

“Definitions of the variables collected under the DCF socioeconomic modules for the fleet, aquaculture and fish processing”

The results presented here were carried out under an ad-hoc contract by Jörg Berkenhagen and are compiled in the file “definition_list_all.xlsx”.

The original file contained columns A-E and was made available for the PGECON meeting held in Zagreb from May 30 to June 3, 2016. During the PGECON meeting the columns F-H were filled in. Column G (“Specification”) contains the definition as suggested by PGECON, having taken into account the preparatory work. In case PGECON suggested to adopt the definition as suggested in column D (“reference”) the cell was left blank and the subgroup comment (column H) was “ok”.

Remark on social variables

In accordance with Mr Calvo (COM) during PGECON the definition of social variables was regarded complete and no entry was provided in the related sheet for the following reason:

The social variables are essentially an extension of employment variables as defined under the three sectors. In this respect the definition of social variables (FTE, unpaid labour, employment) should be the same as under the other sectors.

The extension refers to certain specific aspects, i.e. gender, nationality, education level, employment status, age. Except for gender these aspects will require a suitable classification scheme (e.g. age classes).

The provision of appropriate classification schemes is to be completed in cooperation with users of these data and is thus beyond the scope of both the ad-hoc contract and PGECON.

“Employment” is not defined as such under the three sectors. Thus the ESA definition (ESA 11.11) is suggested:

Employment covers all persons – both employees and self-employed – engaged in some productive activity that falls within the production boundary of the system. ESA (11.11)

The request for social variables should be consistent between the “social variables” table and the three sector tables (e.g. “FTE-national” is in the social as well as in the fleet and the fish processing table, but not in aquaculture).

It might be worth considering collecting data by gender only with respect to one gender (female or male) as the other figure can be derived as difference from the total.

Remarks on specific variables:

The “value of landings” is listed twice under the “fleet variables”. One version was previously (93/2010) referred to as “income from landings” while “value of landings” was defined as transversal variable. Yet it seems unclear whether both are required and which should be the difference. The author interpreted the difference as follows: “income from landings” refers to money actually received for selling the landings whereas “value of landings” includes an estimated value also for landings which had no entry of revenues in the sales notes (e.g. in case of own consumption).

However, it is recommended to reconsider the request, naming and specification of these variables.

At PGECON the discussion on tax refunds vs. tax exemption was taken into consideration for the definition of energy costs (fleet). In order to get comparable figures it was suggested to request energy costs as net figures, i.e. reduced by potential refunds. In principle tax refunds and tax exemptions are very similar, and thus it might be advisable not to report them separately. As the proposal is for now, both would not be collected under EUMAP. The figures could be rather easily determined by using the fuel consumption and the value of tax refund/exemption per litre.

Concerning the variables for the aquaculture sector it is crucial to define a priori the reference unit: enterprise or branch. This has been discussed during several EWGs, but to the best knowledge of PGECON participants a clear decision has not been made.

Remark on the ad hoc task

The task under the ad hoc contract was specified as “propose only one definition based on its simplicity, relevance, accuracy and consistency with international definitions, notably the European Statistical System.”

Several reports of preceding meetings have been evaluated for the compilation, revealing that standard definitions are often not suitable as they do not meet the specific requirements. In most cases the definition as used in “Structural business statistics” (SBS) or the “European Statistical System” could be adapted. However, emphasis was put on avoidance of ambiguities.

Whenever feasible the definitions aimed for consistency between the sectors. Consistency was sacrificed only when required due to characteristics of the sector. However, as the variables have never been meant to be compared between sectors, consistency is regarded less crucial as relevance.

It has to be born in mind that even under the suggested definitions there is space for a wide margin of results. This applies in particular to the “Capital value” and the “Value of unpaid labour”. The underlying reports allow for a range of different input values. This should be addressed in the future. The issue applies also to the estimation of the value of fishing rights for which yet no procedure has been agreed.