has been that the segmentation between the old and the new regulation has not been aligned and that MSs have been changing the segments to be presented in the national chapter. Also, there are no guidelines for clustering small segments with others, which creates discrepancies between MS reporting. The document 'EUMAP_guidance_AQUACULTURE' should be checked and finalised.
Follow-up actions needed	In the next EWG the group should draft guidelines for clustering on species and technique and updating definitions for variables in aquaculture data collection.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	DG MARE; EWG 22-17
Time frame (Deadline)	Before EWG 22-17 (October 2022)
Comments	Annex III: Minutes Aquaculture Workshop

9

Nowcast model for aquaculture AER

Recommendation 5	The same Nowcast model should be applied for aquaculture EWG 22-17 report than in the previous year.
TOR 3	Feedback from: Aquaculture Workshop

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Justification	There is a need for reporting more up to date economic data in the aquaculture EWG report than what is currently provided under the aquaculture economic data call. For this reason, a nowcast model was created last year. This model requires additional data from the experts for 2021 and 2022 in the EWG 22-17.
Follow-up actions needed	Need for ad hoc contract again for one expert preparing the nowcast model. After the meeting, asking for a contract for developing the model further or organising a forecast workshop under the RCG ECON. This workshop could cover other sectors as well.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	DG MARE
Time frame (Deadline)	Before EWG 22-17 (October 2022)
Comments	Annex III: Minutes Aquaculture Workshop

Environmental and animal welfare data	
Recommendation 6	If the environmental data will be requested by the DG MARE in 2024 and onwards, it should be clarified which variables to be collected.
TOR 3	Feedback from: Aquaculture Workshop
Justification	In the new EU-MAP, there is no table for environmental variables to be collected. If environmental data will be requested in future data calls, more guidance is needed for MS on how to report the data. Currently, the legislation obligates to collect national totals for environmental variables. For the aquaculture report national total is not at sufficient precision level for a proper analysis. Also, there are no consistent units used in the reporting. It has been questioned if the environmental data collected was structured in such a way that it made comparison between MS possible or if this data collection provided valuable knowledge to the report.
Follow-up actions needed	DG MARE could inform RCG ECON if they plan to request environmental data in the future. If environmental data will be requested, RCG ECON recommends a case study on a group of countries regarding the possibility of collecting new environmental and climate indicators in the future (nitrogen, phosphorus, organic matter, CO2 emissions).
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	DG MARE

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Time frame (Deadline)	2022-2027
Comments	Annex III: Minutes Aquaculture Workshop

Fishing activity data submission	
Recommendation 7	Submission of the final annual Fishing Activity data (landing; effort) from EUMAP Table 6 should be implemented in the frame of a Fishery Dependent Information (FDI) data call. The provisional Fishing Activity data can be submitted in the frame of the Fleet Economic Data Call.
TOR 4	Issues related to WVP implementation and data transmission
Justification	The landings and effort data from the EUMAP table 6 are requested annually twice a year in the frame of Fleet Economic data call and FDI data call. In order to improve the MS performance and minimise the discrepancies for the submitted data and decrease the number of the DT issues, the possibility of combining these two calls should be considered.
Follow-up actions needed	The discussion between economists and biologists should be organised in the frame of RCGs ISSG. The comparison of landing and effort data from both data calls should be done. The definitions, clustering procedures and allocation vessel to the segment should be checked between the data calls.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	JRC, MS, RCGs chairs
Time frame (Deadline)	2022-2023
Comments	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%2F1407628%3F_110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u_redirect%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fdatacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu%252Fdocs%252Fother-meetings%253Fp_p_id%253D110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u%2526p_p_lifecycle%253D0%2526p_p_state%253Dnormal%2526p_p_mode%253Dview%2526p_p_col_id%253Dcolumn-2%2526p_p_col_count%253D1&110_INSTANCE_YliNTIqXsG0u_fileEntryId=1242879

Fish processing data collection and submission	
Recommendation 8	The fish processing data collection, definitions and methodology should be discussed by MS. The Raw materials data collection should be consistent between MS.
TOR 4	Issues related to WP implementation and data transmission.
Justification	<p>Fish processing is not mandatory in the new EUMAP however, it was planned for annual data collection in 16 MS National Work Plans. The MS uses a different type of aggregation to report the Raw materials data by species. The Raw materials data are incomparable between MS and cannot be used for the analysis. In order to improve the homogeneous approach to fish processing data collection the following recommendations should be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MS should follow the fish processing data collection format provided in table 11 PGECON report 2020. - definitions in the file 'EUMAP_guidance_PROCESSING' should be checked and revised, if necessary. - the identification for the frame population for main and non-main activities should be improved. - MS should follow the Raw materials categories recommended by PGECON 2020 and use the FAO codes for species uploading the data to JRC. The JRC data call templates should include all the categories suggested by PGECON 2020. - MS should follow age categories for social data proposed by PGECON 2019. - the variables (table 11) should be collected and transmitted separately and not be combined. - turnover for main and non-main activity should be transmitted separately.
Follow-up actions needed	The Workshop for Fish Processing data collection should be organised to discuss specific issues, nowcast, identify frame population and raw materials data. WS should provide proposal for the EUMAP guidelines (definitions).
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS; RCG ECON chairs (WS); WS chair; JRC (to update the templates for raw material).
Time frame (Deadline)	Fish Processing WS - November 2022 before RWP WS 2023.



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Comments	<p>PGECON 2019 report: https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/pgecon?p_p_id=110_INSTANCE_14EJ6BVHCSBT&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_14EJ6BVHCSBT_struts_action=%2Fdocument_library_display%2Fview_file_entry&_110_INSTANCE_14EJ6BVHCSBT_redirect=https%3A%2F%2Fdatacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu%2Fdocs%2Fpgecon%3Fp_p_id%3D110_INSTANCE_14EJ6BVHCSBT%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_14EJ6BVHCSBT_fileEntryId=1264168</p> <p>PGECON 2020 report: https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/docs/pgecon?p_p_id=110_INSTANCE_14EJ6BVHCSBT&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_14EJ6BVHCSBT_struts_action=%2Fdocument_library_display%2Fview_file_entry&_110_INSTANCE_14EJ6BVHCSBT_redirect=https%3A%2F%2Fdatacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu%2Fdocs%2Fpgecon%3Fp_p_id%3D110_INSTANCE_14EJ6BVHCSBT%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_14EJ6BVHCSBT_fileEntryId=1370340</p>
-----------------	---

COVID payments	
Recommendation 9	COVID payments should be provided under the variable 'Operating subsidies' and not be combined with 'Other income'.
TOR 4	Issues related to WP implementation and data transmission
Justification	The current definition for the Operating subsidies does not cover the COVID payments which were provided in 2020 and 2021 to fishing enterprises in MS.
Follow-up actions needed	The current definition should not be revised, however for the fleet economic data submission in 2022-2023 the COVID payments should be attributed to the variable 'Operating subsidies'. The clarification about COVID subsidies data submission should be published on Datacollection web.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS
Time frame (Deadline)	2022
Comments	Not applicable.



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Clustering	
Recommendation 10	MS should follow a consistent approach for clustering of fleet segments.
TOR 4	Issues related to WP implementation and data transmission
Justification	Additional variables Geographical indicator and Gear code are used to distinguish specific fisheries from the basic segmentation. In cases when these additional variables are used, these should be applied consistently over and over time in order to provide the consistent time series.
Follow-up actions needed	MS should follow the rules of clustering. The clustered fleet segments should be consistent in time series. The guidelines for clustering should be clarified.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS, RCG ECON ISSG: RWP
Time frame (Deadline)	RCG ECON ISSG: RWP -November 2022 MS - annual (data submission)
Comments	Clustering rules WP text boxes template page 11: https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/guidelines/wp-text-boxes-template

NWP ANNEX 1.2 - Quality report for socioeconomic data sampling scheme	
Recommendation 11	The expert evaluation of the content of NWPs Quality Reports (QR).
TOR 4	Issues related to WP implementation and data transmission
Justification	During the EWG Work Plan evaluation meetings the comparability and compliance of Annex 1.2 was evaluated. However, the quality of methodology for the data collection also should be evaluated. The best practice about how to fill in the NWP 1.2 QR should be shared between social and economic experts. The possible evaluation criteria for WP 1.2 QR should be discussed.
Follow-up actions needed	The short-term ad-hoc contacts should be set up to compare the QRs and summarise how MS organises the data collection process. The Quality Assessment System should be developed. The appropriate indicators should be selected for the Assessment System. EWG should be organised for the evaluation of NWP 1.2 QR.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	DG MARE
Time frame (Deadline)	2023

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Comments	<p>The Handbook can be used for a type of data collection - PSS: 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</p> <p>EUROSTAT Guidelines for the Implementation of the ESS Quality and Performance Indicators: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/64157/4373903/02-ESS-Quality-and-performance-Indicators-2014.pdf/5c996003-b770-4a7c-9c2f-bf733e6b1f31</p>
-----------------	---

FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Presentation of Regional WP draft	
Recommendation 12	RCG ECON mandates a group of experts appointed by national correspondents to prepare the draft regional work plan. Fishn'Co project facilitates the work of this group.
TOR 5	Presentation of Regional WP draft
Justification	In the rules of procedures of RCG ECON it is stated that RCG ECON can mandate a group of experts appointed by national correspondents to draft the regional work plan. Already last year, RCG ECON mandated Fishn'Co project to start preparing the regional work plan. The current status of the regional work plan was presented by Fishn'Co project in 2022 RCG ECON. The draft Regional Work Plan includes current pan regional methodological guidelines, definitions, statistical Handbook and should include also other guidelines (e.g. clustering). The other National Work Plan tables and text boxes are not included in the RWP.
Follow-up actions needed	The regional work plan needs to be developed further with the help of experts from all MS. The chair of RCG sends out draft guidelines to the national correspondents highlighting methodologies and definitions which need further investigation for homogenous approach and informs NCs about RCG ISSG: RWP. National correspondents should nominate national experts to participate in ISSG drafting the regional work plan and provide the comments on the highlighted definitions. The meeting will take place online in November 2022 and will be chaired by experts from Fishn'Co project. All MS can appoint their representatives (for fleet, aquaculture and fish processing) to discuss and draft further the content of the regional work plan.

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCG ECON chairs, Fishn'Co project organises the meeting in November 2022 and appoints the chairs for the meeting. NCs appoints national experts for ISSG to draft regional work plan.
Time frame (Deadline)	November 2022
Comments	Annex IV

FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Comparative analysis on capital value and capital cost estimation. Inventory of issues with PIM

Recommendation I3	<p>More information on methods used for estimating capital value and details on the assumptions should be included in the work plans in Annex I.2.</p> <p>Online workshop on a regional comparative analysis of methodologies and results.</p>
TOR 6	Comparative analysis on capital value and capital cost estimation. Inventory of issues with PIM.
Justification	<p>Information used on the assumptions used to estimate the value of the physical capital on the basis of the PIM is crucial to evaluate if the derived estimates reflect the depreciated replacement value of the fleet and are consistent with the economic analysis of the fleet. Likewise, alternative methods have to be comprehensively described.</p> <p>The comparative analysis based on data collected from the AER and the survey carried by FISHN'CO and the RCG confirmed the importance of assuring homogeneity in the approaches used and in the results of the estimates.</p>
Follow-up actions needed	<p>The annex I.2 of NWP's have to include a comprehensive description of methods (PIM or alternative approaches) and assumptions used to estimate the value of physical capital.</p> <p>MSs share their approaches and knowhow reached so far in order to ensure homogeneity in the estimation among similar regional fleet segments. The fishing rights should be discussed.</p>
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	<p>MS comprehensively indicate methods and assumptions in the Annex I.2 of the WP.</p> <p>RCG ECON chairs facilitate organising an online WS for regional comparisons and sharing of knowhow.</p>
Time frame (Deadline)	<p>2023 - WS PIM</p> <p>2022-2027 - NWP Annex I.2</p>
Comments	Not applicable.



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Social data: National profiles	
Recommendation I4	Improvement of coordination and communication between different working groups in the field of social data collection. Identification of the data gaps. Community profiles development.
TOR 7	FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: data/information available for the National profiles (collected outside the frames of EUMAP)
Justification	Several working groups collect and analyse various types of social information (RCG ECON in the frame of EUMAP, ICES, STECF etc.). The overview for these groups' responsibilities needs to be clarified.
Follow-up actions needed	In the frame of the FishNCo project, to organise a Pilot study and continue development of National and Community Profiles. Determine what information could be collected from other sources such as EUROSTAT or ICES data calls and what would be difficult to obtain. Additional communication between groups the ICES WGECON and WGSOCIAL and STECF.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	FishNCo, RCG ECON Chairs, ICES, STECF
Time frame (Deadline)	National Profiles discussion 2022-2023 Cooperation between working groups 2022-2027
Comments	Not applicable.



4. Summary of work plan RCGs 2022-2024

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Alternative Segmentation Application	Organisation on ISSG	Communication with other RCGs	Communication with other RCGs
	<p>Develop pre-segmentation protocols:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - introducing vessel characteristics indicator (e.g., size, power, equipment) - grouping gears (regionally) to replace “main gear” as currently used - introducing reasonable target assemblages or métier groups by region <p>Continue describing regional, consistent fisheries</p> <p>Check effects on cost structure</p> <p>Draft set of rules.</p>	Further development of the alternative, fisheries-based approach.	Further development of the alternative, fisheries-based approach.
Presentation of Regional WP draft	Set-up basic structure of Regional Work Plan	Regional Work Plan presentation	Regional Work Plan implementation
	<p>The regional work plan needs to be developed further with the help of experts from all MS. The chair of RCG sends out draft guidelines to the national correspondents highlighting methodologies and definitions which need further investigation for a homogenous approach and informs NCs about RCG ISSG: RWP.</p>	Regional Work plan should be presented on RCG ECON 2023	Regional Work plan should be applied by MS.



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

<p>Social data: National profiles</p>	<p>In collaboration with FishNCo project</p>	<p>Communication with other Expert groups</p>	<p>Communication with other Expert groups</p>
	<p>In the frame of the FishNCo project, to organise a Pilot study and continue development of National and Community Profiles. Determine what information could be collected from other sources such as EUROSTAT or ICES data calls and what would be difficult to obtain.</p> <p>Communication between the ICES WGECON and WGSOCIAL and STECF.</p>	<p>Communication between the ICES WGECON and WGSOCIAL and STECF.</p>	<p>Communication between the ICES WGECON and WGSOCIAL and STECF.</p>
<p>Comparative analysis on capital value and capital cost estimation. Inventory of issues with PIM</p>	<p>RCG ECON ISSG</p>	<p>National Work Plan</p>	<p>National Work Plan</p>
	<p>MSs share their approaches and knowhow reached so far in order to ensure homogeneity in the estimation among similar regional fleet segments. The fishing rights should be discussed.</p> <p>Annex 1.2 of NWP's have to include a comprehensive description of methods (PIM or alternative approaches) and assumptions used to estimate the value of physical capital.</p>	<p>Annex 1.2 of NWP's have to include a comprehensive description of methods (PIM or alternative approaches) and assumptions used to estimate the value of physical capital.</p>	<p>Annex 1.2 of NWP's have to include a comprehensive description of methods (PIM or alternative approaches) and assumptions used to estimate the value of physical capital.</p>





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

During the second year of the RCG ECON implementation, the work under each ToR has been carried out. Two 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 a pan-regional level.

The RCG ECON 2022 report is composed of one overview of the work done under each ToR (section 6), related recommendations (section 3) and four Annexes with attached draft of Regional Work Plan in Annex IV attached in a separate file to the report.

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

The RCG ECON 2022 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: Level of ambition for regional coordination

6.1.1 ToR I: FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Level of ambition for regional coordination.

Objectives

As part of the Fishn'Co project to develop a Regional workplan the ambition level of the international cooperation for the economic data was agreed during the previous RCG ECON meeting. This level ambition was set to be at level 2; Agreed guidelines, because the implementation of some of the agreed guidelines is still lacking for some specific issues (e.g., valuation of fishing vessel and intangible assets) and the collection of economic data remains a well-defined national responsibility. In the discussion, however some topics were identified where international cooperation in data collection might solve issues that exist in the national data collection plan. The objective was to make an inventory on these issues and discuss further actions to solve these.

Achievements

In 2021-2022 a survey was sent out to all MSs to identify issues which were still existing in the data collection and could be solved by increased international cooperation. Twenty three MS replied on the question with a good distribution over the various regions. About one third of the MSs replied that they did not see any issues that needed international cooperation, from the other MSs, the issues of small segments for which currently data cannot be published because of confidentiality reasons and the estimation of foreign crew were the most important issues mentioned. Other issues mentioned were the valuation of fishing rights and fishing vessels and the collection of data outside the DCF. For the two main issues, there was no clear difference between regions as they were mentioned in equal proportions of the MSs of all regions. Only in the Atlantic, No MS mentioned the issue of foreign crew. The issues of the valuation of the fishing rights and the valuations of the vessels were only mentioned in the Baltic region. During the discussion it became clear that the extent of the issue of foreign crew needs further investigation as it is not clear from the survey how important this issue is for MS. The issue of the small segments is of legal and technical nature and it is questionable whether international cooperation can solve this.

RCG ECON Workplan for 2022 – 2023:

In order to investigate the possibilities for international cooperation the following follow-up actions are suggested:

- Small segments: a short study on technical possibilities and legal options with people from JRC would be needed. This point will be further discussed in a small group of experts with JRC in the frame of FishNCo project
- Foreign Labour: a workshop with MS representatives could discuss the scale of the issue and ways forward. This topic will be taken up in the in the frame of RCG ECON ISSG (Regional Work Plan).



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Recommendation:

The topics of publishing data for small segments and foreign labour will be taken up in the coming year in order to see whether international cooperation can add to the quality of the data collection and

Rapporteur: Hans Van Oostenbrugge



6.2. ToR 2 Feedback from: Workshop on Effects of the Alternative Segmentation

6.2.1. ToR 2: Feedback from: Workshop on Effects of the Alternative Segmentation

Objectives

A summary of the 2nd workshop on an alternative approach to the segmentation of the fishing fleet was presented by Jörg Berkenhagen. The basic idea is to further develop 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 often combines vessels with different target species, areas of operations, and potentially different cost structures. In addition, the length classes used for the classification often fail to group vessels of similar operational scales properly. Thus far, the alternative approach has proven to create more homogeneous vessel groups with respect to catch composition. Yet the results are to a substantial extent based on expert knowledge.

Achievements

The novel segmentation approach is based on a hierarchical agglomerative clustering procedure that was transferred to an R package. Vessels are grouped based on target stocks and main gear. The approach was tested at two successive virtual workshops on fleets from about 15 MS. After the first WS, the approach was further fine-tuned, following participants' suggestions. All fleets could be assigned to stock/catch-based clusters.

The functions of the R package now allow to view vessel numbers and to merge stocks to target assemblages. Further aspects will have to be implemented in order to perform a pre-segmentation in a way that e.g., the current separator "main gear" can be replaced. Additional effort is to be spent to specify the resulting clusters e.g., on the basis of their cost structure. Further suggestions from participants comprised testing the implementation of activity and vessel size indicators.

Criteria for the evaluation of the alternative approach (in comparison with the existing DCF method) have been drafted, but require further elaboration. The main aspects are:

- Link between segments and specific fisheries (e.g., stocks, target assemblages)
- Homogeneity of cost structure
- Compatibility with existing data
- Consistency and feasibility of the approach.

These criteria need to be applied and prioritized.

Workplan for 2022 – 2023

1. Joint meeting with RCG-NANSEA mid-2022 to analyze the results of the amended alternative, fisheries-based approach and develop adjustments
2. Virtual workshop in September 2022



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Recommendation

Further development of the alternative, fisheries-based approach through:

- a joint meeting with RCG (preferably NANSEA) or related ISSG
- another virtual ISSG workshop in September 2022, to implement and test suggestions from previous participants

Rapporteur: Jörg Berkenhagen





6.3. ToR 3: Feedback from: Aquaculture Workshop

6.3.1. ToR 3: Feedback from: Aquaculture Workshop

Objectives

Workshop on aquaculture was held 2.-3.5.2022 as an online meeting and chaired by Rasmus Nielsen. The workshop had 32 participants from 16 member states including also experts from JRC, DG MARE and ICES. A summary of the main points from the discussion and the suggested recommendations in the aquaculture workshop was presented by Heidi Pokki.

In the workshop the following themes were discussed:

- improving the data collection reporting and correction of data
- segmentation in DCF vs. EU-MAP and any issues related to the segmentation
- content to be included in the imputation and nowcast models
- how to present the social data in the EWG report
- inclusion of new freshwater data in the EWG report
- environmental data collection and reporting
- regional coordination and how to involve stakeholders

Achievements

The group discussed how the quality of data can be improved prior to the aquaculture EWG meeting, so that the submitted data are corrected and finalised in the JRC database earlier than in the previous meetings. JRC gives guidance and helps MS to spot any errors in the data already before the EWG meeting. Experts should inform JRC on the most important segments to be included in the report and how the segmentation changes between DCF and EU-MAP. Guidelines for clustering should be given by RCG ECON/STECF EWG.

The group found the nowcast model in the previous report useful and suggested using the same approach also in this year's report. Also, data from European aquaculture producer organization can be used for the nowcast model. Guidance for submitting and reporting the social data is needed in order to have comparable data in the EWG report. The group agreed that regional cooperation would be valuable for the collection and reporting of social variables and that definitions and methodology for aquaculture will be included in the regional work plan. Environmental variables are requested by the commission in the coming aquaculture data call.

RCG ECON Workplan for 2022 – 2023:

EWG 22-17 in October will draft guidelines for clustering on species and technique and updating definitions for variables in aquaculture data collection.





RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Recommendation:

- JRC provides an example of data templates filled in. JRC will prepare an Excel file for each MS with report tables and pointing out potential data issues. JRC offers help for MS that have more reporting issues regarding the EU economic report. Data will be made available on ftp for experts to check data prior to the meeting.
- In the next EWG the group should draft guidelines for clustering on species and technique and updating definitions for variables in aquaculture data collection.
- Nowcast model for aquaculture EWG; Continuing with the nowcast model from previous report. Need for an ad hoc contract again for one expert preparing the nowcast model. After the meeting, asking for a contract for developing the model further or organizing a forecast workshop under the RCG ECON. This workshop could cover other sectors as well.
- Case study on group of countries regarding the possibility of collecting new environmental and climate indicators in the future (nitrogen, phosphorus, organic matter, CO2 emissions)

Rapporteur: Heidi Pokki



6.4. ToR 4 Issues related to WP implementation and data transmission

6.4.1. ToR 4: Fishing activity data submission

Objectives

The fishing activity variables to be collected and reported annually by MS are listed in the EUMAP table 6. These data are used to analyse economic and biological data, and accordingly, fishing activity data is requested twice a year for the Fleet Economic data call and Fishery dependent information data call. At the Transversal Variables workshop held in Nicosia in 2016, it was proposed that landings and effort data from both data calls be requested under one call – Fishery Dependent Information (FDI). The general conclusion of the workshop was that the number of the variables requested could be reduced in numbers for the Economic data call. This should reduce the discrepancies as well as Data Transmission issues between both data calls.

Achievements

Some progress has been made since the Nicosia workshop: the columns with the fleet segmentation from EUMAP table 8 have been added to the FDI templates and the table CAPACITY with inclusion of the inactive vessels has been developed. Consistency between both data calls was checked and the following issues were found:

- Difference in timing of submitted data.
- Difference in number of fleet segments reported in both data calls (clustering issue; data confidentiality)
- Inconsistency of data in the capacity table when comparing fleet segments (different fleet segments names used or/and inconsistent GEO – indicator code used).
- Absence of data on inactive vessels in FDI.

RCG ECON Workplan for 2022 – 2023:

Recommendation: the suggestions from EWG 21-10 FDI have been done to facilitate the implementation of both data calls:

- the definitions and guidance used in both data calls should be checked.
- National coordination in preparation of both data calls should be improved (definition of the inactive vessels; clustering procedure; allocation of vessels to the fleet segments and metiers).
- the workshop should be organised where the allocation of vessel, landing and effort to fleet segment and metier for FDI and AER data calls should be explored. Different approaches according to the DCF definitions, variables and data call specifications should be harmonised between both data calls.

The recommendation is provided under Section 3 Recommendation 7.

Rapporteur: Zeynep Hekim

6.4.2. ToR 4: Fish processing data collection and submission

Objectives

According to the MS National Work Plans 2022-2024/(2027) the data collection for fish processing is planned in 16 MS NWP. However, the new EUMAP does not include any table for fish processing data collection; it only states that MS may collect additional socioeconomic data on the fish processing sector to complement SBS data. The final table which provides the list of variables recommended for fish processing data collection is table II from PGECON report 2020. Table II is in line with the previous legislation and could be used as a reference for the data collection in MS.

Several issues from the EWG 21-14 meeting for the Fish Processing Annual Economic Report have been detected. These issues should be considered by MS when they implement data collection and data transmission for fish processing data call:

- For Raw materials, MS should follow categories recommended by PGECON 2020 and use FAO codes for species.
- MS should follow age categories for social data proposed by PGECON 2019 ('40-64' should be broken down, at least, by '40-54' and '55-64').
- Turnover for fish processing for main and non-main activity should be transmitted separately and not be combined.
- The variables should not be combined but transmitted separately (example case: Energy costs combined with Other operational costs).

Achievements

At the RCG ECON 2022 meeting, a discussion with participants was held about possible difficulties on fish processing data collection. The main problems are connected to the several reasons: difficult to define a population because of the annual changes in the list of companies in MS; unclear if fish processing is a first activity or not; difficult to execute Raw materials; the methodology for Raw material data collection should be clearer defined; low response rates for the fish processing social data collection.

RCG ECON Workplan for 2022 – 2023:

Recommendation: the MS for fish processing data collection should be as consistent as possible and follow the rules for the previous requirements (PGECON 2020 table II and Raw materials categories; PGECON 2019 for social data collection).

The recommendation for MS is provided under Section 3 Recommendation 8.

Rapporteur: Loretta Malvarosa

6.4.3. ToR 4: COVID payments

Objectives

One of the measures taken by the MS to mitigate the negative effect of COVID-19 was financial compensation for the downtime of the enterprise during the lockdowns. At the EWG 22-02 meeting for the Fleet Annual Economic Annual report 2022 the COVID payments were discussed. For the fleet economic data submission, few MSs attributed COVID payments to the variable 'other income'. Some MS did not submit COVID payments and the majority of the MS attributed COVID payments to the variable 'Operating subsidies'.

The current DCF Guidelines define the "Operating subsidies" as the following:

"Direct payments which the general government or the institutions of the European Union make to resident producers. (ESA D.3).

Refers to direct payments/transfers related to the vessel activity, except for:

- *Fuel tax refunds*
- *Subsidies for permanent cessation of fishing activities*
- *Investment subsidies (fleet modernization)".*

The current DCF definition is partly based on the European System of Accounts (ESA 2010) where the Subsidies definition includes D.3 but not D.99 (other capital transfers):

"4.30 Definition: subsidies (D.3) are current unrequited payments which general government or the institutions of the European Union make to resident producers.

The following are not treated as subsidies (D.3):

(e) transfers made by general government to nonfinancial corporations and quasi-corporations to cover losses accumulated over several financial years, or exceptional losses due to factors outside the control of the enterprise, which are recorded as other capital transfers (D.99)

4.164 Definition: other capital transfers (D.99) cover transfers other than investment grants and capital taxes which do not themselves redistribute income but redistribute saving or wealth among the different sectors or subsectors of the economy or the rest of the world. They can be made in cash or kind (cases of debt assumption or debt cancellation) and correspond to voluntary transfers of wealth.

4.165 Other capital transfers (D.99) include the following transactions:

(a) payments by general government or by the rest of the world to the owners of capital goods destroyed or damaged by acts of war, other political events or natural disasters (floods etc.)"

Achievements

The RCG ECON 2022 group discussed if the classification of COVID payments in DCF definition be updated with inclusion of (D.99). The conclusion has been made that the current definition should not be revised, however for the fleet economic data submission in 2022-2023 the COVID payments should be attributed to the variable 'Operating subsidies'. The COVID payments should not be merged with the variable 'Other income'.

The same principle applies to all sectors; the main point is that MS should include covid subsidies under operating subsidies. In case, there is some compensation paid to the individuals/workers, not the company, it should not be included in the operating subsidies of the firm.

RCG ECON Workplan for 2022 – 2023:

Recommendation: the recommendation for MS is provided under Section 3 Recommendation 9.

Rapporteur: Jarno Virtanen and Evelina Carmen Sabatella

6.4.4. ToR 4: Clustering

Objectives

The current fleet segmentation and clustering for the socioeconomic data submission is based on the vessel length class and the main active or passive fishing gear provided in EUMAP Table 8. The fleet Economic data call templates use the following fields to define the fleet segments:

- YEAR
- SUPRA_REGION
- FISHING_TECH
- VESSEL_LENGTH
- GEO_INDICATOR
- GEAR
- FISHERY

All templates include the possibility of adding the additional variable ‘Geographical Indicator’ or (Geo-indicator) to identify a fleet segment operating in Outermost Regions (OMR) and fleet segments operating predominantly or exclusively in non-EU waters (international waters + third country – fishing partner agreements).

The use of the Geo-indicator inconsistently from year to year can introduce discrepancies in time series for the fleet clustered segments and other economic variables submitted and analysed based on the clustered segment.

Achievements

The issue was discussed by RCG ECON and it was agreed that segment clusters should be consistent in time. The MS should apply clustering based on Geo-indicator and Fishery when they prepare data for the data call. The segmentation and clustered segment should be in line with National Work Plan (NWP) Tables 5.1; 5.2 and Text Box 5.2. (Economic and social variables for fisheries data collection strategy). The guidelines in the NWP Text Box 5.2 should be used by MS when they apply clustering.

RCG ECON Workplan for 2022 – 2023:

Recommendation: the recommendation for MS is provided under Section 3 Recommendation 10.

Rapporteur: Jarno Virtanen



6.4.5. ToR 4: NWP ANNEX 1.2 - Quality report for socioeconomic data sampling scheme

Objectives

The questions and problems for NWP Quality Report preparation were discussed by the RCG ECON group. During the EWG 21-17 Work Plan evaluation meeting, the comparability of Annex 1.2 and completeness related to the WP sections was evaluated. However, the quality evaluation for the metadata completeness and the explanation for the data collection process in the MS also should be checked in Annex 1.2. The best practice about how to fill in the NWP Annex 1.2 Quality Report for socioeconomic data sampling scheme should be shared between social and economic experts. The possible evaluation criteria for WP Annex 1.2 QR should be discussed.

Achievements

RCG ECON proposes to set up the EWG to provide the best evaluation criteria to assess the Quality Annex and to define the best practice for the QR preparation.

EWG should be organised for the evaluation of NWP Annex 1.2 QR. The short-term ad-hoc contacts should be implemented for the independent experts in the area of social and economic data before the EWG to compare the QRs and summarise how MS organises the data collection process. The Quality Assessment System (Guidelines) should be developed. The appropriate indicators should be selected for the Quality Assessment System (Guidelines). Should be evaluated as an option of using current ESS GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ESS QUALITY AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (QPI) /ESTAT / D4/LA D(2014).

RCG ECON Workplan for 2022 – 2023:

Recommendation: the recommendation for is provided under Section 3 Recommendation 11.

Rapporteur: Edvardas Kazlauskas and Irina Davidiuk

6.4.6. ToR 4: RCG ECON Workshop/ one-to-one coaching for filling in socioeconomic tables in WP

Objectives

Organising the Workshop/ one-to-one coaching for filling in socioeconomic tables in WP was proposed by DG MARE. The idea of the workshop was to provide the explanation about use and completion of the WP tables and text boxes for the new coming experts who started to be involved in Datacollection in the MS.





RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Achievements

The RCG ECON suggests not to organise the new workshop but to develop the list of experts who could be available online for the explanations and clarification of the best practice in regards to QR preparation and Handbook application. Clarification can be provided also in regards to application of the new formats or codes. Checks and/or changes in the CodeList for the WP socioeconomic tables templates should be done in the future EWG WP evaluation meeting.

RCG ECON Workplan for 2022 – 2023:

Recommendation: Not applicable.

Rapporteur for ToR4: Irina Davidiuk



6.5. ToR 5 FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Presentation of Regional WP draft

6.5.1. ToR 5: FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Presentation of Regional WP draft

Objectives

Draft Regional Work Plan related to socio economic variables

Achievements

During the RCG ECON 2021, it was agreed that the ultimate goal is not to reach the highest level of ambition for regional coordination but rather to develop a consistent set of definitions and methodologies that are implemented correctly by all MS, resulting in comparable and homogenous estimations. Also taking into account the special case represented by economic and social variables, which are already coordinated at pan regional international level and included in the national plans, Guidelines are the most appropriated format to develop and implement procedures and harmonization methods which have to be considered as pan-European and, therefore, cannot be addressed at regional level without duplicating the content and structure already present in the NWP. Therefore, the FishNCo project proposed to develop a consistent set of definitions and methodologies that are implemented correctly by all MS, and resulting in comparable data sets, represents a valued added and innovative and useful approach for a RWP on socio -economic issues.

Guidelines implemented through the RWP in the form of tables will facilitate the dissemination of already commonly agreed definitions and methodologies and definitions and methodologies which need further investigations and developments (Annex IV: Attached Excel file *Guidance with highlighted issues.xlsx*)

This format is in accordance with the provisions in Art. 9(8) of the REGULATION (EU) 2017/1004 (Regional coordination groups may prepare draft regional work plans, which shall be compatible with this Regulation and with the multiannual Union programme. Those draft regional work plans may include procedures, methods, quality assurance and quality control for collecting and processing data as referred to in points (a) and (b) of paragraph 2 and in paragraph 5 of Article 5, regionally coordinated sampling strategies and conditions for delivery of data in regional databases. They may also contain cost-sharing arrangements for participation in research surveys at sea).

RCG ECON Workplan for 2022 – 2023:

The Regional Work Plan, in the form of Guideline tables, needs to be developed further with the help of experts from all MS. The chair of RCG sends out draft guidelines to the national correspondents highlighting methodologies and definitions which need further investigation for homogenous approach and informs NCs about RCG ISSG: RWP (Annex IV). National correspondents should nominate national experts to participate in ISSG drafting the RWP and provide the comments on the highlighted definitions. The meeting will take place online on November 2022 and will be chaired by experts from Fishn'Co project. All MS can appoint their representatives (for fleet, aquaculture and fish processing) to discuss and draft further the content of the regional work plan.



Recommendation:

RCG ECON mandates a group of experts appointed by national correspondents to prepare the draft regional work plan. Fishn'Co project facilitates the work of this group.

Rapporteur: Monica Gambino, Hans Van Oostenbrugge



6.6. ToR 6 FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Comparative analysis on capital value and capital cost estimation. Inventory of issues with PIM

6.6.1. ToR 6: FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Comparative analysis on capital value and capital cost estimation. Inventory of issues with PIM

Objectives

On the basis of the outcomes of a dual analysis carried out from FISHNCO project on AER data and information collected from the survey, to make an Inventory of issues with PIM and unsolved problems experienced by MS in the application of PIM with the objective to reach a higher harmonisation of methodology for estimation of Capacity value and Capital costs.

Achievements

21 MSs and 2 landlocked MSs provided feedback. 10 MSs out of 15 applying the PIM use an alternative tool to the excel template available on the data collection website.

Some MSs adapted assumptions to the fleet segments, using a wide a range of prices capacity units (PCU). The comparison among homogenous fleet segments at regional level highlighted some differences in terms of PCUs used and the results measured as Capital Value per capacity unit. However, the comparison of PCU according to mean age of vessel by size and fishing technique sourced from AER shows a homogeneity for most groups of fleets, at least in the Baltic region and for old fleets, thus confirming that lifetime have much more impact on the capital value than the PIM assumptions themselves.

Four MS replied that results of the PIM application are not reliable and consistent with the economic analysis of the fleets because they are overestimated. Three MSs expressed concern about the reliability of the assumptions, for example useful lifetime and the asset share are highly variable amongst vessels and over time.

Regarding the estimate of the price per capacity unit, it has been emphasised that this should reflect the price of new constructed vessels. In case this price is not known, other values can be used as a starting point, but they have to be “adjusted”. 2019_WS_Capital reviewed the best practices and formulated the schemes to explain step by step how to obtain an appropriate PCU to be used as an input in the PIM method for each case (book value, insurance value, market price, scrapping value). For example, both the market value or the decommissioning value (currently used at least by five MSs) might include the value of licence or other fishing rights (which instead should be excluded). In the OCSE manual 2001 (chapter 8), it is also recommended to not use book value (used by five MSs), as “It is clear from the above that asset values reported in company accounts cannot simply be aggregated to obtain estimates of the capital stock. Historic costs are not suitable for national accounts purposes because assets are then being valued at a mixture of prices, and the use of different depreciation methods adds a further element of non-comparability from one company to another. The same problems also render depreciation reported in company accounts unsuitable for national accounts purposes”.

Regarding the reliability of the other assumptions (age schedules, depreciation schemes, depreciation rates, etc.), PGECON and RGC_ECON already recommended to undertake national surveys to updated assumptions for the application of the PIM method to the actual characteristics of the national fleet. These surveys may be implemented once and there is no need to repeat them annually. The

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

2019 WS on Capital value also concluded that differences in the assumption may originate from the approaches in capital valuation but it may also indicate the difference in vessel armament and related prices. In order to improve the results of the estimations it would be advisable to collect more information about the service life and gross value of investment of various asset classes i.e., price of new vessel and vessel parts.

2019_WS_Capital concluded that depreciation rates suggested by EC 2005 study should be used only in case no alternative is available. 2019_WS_Capital also recommends experts to make an inquiry with the national statistical institutes to know which depreciation rates they are using. Another alternative is to use OECD standard (see Eurostat- OECD survey of national practices in estimating net stocks of structures).

Only for the very old vessels the results may be overestimated. 2019_WS_Capital considers that digressive depreciation scheme is appropriate for new or rather new vessels. This issue could be solved by: a) applying, for very old vessels, a linear depreciation scheme and not a digressive depreciation scheme (because economic depreciation rates are linked to the service life of an asset), b) considering a threshold for the depreciation cost (for instance a 2.5% residual value as in the case of the value of the hull). These suggestions were also reported in the 2019 WS on capital evaluation and MS may investigate the application of these improvements.

MS with small fleets may consider to apply PCU and assumptions of fleets operating in the same region.

Finally, with regards to alternative methods to PIM, in the OCSE Manual 2001 (chapter 8) there is a specific section suggesting Statistical surveys in market economies and the use of administrative records

The analysis concluded the need to assure:

1. homogenous assumptions (CPU; depreciation, etc.) for homogenous regional fleet segments
2. to differentiate depreciation schemes and costs for different age classes of vessels
3. alternative methods are consistent with the definitions
4. methods used have to be described in detail in the Quality Report of the NWP

RCG ECON Workplan for 2022 – 2023:

Recommendation:

More information on methods used for estimating capital value and details on the assumptions should be included in the work plans in Annex I.2.

The annex I.2 of NWPs have to include a comprehensive description of methods (PIM or alternative approaches) and assumptions used to estimate the value of physical capital.

MSs share their approaches and knowhow reached so far in order to ensure homogeneity in the estimation among similar regional fleet segments. The fishing rights should be discussed.

Rapporteur: Monica Gambino, Evelina Carmen Sabatella

6.7. ToR 7 FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: data/information available for the National profiles (collected outside the frames of EUMAP)

6.7.1. ToR 7: FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: data/information available for the National profiles (collected outside the frames of EUMAP)

Objectives

Over the last years there has been increasing awareness that the functioning of the CFP and its economic effects is to be evaluated in the socio-economic context in which the fishing sector operates. Because of this there is a need to gain further insight in this context, both at national and community level. This will help the commission to operationalise its social objectives i.e., article 2 (CFP) 5f: contribute to a fair standard of living for those who depend on fishing activities, bearing in mind coastal fisheries and socio-economic aspects. Both in STECF and ICES work has been carried out in order to assess the socio-economic context. The ICES working group SOCIAL has been working on defining fishing communities, 'putting them on the map' and developing social and economic indicators (in collaboration with WGECON) in relation to them. STECF (STECF EWG 19-03 social variables reviewed the social variables and concluded that National profiles would contribute to a better understanding of the (fisheries management) context of each individual country and would facilitate more proper social analyses in the future and that development of fishing community profiles, a key point since aggregated data often cannot show the relative importance of the fisheries sector; the importance of fisheries is often local. Based on the recommendations from STECF a report with templates for national and community profiles has been written, which can now be used to further test the template and implement it in the coming years.

Achievements

The background and an overview of the content of the templates were presented to RCGEcon and the role of RCGEcon for the implementation of these templates was discussed. The group agreed that it is not for RCGEcon to decide on templates or guidelines as this is the responsibility for the end users (ICES and STECF). Moreover, the current group consists mainly of economists with limited experience in social data collection. Concerns were raised on the extra workload that the implementation of these National and community profiles would give on the already stretched agenda's in many countries. Also, there is a growing concern that collection of extra information from the sector would cause a further decrease in the willingness from fishers to provide information, a trend that is already taking place in many countries. It was suggested that in the development of the profiles, practical information on the work load of data collection is of great importance to come to a system that provides the insights needed and can be implemented.

RCG ECON Workplan for 2022 – 2023:

During the remaining period of the Fishn'Co project the group suggested that some pilot studies should be carried out by the project partners in order to get a grip on the potential data sources that are available, additional data that need to be gathered, time needed to gather these data and other experiences that can help to develop a feasible system. Moreover, additional communication between groups the ICES WGECON and WGSOCIAL and STECF should be used to help coordinating the efforts in the various groups.



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Recommendation:

Improvement of coordination and communication between different working groups in the field of social data collection and the development of the national and community profiles. Pilots studies to be carries out in order to identify of the data needs and work load.

Rapporteur: Hans Van Oostenbrugge



6.8. ToR 8 SECWEB (MARE/2020/08) project: Supporting administrative tasks and online visibility to RCGs

6.8.1. ToR 8: SECWEB (MARE/2020/08) project: Supporting administrative tasks and online visibility to RCGs.

Objectives

- To develop and setup the framework for a secretariat for RCGs by providing administrative support to RCGs chairs.
- To disseminate the RCG work and its outcomes, to promote visibility, knowledge transfer and fluent communication.
- To develop and set-up the input for a website to support the visibility of the work of the RCGs.

Achievements

RCG ECON microsite on the website is fully operational <https://www.fisheries-rcg.eu/rcg-econ/>. The contents have been developed in close collaboration with RCG ECON chairs.

RCG ECON visibility and branding has been reinforced. Templates are available and have been used for presentations and reports promoting the branding of the RCG. Visibility has also been promoted in the form of news in the RCG's website:

<https://www.fisheries-rcg.eu/2nd-workshop-on-a-fisheries-based-fleet-segmentation-approach/>

The RCG's newsletter is periodically distributed to subscribers:

<https://www.fisheries-rcg.eu/newsletter/>

The RCG Secretariat has also supported consultation processes within RCG ECON network, such as the survey on economic data and methodology; providing the platform for the consultation and the communication channel with Member States.

Other activities of the RCG Secretariat in support of RCG ECON chairs have been the communication of workshops and technical meeting to national correspondents and RCG ECON network.

RCG ECON Workplan for 2022 – 2023:

1. Continue to foster fluent communication between RCG ECON and the RCG Secretariat.
2. Provide inputs for Newsletter and any other communication actions, e-calendar, etc.
3. Attract traffic to the RCG's website, spread the word for example including the link in future presentations, in email signature, etc.
4. Liaise with RCG Secretariat for administrative task support.
5. Current established support to RCG ECON will continue until end of the project, being 31st December 2022.
6. RCG ECON supports the long-term continuation and the transition to the long-term set-up of secretariat and website services.
7. 2023: Secretariat will support the follow-up the intersessional work in RCG ECON, next to the other support in place



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Recommendation: Not applicable

Rapporteur: Els Torreele, Susana Rivero





RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

7. Next meetings

RCG ECON 2023

Preliminary ToRs:

Chairs: Heidi Pokki (Finland) & Hans Van Oostenbrugge

Dates: preliminary first part of June 2023

Venue: Dublin, Ireland

Number of days: 5 days

RCG ECON ISSG: Inventory of issues with PIM

Ref. recommendation 13

Preliminary ToRs: online WS for the regional comparisons and sharing of know-how.

Chairs: Monica Gambino (Italy) & tbd

Dates: 2023

Venue: online meeting

Number of days: tbd

RCG ECON ISSG: Fish Processing

Ref. recommendation 8

Preliminary ToRs:

- identification of the frame population
- discussion about specific issues
- nowcast
- raw materials data; common format for aggregation and data submission
- proposal for the EUMAP guidelines (definitions).

Chair: Loretta Malvarosa & Christos Danatskos

Dates: beginning of November

Venue: online meeting

Number of days: 2 days





RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

RCG ECON ISSG: Regional Work Plan

Ref. recommendation 12

A mandate to the national experts to be involved in the preparation of RWP should be given by NCs.

Preparational work: combining all the comments received by email from MSs.

Preliminary ToRs:

- draft RWP proposal from FishNCo
- draft definitions (Fleet; Aquaculture; Fish Processing; Social)
- draft methodologies
- clustering Guidelines (rules)

Chair: FishNCo

Dates: end of November

Venue: online meeting

Number of days: 1- 2 days

RCG ECON ISSG: Workshop on Effects of the Alternative Segmentation

42

Ref. recommendation 2

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.

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 and Erik Sulanke

Dates: September 2022

Venue: online

Number of days: 3 days





RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Annex I: RCG ECON List of Participants

NAME		COUNTRY	Institution	Role	email
Heidi	Pokki	Finland	Natural Resources Institute Finland - LUKE	Chair	Heidi.Pokki@luke.fi
Irina	Davidjuka	Latvia	Scientific Institute of Food Safety, Animal Health and Environment "BIOR"	Chair	Irina.Davidiuk@inbox.lv Irina.Davidjuka@bior.lv
Monica	Gambino	Italy	NISEA	Presenter	gambino@nisea.eu
Evelina	Sabatella	Italy	NISEA	Presenter	e.sabatella@nisea.eu
Hans	Van Oostenbrugge	The Netherlands	WUR	Presenter	hans.vanoostenbrugge@wur.nl
Jamal	Roskam	The Netherlands	WUR	Presenter	jamal.roskam@wur.nl
Els	Torreele	Belgium	ILVO	NC, Presenter	els.torreele@ilvo.vlaanderen.be
Jörg	Berkenhagen	Germany	Thunen Institute of Sea Fisheries	Presenter	joerg.berkenhagen@thuenen.de
Jordi	Guillen		Joint Research Centre	JRC	jordi.GUILLEN@ec.europa.eu
Jarno	Virtanen		Joint Research Centre	JRC	Jarno.VIRTANEN@ec.europa.eu
Zeynep	Hekim		Joint Research Centre	JRC	Hekim.ZEYNEP@ec.europa.eu
Evelien	Ranshuysen		EU DG MARE	EC	evelien.ranshuysen@ec.europa.eu
Monika	Sterczewska		EU DG MARE, Unit C3	EC	Monika.STERCZEWSKA@ec.europa.eu



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Margareta	Stubenrauch	Austria	Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Regions and Tourism	NC	margareta.stubenrauch@bmlrt.gv.at
Adelbert	De Clercq	Belgium	Flanders Research Institute for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food Visserij & Aquacultuur Biologie - ILVO		adelbert.declercq@ilvo.vlaanderen.be
Kolyo	Zhelev	Bulgaria	IARA		kolyo.zhelev@iara.government.bg
Simona	Nicheva	Bulgaria	IARA	NC	simona.nicheva@iara.government.bg
Ivana	Vukov	Croatia	Ministry of Agriculture, Directorate of Fisheries	NC	ivana.vukov@mps.hr
Matija	Pofuk	Croatia	Ministry of Agriculture, Directorate of Fisheries		matija.pofuk@mps.hr
Jiří	Dubec	Czech Republic	Institute of Agricultural Economics and Information	NC	Dubec.Jiri@uzei.cz
Jan	De Haes	Denmark	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)	ICES	jan.dehaes@ices.dk
Julie	Kellner	Denmark	ICES Secretariat	observer	julie.kellner@ices.dk
Anne	Cooper	Denmark	ICES Secretariat	observer	anne.cooper@ices.dk
Janek	Lees	Estonia	Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu		janek.lees@ut.ee
Tommi	Kaatrasalo	Finland	Natural Resources Institute Finland - LUKE		tommi.kaatrasalo@luke.fi
Marie-Dominique	Minne	France	MINISTÈRE DE L'AGRICULTURE ET DE L'ALIMENTATION, Chargée des statistiques économiques des pêches maritimes		marie-dominique.minne@agriculture.gouv.fr
Olivier	Guyader	France	Ifremer		olivier.guyader@ifremer.fr



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Sebastien	Demaneche	France	Ifremer	sebastien.demaneche@ifremer.fr
Matthias	Bernreuther	Germany	Thunen Institute of Sea Fisheries	matthias.bernreuther@thuenen.de
Christos	Danatskos	Greece	FRI-Elgo Dimitra	chris_dane@yahoo.com
Irene	Tzouramani	Greece	Agricultural Economics Research Institute. Hellenic Agricultural Organization-DEMETER	tzouramani@agreri.gr
Ntavou	Stavroula	Greece	Fisheries Research Institute, Kavala-Greece	ntavou@inale.gr
Angelos	Liontakis	Greece	Agricultural university of Athens	aliontakis@gmail.com
Ágnes Irma	György	Hungary	Fisheries Information Group	gyorgy.agnes@aki.gov.hu
Sarah	Perry	Ireland	Ireland's Seafood Development Agency - BIM	sarah.perry@bim.ie
Emmet	Jackson	Ireland	Ireland's Seafood Development Agency - BIM	Emmet.Jackson@bim.ie
John	Dennis	Ireland	Economic and Strategic Services Unit, BIM	john.dennis@bim.ie
Loretta	Malvarosa	Italy	NISEA	malvarosa@nisea.eu
Edvardas	Kazlauskas	Lithuania	Agriculture Information and Rural Business Center, Lithuania	edvardas.kazlauskas@gmail.com
Andrew	Sciberras	Malta	MINISTRY FOR AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES, FOOD AND ANIMAL RIGHTS GOVERNMENT FARM GHAMMIERI, MARSA, MALTA	andrew.d.sciberras@gov.mt
Brian-Paul	Zammit	Malta	Fisheries Research Unit Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture	brian-paul.zammit@gov.mt





RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Emil	Kuzebski	Poland	Sea Fisheries Institute	emil@mir.gdynia.pl
Suzana Faria	Cano	Portugal	Directorate-General for Natural Resources, Safety and Maritime Services	sfcano@dgrm.mm.gov.pt
Inês	Ferreira	Portugal	Directorate-General for Natural Resources, Safety and Maritime Services	ifferreira@dgrm.mm.gov.pt
Alexandru	Gheorghe	Romania	National Agency for Fisheries and Aquaculture	alexandru.gheorghe@anpa.ro
Edo	Avdic	Slovenia	Fisheries Research institute, Slovenia	edoavdic@gmail.com
Juana	Poza Poza	Spain	General Secretariat for Fisheries of Spain	jpoza@mapa.es
Ricard	de la Peña Buxó	Spain	General Secretariat for Fisheries of Spain	rbuxo@mapa.es
Maria	Mar Domínguez Amaral	Spain	General Secretariat for Fisheries of Spain	bec_sgicrm15@mapa.es
Sara	M García Poza	Spain	General Secretariat for Fisheries of Spain	bec_sgprp25@mapa.es
Susana	Rivero Rodríguez	Spain	Centro Tecnológico del Mar - Fundación CETMAR	rivero@cetmar.org
María	Valiente	Spain	SG de Sostenibilidad Económica y Asuntos Sociales Secretaría General de Pesca	mvaliente@mapa.es
Álvaro	Mínguez	Spain	SG de Sostenibilidad Económica y Asuntos Sociales Secretaría General de Pesca	amvelasco@mapa.es
Hanna	Swahnberg	Sweden	The Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management	hanna.swahnberg@havochvatten.se





RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Annex II: Agenda for RCG ECON 2022

Time (CET, Brussels Time)	Duration	Topic	TOR	Presenter	Rapporteur
Wednesday 4 May					
09:00	30 min	testing			
09:30	30 min	Welcome and introduction Welcome, house rules, adoption of the agenda, format of the report, notification of AOB		RCG chairs	
10:00	45 min	FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Level of ambition for regional coordination.	ToR I	Hans Van Oostenbrugge/ Jamal Roskam	Hans Van Oostenbrugge/ Jamal Roskam
		Discussion: 1. define next step, short/ long term actions 2. identify recommendations / decisions			
10:45	45 min	Feedback from: Workshop on Effects of the Alternative Segmentation	ToR 2	Jörg Berkenhagen	Jörg Berkenhagen
		Discussion: 1. define next step, short/ long term actions 2. identify recommendations / decisions			
11:30	30 min	Coffee break			



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

12:00	60 min	Feedback from: Aquaculture Workshop	ToR 3	RCG chairs	RCG chairs
13:00	90 min	<i>LUNCH</i>			
14:30	60 min	Issues related to WP implementation and data transmission	ToR 4	Irina Davidjuka	Irina Davidjuka
15:30	30 min	<i>Coffee break</i>			
16:00	30 min	Issues related to WP implementation and data transmission	ToR 4	Irina Davidjuka/All ISSG	Irina Davidjuka
		Discussion: 1. define next step, short/ long term actions 2. identify recommendations / decisions			
16:30	30 min	Summary of the 1st day		All ISSG and SG chairs	
17:00		<i>END OF A DAY</i>			
Time	Duration	Topic	TOR	Presenter	Rapporteur
Thursday 5 May					
09:00	30 min	ZOOM testing/chat			
09:30	60 min	FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Presentation of Regional WP draft	ToR 5	Monica Gambino/Hans Van Oostenbrugge	Monica Gambino/Hans Van Oostenbrugge
		Discussion: 1. define next step, short/ long term actions 2. identify recommendations / decisions			



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

10:30	60 min	FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: Comparative analysis on capital value and capital cost estimation. Inventory of issues with PIM	ToR 6	Monica Gambino/Evelina Sabatella	Monica Gambino/Evelina Sabatella
		Discussion: 1. define next step, short/ long term actions 2. identify recommendations / decisions			
11:30	30 min	Coffee break			
12:00	60 min	FishNCo (MARE/2020/08) project: data/information available for the National profiles (collected outside the frames of EUMAP)	ToR 7	Hans Van Oostenbrugge	Hans Van Oostenbrugge
		Discussion: 1. define next step, short/ long term actions 2. identify recommendations / decisions			
13:00	90 min	LUNCH			
14:30	60 min	New RCG ECON 2023/chairs/venue/ related workshops planning		All ISSG and SG chairs	All ISSG and SG chairs
15:30	30 min	Coffee break			
16:00	60 min	Summary of the 2nd day		RCG chairs	RCG chairs
17:00		END OF A DAY			





RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Time	Duration	Topic	TOR	Presenter	Rapporteur
Friday 6 May					
09:00	30 min	ZOOM testing/chat			
09:30	45 min	SECWEB updates/results	ToR 8	Els Torreele (project coordinator)/Susana Rivero	Els Torreele (project coordinator)/Susana Rivero
		Discussion in plenary 1. define next step, short/ long term actions 2. identify recommendations / decisions			
10:15	45 min	AOB		RCG chairs	RCG chairs
11:30	30 min	<i>Coffee break</i>			
12:00		Summary , overview of Intersessional work 2023, tasks		RCG chairs	RCG chairs
13:00		<i>END OF THE MEETING</i>			





Annex III: Minutes Aquaculture Workshop

Date	2 and 3 of May	Venue	
Chair	Rasmus Nielsen	Online	

Attendees				
NAME	SURNAM E	COUNTR Y	Institution	email
Rasmus	Nielsen	Denmark	Denmark Department of Food and Resource Economics, University of Copenhagen	rn@ifro.ku.dk
Jordi	Guillen		Joint Research Centre	jordi.guillen@ec.europa.eu
Margareta	Stubenrauch	Austria		Margareta.Stubenrauch@bmlrt.gv.at
Cladia	Winkler	Austria		Claudia.Winkler@joanneum.at
Adelbert	De Clercq	Belgium	Flanders Research Institute for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food - ILVO	adelbert.declercq@ilvo.vlaanderen.be
Kolyo	Zhelev	Bulgaria	IARA	kolyo.zhelev@iara.government.bg
Simona	Nicheva	Bulgaria	IARA	simona.nicheva@iara.government.bg





RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Matija	Pofuk	Croatia	Ministry of Agriculture, Directorate of Fisheries	matija.pofuk@mps.hr
Ivana	Vukov	Croatia	Ministry of Agriculture, Directorate of Fisheries	ivana.vukov@mps.hr
Svjetlana	Višnić Novaković	Croatia	Ministry of Agriculture, Directorate of Fisheries	svjetlana.visnic@mps.hr
Jiří	Dubec	Czech Republic	Institute of Agricultural Economics and Information	Dubec.Jiri@uzei.cz
Anne	Cooper	Denmark	ICES Secretariat	anne.cooper@ices.dk
Heidi	Pokki	Finland	Natural Resources Institute Finland - LUKE	Heidi.Pokki@luke.fi
Joonas	Valve	Finland	Natural Resources Institute Finland - LUKE	joonas.valve@luke.fi
Tommi	Kaatrasalo	Finland	Natural Resources Institute Finland - LUKE	tommi.kaatrasalo@luke.fi
Anael	Delorme	France	MINISTÈRE DE L'AGRICULTURE ET DE L'ALIMENTATION	anael.delorme@agriculture.gouv.fr
Morineau	Baptiste	France	University of Nantes	Baptiste.Morineau@univ-nantes.fr
Johna	Barrelet	Germany	Thünen Institute of Sea Fisheries	johna.barrelet@thuenen.de
Christos	Danatskos	Greece	FRI-Elgo Dimitra	chris_dane@yahoo.com
Ntavou	Stavroula	Greece	Fisheries Research Institute, Kavala-Greece	ntavou@inale.gr
Sarah	Perry	Ireland	Ireland's Seafood Development Agency - BIM	sarah.perry@bim.ie



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

John	Dennis	Ireland	Economic and Strategic Services Unit, BIM	John.Dennis@bim.ie
Irina	Davidjuka	Latvia	Scientific Institute of Food Safety, Animal Health and Environment "BIOR"	Irina.Davidjuka@bior.lv
Adam	Mytlewski	Poland	National Marine Fisheries Institute from Gdynia	amytlewski@mir.gdynia.pl
Tomasz	Kulikowski	Poland	National Marine Fisheries Institute from Gdynia	tkulikowski@mir.gdynia.pl
Suzana Faria	Cano	Portugal	Directorate-General for Natural Resources, Safety and Maritime Services	sfcano@dgrm.mm.gov.pt
Inês	Ferreira	Portugal	Directorate-General for Natural Resources, Safety and Maritime Services	ifferreira@dgrm.mm.gov.pt
Christina	Borges	Portugal		cborges@dgrm.mm.gov.pt
Alexandru	Gheorghe	Romania	National Agency for Fisheries and Aquaculture	alexandru.gheorghe@anpa.ro
Edo	Avdic	Slovenia		edoavdic@gmail.com
Almudena	Mínguez Matorras	Spain	Deputy Directorate General for Analysis, Coordination and Statistics of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food of Spain.	aminguez@mapa.es
Frida	Solstorm	Sweden	Agriculture & Fisheries Development Unit Swedish Board of Agriculture	Frida.Solstorm@jordbruksverket.se



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Johan	Penner	Sweden	Agriculture and Fisheries Development Unit Swedish Board of Agriculture	Johan.Penner@jordbruksverket.se
Hidde	POLITIEK		EU DG MARE	hidde.politiek1@ext.ec.europa.eu
Monika	Sterczewska		EU DG MARE, Unit C3	Monika.STERCZEWSKA@ec.europa.eu
Evi	Lardi		EU DG MARE	Evi.Lardi@ec.europa.eu

Objectives

- Improve aquaculture data collection
- Improve EWG working conditions allowing for more time spend on data analysis
- Improving interaction between aquaculture experts, data collectors and data receivers

Agenda

Meeting structure

1. How can we improve the data collection, reporting and correction of data

- Time of data call – and time to process and correct data
- Submission and resubmission of data before and during the meeting
- Template structure – and readiness (incl. text from last report and new data in tables and figures)

2. DCF and EU-MAP segmentation

- Segmentation in relation to DCF and EU-MAP – should be decided before the meeting by MS.
- The reporting of economic data should consider the changed segments between DCF and EU-MAP
- Reporting of data at farm or enterprise level to segments
- Reporting of enterprises that cannot be allocated to segments do to confidentiality reasons

3. Content to be included in the imputation and nowcast models

- How can the use of imputation and nowcast be better supported by MS
- Relevant variables and sources for extracting data for the now cast

4. Presentation of social data

- The reporting of "Social data" data should be structured to one common format





RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

5. Inclusion of new freshwater data

- It should be discussed how new submitters of data (reporting of freshwater data from MS that have not submitted data before) can be checked to secure that data are submitted according to RCG recommendations (a manual or the handbook?)

6. Environmental and animal welfare data?

- Is collection of environmental variables still relevant?
- If collected, how should they be used

7. Regional coordination

- Regional or sector specific Work Programs should be discussed during the WS. A regional mapping of production (technology and species) including the new social data could be used as a future indicator of the importance of aquaculture in EU and for future impact assessments of aquaculture economic and social importance in different regions.

8. Stakeholders

- Identification of stakeholders need and interactions to improve the report

Specific issues addressed

Minutes for the aquaculture workshop 2 and 3 of May 2022.

Agenda and Meeting structure - (Questions to be discussed?)

The experience from the latest aquaculture meetings is that there is too little time to get data organized and corrected, which hampers the opportunity for making the EU overviews and special chapters with deeper economic analysis. Thus, the experts at the workshop need to discuss how this process can be streamlined and how JRC can support this process.

The following point was addressed in the agenda:

1. How can we improve the data collection, reporting and correction of data

The problem experienced is that data issues/errors are first discovered when the experts start working with the data at the meeting. This means that the first part of the meeting or more have been used to correct and re-upload data for the report. The data from each MS feed into the EU overview and species chapters, which cannot be made before all data corrections are in place. Thus, it is very important that most of these issues are solved before the meeting, allowing experts to analyze data at the EU and species level and making room for deeper economic analysis of the data submitted.

Time of the data call – and time to process and correct data

- It is suggested that the data call is placed as early as possible to leave as much time as possible for data correction between the submission deadline and the meeting start.



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

- For the coming meeting (24-28 of October) a suggestion could be to initiate a data call starting at the 15 August to 15 September – which leaves time for JRC to process the data and send out data checks/reports, so that MS can evaluate and re-upload data if needed.
- If possible, data should be checked by an aquaculture expert with experience from former EWG meetings

Submission and resubmission of data before

- To help MS in uploading the data correctly an example for the economic and the social data will be provided by JRC before the submission of data
- A short communication on data issues discovered in previous data call will be provided by JRC to avoid that the same mistakes are made twice.
- Automatic data checks in the upload template are suggested when submitting the data.
- MS is urged to share if they have developed data quality check programs or other features
- MS is urged to reach out to JRC, RCG ECON or other MS if they need help when submitting data
- JRC checks if the templates can be disseminated already before the meeting containing the Excel file for each MS with report Tables and pointing out potential data issues/errors making it possible for expert to make a data check before the meeting (set up an FTP-server for the data?).
- JRC checks if the templates can be disseminated to an expert on the social data, so that the social data submitted can be checked before the meeting.
- Data should be final when experts arrive to the meeting. If this is not the case, deadline for the final resubmissions of data during the EWG meeting is Tuesday afternoon.

56

Template structure – and readiness (incl. text from last report and new data in tables and figures)

- For the next meeting in October 2022, the template for the national chapters and the overview will be the same as last time. Smaller changes would be decided between the chair, JRC and DG MARE
- If data can be checked prior to the meeting, template populated with text and figures can also be ready for the experts at the start of the meeting

Expert should prepare the following before coming to the meeting

- Experts should collect data for trends and drivers prior the EWG meeting (Covid effect on the sector, the effect of the war between Ukraine and Russia and the boycott of Russia)
- Data for 2021 and 2022 on volume and value of production should be provided for the Nowcast
- If Macro algae production is not reported, due to thresholds or other issues. Please try to find information on production value and volume and other relevant information in your MS

2. DCF and EU-MAP segmentation

The problem encountered when reporting under the EU-MAP have been that the segmentation between the old and the new regulation have not been aligned and that MS have been in doubt on which segment to present in the national chapter.

Segmentation in relation to DCF and EU-MAP – should be decided before the EWG meeting by the individual MS.

In order to make the templates ready for the meeting, JRC will request the following information:

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

- JRC will send out an email to MS to get an indication of the segmentation that should be in the coming report - Aquaculture report 2022 (See also the National chapter for the segmentation presented in the last report).
- The final agreement on the segments will be decided when the data checks are sent out by JRC after the data has been submitted for the next meeting.

The reporting of economic data should consider the changed segments between DCF and EU-MAP

- JRC will investigate if it is possible to re-upload “old DCF-data” to the new EU-MAP segments.
- However, the idea of re-upload “old DCF-data” using the new structure in EU-MAP for MS might be too time consuming and may not provide additional information. Thus, this is up to the individual MS to decide if an upload of “old DCF-data” to the new EU-MAP segments will generate extra value.

Reporting of data at farm or enterprise level to segments and reporting of enterprises that have other activities than aquaculture

- The enterprise level is the preferred level to report on for MS (the mandatory level).
- For many MS it is not possible to go below the enterprise level (down to the farm level)
- However, it should be described in the section “Data Coverage and Data Quality” for the individual MS if there is larger amount of other activities that are included in the reported data (processing, restaurants, farming, feed production etc.).
- Guidelines on how to separate activities at the enterprise level to farm level (after volume or value produced etc.) is suggested to be included in the handbook.
- Guidelines for the calculation of prices on fish sales and input (unpaid labor, feed etc.) might also be an issue that could be addressed in the handbook

Reporting of enterprises that cannot be allocated to segments do to confidentiality reasons or other reasons

- General rules for clustering enterprises (allocate of enterprises to different segments) according to species and technique used should be included in the handbook.
- General rules for confidentiality should also be described in a short paragraph following the rules of EUROSTAT.
- A description of the allocation of enterprises should be placed in the section “Data Coverage and Data Quality” for the individual MS if enterprises have been placed in “other” segments.

3. Content to be included in the imputation and nowcast models

The EWG imputation is based on Eurostat, FAO and expert data. The first Nowcast model covered 2019 and 2020 but due to the lack of data 2020 was not presented in the report.

The new Nowcast model should cover 2021 and 2022. This requires extra data from MS on production volumes and values and other kind of information that would be valuable in forecasting the production in the aquaculture sector.

How can the imputation and Nowcast models be better supported by MS

- MS should support the collection of the needed variables for the now cast (production volume and value, employment etc.). These numbers should be available for the meeting.

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

- RCG ECON suggest that a separate contract should be made for one person to facilitate the work on the imputation and Nowcast, so it will be available at the start of the EWG meeting.

Relevant variables and sources for extracting data for the now cast

- It will be investigated if additional data can be provided by The European Aquaculture Producer organization. They should have the newest data on production volume and values and might even have a forecast on future production volumes.
- Share information on modelling and relevant variables with the fisheries group.
- Organize a workshop with focus on Nowcasting modelling for 2023.

4. Presentation of social data

The reporting of social data by the MS has not followed the recommendation put forward by PG-ECON. This means that a lot of time have been spend on correcting and re-uploading data. To avoid this in future meetings the improvement has been suggested at the workshop.

The reporting of “Social data” data should be structured to one common format

- A common format for reporting the data will be provide to the MS before the submission of data.
- The social data will be checked by an expert after the submission, so that it can be corrected and re-uploaded before the meeting starts.
- When reporting gender in numbers – the overall totals should correspond with the numbers reported on Education, Age and Nationality
- All variables (Gender, Education, and Nationality) should be distributed according to these age classes!
- RCG ECON suggest that the age categories (40-64) is split into two groups 40-54 and 55-64. This will increase the value of the information received and allow for more detail analysis.
- It is suggested that the term Nationality equals the definition used in the fisheries report, where the Nationality is decided by the individual’s passport and not the place of birth.

5. Inclusion of new freshwater data

In 2023, the collection of freshwater aquaculture data becomes mandatory. Therefore, it was discussed if RCG ECON and the group of experts present the workshop could help the MS that was collecting and reporting this data for the first time.

It should be discussed how new submitters of data (reporting of freshwater data from MS that have not submitted data before) can be checked to secure that data are submitted according to RCG recommendations (a manual or the handbook?)

- It was suggested that MS starting to collect freshwater data could contact the group of experts present at the workshop. This includes help for structuring and design of the data collection to the reporting of the final data.
- MS shared experiences from starting up freshwater data collection. The group provides support and knowledge sharing for MS having questions on freshwater data collection.

6. Environmental and animal welfare data?

It has been questioned, if the environmental data collected was structured in such a way that it made comparison between MS possible or if this data collection provided valuable knowledge to the report.

RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

Is collection of environmental variables still relevant?

- Report on environmental data pilot studies (fish mortalities and medicine used) was prepared last year and an evaluation report was published online in DCF website (<https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/pilots-study-reports-2017-2019->).
- In the latest data call, no environmental data was requested. This year DG MARE is going to request environmental data.
- Ideally environmental data reporting by species and technique. Legislation only obligates to report national totals.
- JRC prepares a template for reporting the environmental data in the coming data call.
- EWG 22-13 on 5th-9th Sept. 22: Marketing standards: review of proposed sustainability criteria / indicators for aquaculture. This group will discuss using the environmental data collected under the EU-MAP.
- It was also suggested that a methodology workshop for collecting/measuring environmental impacts and climate effects from aquaculture could be valuable to the experts collecting and analyzing data for aquaculture.
- Recommendation to DG MARE: A case study including a representative group of countries regarding the possibility of collecting new environmental and climate indicators in the future (nitrogen, phosphorus, organic matter, CO2 emissions). A report delivered to DG MARE.

7. Regional coordination

RCG-ECON is a regional coordination group; however, it covers the whole EU in respect to the data collection on aquaculture. Nevertheless, it was discussed if analysis on a more regional level could be valuable.

59

Regional or sector-specific Work Programs was discussed during the WS.

- Draft regional work plan has been prepared in the Fishn'Co project. This will be presented in the RCG ECON.
- The draft work plan includes guidelines, definitions and Handbook and data gaps/need for further pan-regional co-operation.
- There are no predefined "regions" for aquaculture. However, it would make sense to divide regions after species produced and technology used, which is already the case in the aquaculture report. Another suggestion is a division related to the coastline: Baltic Sea, Mediterranean Sea, Black Sea, Atlantic coastline and inland production.
- A regional mapping of production (technology and species) including the new social data could be used as a future indicator of the importance of aquaculture in different EU regions and be used for future impact assessments of aquaculture economic and social importance in different regions.

8. Stakeholders

The interaction with stakeholders using the report is important in order to align the report with stakeholder needs. It is also important to make the report available and visible to as many users as possible. Furthermore, insights from stakeholders can improve the content of the report.

Identification of stakeholders need and interactions to improve the report

- The report should be available on the RCG-ECON website
- The report could be sent to stakeholder organizations, such as the aquaculture advisory council (secretariat@aac-europe.org), producer organization etc.
- Stakeholders could be invited to meetings as experts or observers (RCG-ECON, EWG etc.)
- Presentations of the report in stakeholder interest forums



RCG ECON 2021 REPORT

- Set up a stakeholder panel/group where issues like nowcasting, price and production development and Covid-19 effects could be discussed





Annex IV: Regional Work Plan draft

Attached Excel file: *Annex_IV_Guidance with highlighted issues.xlsx*

