



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR MARITIME AFFAIRS AND  
FISHERIES

Directorate C: Fisheries Policy Atlantic, North Sea, Baltic and  
Outermost Regions Unit C3: Scientific Advice and Data Collection

Call MARE/2020/08 – **FISHN'CO** – **SI2.839816**

*Strengthening EU-MAP data collection  
by developing Regional Work Plans for the Regional  
Coordination Groups  
(RCG) NANS&EA, Baltic and Large Pelagics, and  
Economics Issues (FISHN'CO)*

European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF)

## Progress Report

Progress Report Number: 1

Covered period: 1<sup>st</sup> Jan. 2021 – 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021

Project duration: from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2021 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2022

Date of submission: 9<sup>th</sup> July 2021

Version: 1

Beneficiary: Coordinator – Institut Français de Recherche pour l'Exploitation de la Mer,  
IFREMER

Project coordinator name and title: Mr. Joël Vigneau

Tel.: (33)2 31515641

E-mail: [Joel.Vigneau@ifremer.fr](mailto:Joel.Vigneau@ifremer.fr)

## 1 Progress of work plan in the covered period

### 1.1 General progress:

Summarise the objectives and the achievements, deviations, important problems and difficulties met.

#### **WP1: Compiling, identifying and filling information gaps.**

The objectives of WP1 is to work in close cooperation with the ISSGs and RCGs to:

a) Assess the current status of regional coordination and define the level of ambitions for the Regional Work Plan (RWP); b) Identify the elements that will make part of the RWP in 2021 and 2022; c) Agree on the core ISSG tasks to be carried out as part of the intersessional work and the supporting tasks as part of the Fishn'co; d) Address these support tasks as distinctive pieces of work to be financed and completed within the Fishn'co project; e) Feed WP2 and WP3 with the outcomes from WP1.

Task leaders for the 10 thematic focus areas (correspondent to the relevant ISSGs) had monthly virtual meeting to update on progress, review example cases, explore synergies and share lessons learned, leading to closer cooperation and information exchange. The work progressed well and could be presented at RCG NANS&EA and Baltic in June, although the levels of ambition were found to be varying among different thematic focus areas, different geographic regions and/or for different species. The mapping of scientific end-user was important in particular for thematic areas where the end user is less well defined, or their role has evolved over recent years.

#### **WP2: Establishing decision making structures / processes**

The main objectives of this Work Package are to develop and describe processes needed in discussions among MS and in the RCGs about sharing responsibilities, expected contributions, decision making and adoption of processes; and on how to implement and manage a RWP in a harmonised, cooperative and transparent way.

The implementation of the RWP will follow a stepwise approach. The first attempt is not as much about regional coordination but more about starting from a comparison of the Rules of Procedure (RoP) for the RCGs operation as a first step. The ultimate purpose is to agree on a unified RoP for all RCGs, i.e. with the focus on the decision process being similar for all regions and supra regions represented through the RCGs.

#### **WP3: Drafting Regional Work Plan**

The main objective of this Work Package is to gather all elements arising from WP1 and WP2 to draft the Regional Work Plan components to the relevant RCGs (NANS&EA, Baltic, Large Pelagics, Long Distance Fisheries and Economic Issues) before their annual meeting of 2021 and 2022.

The work done in this reporting period should enable Fishn'Co to have a first draft RWP for NANSEA and Baltic by the end of July 21, following the agreement reached during the Technical RCG meeting in June 2021. Thus, in September the NCs will have the chance to go through it and decide upon it. This experience will serve as a reference to other relevant RCGs.

#### **WP4: Communication and dissemination**

Fishn'co plans to contribute to communication aspects related to the work of the RCGs, among other things, by preparing contents and feeding the complementary project, Secweb. Fishn'co is also planned to contribute to achieve that the outcomes towards the preparation of the RWP reach out to the relevant stakeholders. Among the activities carried out for these purposes we can highlight the following:

The Dissemination and Communication Plan (DCP) first draft was presented during Fishn'co's kick off meeting for discussion and to plan further completion. DCP includes i) the identification and classification of the relevant **stakeholders'** groups for receiving Fishn'co outcomes; ii) a preliminary selection of **communication contents and materials**, and of the **suitable channels** to convey the project messages; and iii) a preliminary plan of dissemination and communication **actions** within the project timeline (including the edition and dissemination of a first Project Leaflet).

Several meetings (at different scale) have been held to disseminate Fishn'co purpose and structure among the RCG participants and to engage them in the project activities, confirming specific interest to contribute by a total of 95 experts from partner and non-partner organisations. Moreover, within the **2021 Technical Meeting of RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic**, 7th -11th June, Fishn'Co project had a dedicated slot in the agenda to present and discuss progress on the development of the RWP.

#### **WP5: Project co-ordination and management**

Coordination is aimed to a smooth management of the large project network and to allow a systematic monitoring of progress and achievements: i) Setting up shared information and document repositories (for

technical, administrative and financial documents) ii) Initiating the project for all the WPs and tasks; iii) Organising, accomplishing and reporting meetings iii) Visualizing the overarching scenarios towards the RWP development and iv) Establishing a fluent dialogue with the DGMARE of the European Commission Officers facilitating accountability and a transparent implementation of the project. The early detection of deviations or hurdles and this dialog will enable to overcome them with due diligence and efficiency.

### 1.2 Progress on the project against initial general and specific objectives:

Compare the activities planned (based on the Grant Agreement and/or the previous report) to the progress made, by specific objective and according the agreed work plan in the initial proposal (Annex I of the Grant Agreement); list achieved deliverables and identify partners involved, including their roles; describe major subcontractors and other stakeholders involved.

Planned	Status: Finished (F)/ In progress (P) /Not started (NS)	Main Contributors <b>(All the partners had some contributions to all the WPs, but here it is mentioned who has been mainly responsible for what)</b>
<b>WP1</b>		
<b>D1.1:</b> The results of the compilation and identification of gaps will be presented as a “map” of what exists, what are the best elements and approaches already developed, and what additional information is still necessary to be able to develop regional work plans. <b>D1.2:</b> The minutes or brief reports of workshops, meetings or other creative tools through which stakeholder engagement was stimulated and task reports for the thematic focus areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P</li> <li>• P</li> </ul>	Marine Institute, IFREMER, *  Marine Institute, CETMAR
<b>WP2</b>		
<b>D2.1:</b> A short description of the processes that needs to be taken into account when developing RWP. <b>D2.2:</b> Draft decision-making structures for developing the regional work plans. <b>D2.3:</b> Draft timeline and procedure for adoption of a RWP (including proposed scenarios for consultation) <b>D2.4:</b> Draft revised RoP that accommodate for development and adoption of RWP. <b>D2.5:</b> Slideshow on the summary of the draft decision-making process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P</li> <li>• NS</li> <li>• NS</li> <li>• P</li> <li>• NS</li> </ul>	EV-ILVO, *  EV-ILVO, DTU, *
<b>WP3</b>		
<b>D3.1:</b> Draft elements of Regional Work Plan for RCG NANS&EA (textboxes and tables). <b>D3.2:</b> Draft elements of Regional Work Plan for RCG Baltic (textboxes and tables). <b>D3.3:</b> Draft elements of Regional Work Plan for RCG Large Pelagics (textboxes and tables). <b>D3.4:</b> Draft elements of Regional Work Plan related to economics and aquaculture for RCGECON (textboxes and tables). <b>D3.5:</b> Development of Regional Work Plans, main aspects and approach and strategy for their implementation. <b>D3.6:</b> Slideshow on the summary of the draft regional work plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P</li> <li>• P</li> <li>• NS</li> <li>• NS</li> <li>• NS</li> <li>• NS</li> </ul>	IFREMER, *  IFREMER and Marine Institute, *
<b>WP4</b>		

<b>D.4.1.</b> Dissemination and Communication Plan for Fish'nCo.	● P	CETMAR
<b>D.4.2.</b> Dissemination and Communication Materials for Fism'Co	● P	CETMAR
<b>D.4.3.</b> Inputs to feed the RCGs stakeholders database in Annex II project.	● NS	
<b>D.4.4.</b> Compilation of reports from Stakeholders' events meetings	● P	CETMAR
<b>WP5</b>		
<b>D5.1</b> The minutes of the three main PSC meetings consisting, as a minimum, of a list of attendees, notes and action plans, will be maintained as a record of progress for each WP and the project as a whole.	● P	CETMAR, IFREMER
<b>D5.2</b> Reports to the EU Commission after the formal project meetings	● P	CETMAR
<b>D5.3</b> Six-monthly detailed meeting plans	● P	CETMAR
<b>D5.4</b> Six-monthly progress reports	● P	CETMAR, IFREMER

**\*It needs to be noticed that several non-partner organisations (apart from partners) have also contributed to the work needed for the deliverables where there is an \***

### 1.3 Identified deviations, problems and corrective actions taken in the period

If any, identify the nature and the reason for the deviation or encountered problems (technical, financial or organisational), identify partners involved, clarify impacts on the activities and deliverables, present the strategy to overcome them; in case of deviations described in the last report describe to which extent you have managed to get back on track.

In general, some of the project procedures have been slower than expected because of the large number of contributors. There was a need to dedicate time to clarify expectations and commitments. Also, the fact that different ISSGs are on a different stage towards the RWP has made it necessary an adaptive and flexible approach to the RWP design and to the WP implementation. The first elements of RWPs were elaborated only a few days before the RCG NANS&EA (D3.1) and Baltic (D3.2) because of the complexity and the variety of teams working in parallel within the RCG/ISSG, but the objectives of contributing strongly to the ToR 4 of the RCG on the development of RWP was clearly achieved given the importance given to fishn'Co in almost all topics addressed during the RCG week.

## 2 **Work plan for the next period**

### 2.1 Planned activities in the next reporting period:

Give an outlook on planned activities and deliverables, for the period until the next report, according to the agreed work plan in the initial proposal (Annex I of the Grant Agreement).

**WP1:** Elements towards regional work plan to be completed: Guidance for evaluating data accuracy (Sep – Nov 2021) Identify the different types of estimation that are routinely being performed by MS, and those that would be suitable for regional estimation.

**WP2:** First version of the draft timeline and procedure for adoption of a RWP (including proposed scenarios for consultation) (D2.3) and first version of the draft revised RoP which accommodates for development and adoption of the RWP (D2.4). (Oct 2021)

**WP3:** Oct. 2021: Helping RCG in proposing a test RWP for 2022; May 2022: Second version of RWPs to be presented at RCG NANS&EA (D3.1), Baltic (D3.2), Large Pelagics (D3.3) and ECON (D3.4) for their 2022 sessions.

**WP4:** M.4.2. Accomplishment of stakeholder events (Months 6, 12, 24). Continue provisioning inputs for the website and newsletter from the Fishn'co project.

M.4.3. Provision of inputs to SecWeb for the elaboration of a web-based stakeholders database for the relevant RCGs: M 12

**WP5: Coordination:** Follow up of the work progress and compliance of commitments by partners and non-partners. Keep the document repository. Keep meetings support services. Conclude legal documents under signature (Consortium agreement and Data Sharing Agreement) Organise and follow up on financial and administrative reporting (iterim). Support EC interaction and follow up.

## 3 **Other issues**

(N.a.)