

## DTMT Guidance (version October 2023)

### Introduction

The purpose of the Data Transmission Monitoring Tool (DTMT) is to facilitate the exchange of information among the end users of data, the Member States (MS) and the European Commission. The objective of this approach is to efficiently monitor and communicate data issues and in the long-term improve the flow and quality of data. To succeed in these objectives, it is very important that issues are properly reported and commented on by all users of the DTMT, to ensure a follow-up of data transmission issues. This DTMT guidance aims to clarify the nomenclature, processes, roles and responsibilities.

This Guidance document has been developed in stages under the guidance of DGMARE, JRC and STECF at the STECF Plenary in March 2019 (PLEN 19-01) and later used and amended by the EWG 19-09, although it was not endorsed by the following plenary. Since then, the Guidance has been used by the EWG 19-18, 20-08 and 21-09 in addition to the EWGs dealing with data (FDI, Med & BS, and Fleet Economics etc.). In July 2021 (PLEN 21-02) and in March 2023 (PLEN 23-01) the guidance was updated.

The Guidance document is intended to be a living document and updated no more than once a year. It can be found at (<https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/guidelines>).

The DTMT is available at <https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/dcf/dtmt>

Access credentials are user-specific. All end-user groups e.g. STECF (and relevant Expert groups), ICES, GFCM etc., will be provided with log-on credentials to report data by the JRC. Each Member State has access to their own data, credentials provided to the national correspondents. The European Commission has access to the complete tables.

The home page for the DTMT (JRC and DG MARE View) is shown in Figure 1. This shows all columns with an example of 5 records.

Users will see a reduced number of columns in accordance with their access rights (see Table 1).

This Guidance document follows the chronological order of the DTMT sections.

### Guidance for end users on filling in issues in the DTMT

Issues relating to an MS not having provided the data or issues with the data quality should be reported in the DTMT. In this way, MS can track the data issues identified by end users or in preparation of STECF EWGs<sup>1</sup>, solve them, and work on future solutions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although this guidance can be used by all end users (STECF, ICES, RFMO, etc.), it has been drafted by STECF-JRC-MARE staff and therefore there is specific reference to their way of working

The data transmission issues should be reported in the DTMT in a standardised and homogeneous way to allow a quick identification of pending issues and to flag common gaps and issues among MS, among different years of the same data call etc.

The identification of data transmission issues should start right after the deadline for the data call, when the first final dataset is available. The reporting of issues into the DTMT should start right after the expert working group has finished working with the data. If new issues are spotted after the EWG, these can be reported in the DTMT no later than the next data call is launched<sup>2</sup>. If issues are found during the quality check before the EWG, direct communication with MS is desirable prior to reporting the issues in the DTMT. Issues that have already been solved during the process of creating the final dataset should not be included in the DTMT, except for timeliness issues which should be reported.

### 1.1 How to add an issue

The JRC, END USERS and DG MARE can add a new issue using the '**Add issue**' button (Figure 1, upper left over ID column). Clicking '**Add issue**' opens a dialogue box and the end user enters the required information in the appropriate boxes either by entering text or selecting from a drop-down menu (Figure 2).

If the end user fails to insert the relevant information, a warning dialogue box appears.

### 1.2 Selecting an issue

The end user decides whether an issue should be reported. Only issues unresolved by the time end user worked on the data should be reported, that have had some influence on either the coverage, timeliness or quality of the data submitted. The end user decides how to group the issues in one entry in the DTMT for an easy follow up.

The '**Data reference year**' can be different from '**Data call year**' e.g. for historical biological data resubmitted for previous years, or for socio-economic data collected from past years. You can indicate multiple years, separated by comma.

The '**Data requested**' should be identified according to the list for each data call (see Annex 1, at the end of this guidance document). The entries should be selected from lists in Annex 1.

The '**Issue**' field identifies which specific part of the data requested is erroneous, and the nature of the issue. This field should contain enough information to clearly convey which piece of data is the issue.

An efficient identification of issues is key to communicate among users (end user of data, MSs, DGMARE and STECF). Therefore, experts should use their judgment to decide how the information should be aggregated (see also indicative information at the end of this document, in Annex 1 by data call). This should be to the highest level feasible, without loss of clarity regarding the identified data. Any issue raised requires a Member State to

---

<sup>2</sup> This makes specific reference to the FDI data call: once the EWG has finished, the data set is used for different purposes (stock assessment, quota allocation, etc.). If some new issues arise, these can be reported in the DTMT during the year before the next data call is launched to allow the MS to resubmit the data.

provide an explanation as to why the issue has arisen. The STECF EWG on DTi should also be able to provide a comment and a final assessment for each single record.

For example, reported issues must be:

- accurate and focused on the solution;
- precise and specific;

One should avoid being:

- too vague;
- too detailed or too broad.

A second reading of all issues by another expert before uploading them into the DTMT is recommended, to ensure harmonised issue reporting among MS for the same data call.

### 1.3 Deleting an issue

The JRC, END USERS and DG MARE can delete issues they have already inserted by clicking the  button on the far left of the record next to the ID number (Figure 1). Clicking the  opens up a confirmation to delete dialogue box.

JRC have complete rights on the DTMT, as it is developed and hosted by them.

### 1.4 Different issue types

**'Coverage'** essentially relates to variables that were called for but not reported. However, when considering coverage, some expert judgement is required to determine whether a variable that was called for and not transmitted needs to be reported. For example, reporting every missing variable for every stratum requested in a data call is not appropriate. Generally, individual coverage issues that are judged to have low impact on the end user's work should not be reported. However, if the cumulative effect of a series of coverage issues for a particular Member State is judged to be medium-high severity, then the description of the issues should be reported in an aggregated form.

**'Timeliness'** essentially relates to data that were not transmitted in accordance with agreed deadlines (legal or operational). If for whatever reason, the data were transmitted after the deadline and were not available to the end user to undertake the work, this should be specified. **'Quality'** relies even more on the end user judgment and relates to the impact an issue has had on the end user work. Hence, quality issues with low severity need not be reported unless there is a cumulative effect.

### 1.5 Selecting the severity of impact of the issue on the work of the EWG

Severity Field: **'Low'**, **'Medium'** and **'High'**.

**'Low'** implies not important impact on the conduct or output of the EWG.

**'Medium'** has influence on the conduct of the EWG or the results, such that time has been wasted, or the results are in error but not in a major way.

'High' should be chosen where the results of the EWG have been influenced in an important way, such as errors in the output or delays in the conduct of the meeting or the preparation of the report.

## 1.6 Recurrent issue

Select from drop-down menu (yes, NO, UNKNOWN). Mark 'yes' if it is a similar issue to previously raised one. Do not raise it if the same issue (with the same missing or inaccurate data) had been previously addressed. Do not report for example that an MS did not provide data for 2008-2010 if the current data transmission issue relates to a data call in 2017, and the 2008-2010 issue was already reported and dealt with in 2015.

Recurrent means that same kind of issue reoccurs in datasets from several years (e.g. the same variable is missing from a given species/area or a fleet segment in data from 2019, 2020, 2021). It does not mean the same unsolved issue from a given year, already reported in the DTMT in previous year, that is observed again (e.g. data from 2017, missing in 2019 data call, and missing again in 2020 data call etc.).

Select from drop-down menu (yes, NO, UNKNOWN). Do not record again in DTMT an issue for previous years (with the same missing or inaccurate data) that had already been reported. To record that an issue has not been solved despite e.g. MS declaration to resubmit missing data, use 'End-user check' and 'End-user comment' columns.

## Guidance to Member States on commenting on issues reported in the DTMT

Member States (MS) need to address each issue<sup>3</sup> raised and provide a suitable explanation or confirmation of correction. Clarification should be provided where the MS has a reason why there is no obligation to provide the data.

Clicking on the  button on the far left of the record next to the ID number opens a '**Member State Comment**' dialogue box (Figure 1 and 3) where the MS can insert its comments. If MS commits to take an action, they will have to indicate in the DTMT what kind of action will be taken and when. Once the action has been taken, they will go back to the DTMT and fill in the '**Member States Action Taken**' box, with the options (WP amended/Data (re)submitted/WP implemented/Other/No). '**Member States Action when?**' to be filled in by MS with the information on the month and year the action to resolve the issue has been taken.

## End user check and comment

Following the MS comments and actions end users will check if the resubmission of the data or amendment/implementation of the WP has been done. Depending on the status the end user will select the value in the '**End user check**' column (Checked OK;

---

<sup>3</sup> Note that the MS cannot add issues; there is no '**Add issue**' button available for the MS.

Checked not OK; Will be checked later; Cannot be checked). The end user inserts the name of the end user group that performed the check, and any other comment in the **'End user comment'**.

## Guidance to STECF EWG on DTi on commenting and assessment of data issues reported in the DTMT

The EWG dealing with the evaluation of data transmission issues, usually in June (annual reports and DTi) and in November (work plans and DTi) should assess both the data transmission issue reported and the MS comment.

fields are provided: **'STECF EWG DTi Comment'**, **'STECF EWG DTi Assessment'**, and **'Follow-up responsible'**. The field **'STECF EWG DTi Comment'** should be used to provide further information on the data issue, if that is needed following the MS comment. The comments should be concise and clearly indicate the reason of the final assessment of the issue.

The field **'STECF EWG DTi Assessment'** has several options:

**'Not assessed'**, which indicates that STECF has not evaluated the MS response.

**'Satisfactory'**, where STECF considers that the MS response is satisfactory, covers the issue and no further action is needed.

**'Unsatisfactory'**, where STECF considers that the MS response does not resolve the issue and where further action would be helpful to resolve the issue. All cases where the working group or end user were not able to conduct its work should be assessed as Unsatisfactory. An explanatory comment should accompany in the previous column, to help MS and DG MARE to solve the issue, explaining for example an action needed.

**'Unsatisfactory-to be revised'** should be used in situations in which missing or incorrect data might have had an impact on the end-user's work but that the issue will be solved by the Member State in the next data submission

**'Follow-up needed'** should be used in situations in which the issue is unclear, and the information provided by end-users and the MS is contradictory. The field **'Follow up responsible'** is used to identify the responsible to follow up the data issue (MS/DGMARE).

## Guidance to DG MARE on commenting and assessing the data issues reported in the DTMT

DG MARE has read-access to the entire application, but has edit-access to the columns **'DG MARE Comment'** and **'DG MARE Decision'** (Unknown, Open – For review, Closed –

Issue not ok, Closed – Issue solved). Clicking on the  button on the extreme left of the record next to the ID number displays a dialogue box where the comment can be inserted and decision can be selected from the drop-down menu.

**Figure 1. Home page of the online Data Transmission Monitoring Tool (DTMT) (JRC and DG MARE View)**

The screenshot displays the home page of the online Data Transmission Monitoring Tool (DTMT) in JRC and DG MARE View. The interface features a navigation bar at the top with a '+ Add Issue' button (circled in red), a pagination bar showing 'Page 1 of 662', and a 'Logout [jrc]' button. Below the navigation bar is a table with the following columns: Id, Data Call Year, Data Reference Year, Country, End User, Data Call, Meeting, Data Requested, Issue, Issue Type, Severity, Recurrent Issue, and MS Comment. The table is currently empty. The first two rows of the table are circled in red, each containing a trash icon. The rest of the table is a large greyed-out area.

**Table 1. Column headers, associated instructions and read/edit access rights**

Colours refer to user input permissions. End-user input/ other end user input, MS input, STECF EWG on DTi input, DG MARE input

Generally, all fields are available to view by all End users, STECF and DGMARE, but editing rights is only given to the different users according the colour scheme given below. MS will only be able to view their own records.

ID	Automatically generated/search option by entering the number in the first cell	
Data call Year	Manual input: Insert year of the most recent data call. This field is used also to identify records by year	
Data reference year	The year the data record refers to E.g. for biological data, the sampling year, for socio-economic data, the reference year. The years listed separated by a comma e.g. 2013,2014,2015,2018	
Country	The country responsible for the submission of the data record Select from drop-down menu	
End user	Select from drop-down menu e.g. STECF EWG, RFMOs, RCGs etc.	
EWG Issue created	Manual input: Insert the number/name of EWG/meeting the issue created e.g. EWG 21-09	
Data call	Select from drop-down menu	
Data requested	Manual input: A formal data description, which should be taken from the relevant table for each EWG/organization (see Annex 1 below)	
Issue	Manual input identifying the issue. Use data-specific syntax and nomenclature from the database (see Annex 1 below)	
Issue type	Select from drop-down menu (coverage, quality, timeliness - see section 1.4)	
Severity	Select from drop-down menu (High, medium, low, see section 1.5 for basis)	The text should contain enough detail to be self-explanatory. The text should only refer to the data that causes an issue and not data that is satisfactory, see Annex 1 and Table 3 for examples. Do not report issues that were dealt with in the past.
Recurrent Issue	Select from drop-down menu (yes, NO, UNKNOWN), see section 1.6)	
MS Comment	Manual input by MS. MS should provide sufficient detail to allow the end user to assess whether the issue has been adequately addressed or whether it should remain as a potential data failure. Edit access: relevant MS only, Read access: end user that raised the issue, STECF and DG MARE	
MS Action taken	Select from drop-down menu (WP amended/Data (re)submitted/WP implemented/Other/No) as appropriate.	
MS Action When?	Enter month and year of action to be taken. (e.g. when the correction will be submitted, year of next data call)	

End User Check	Select from drop-down menu (Solved/Pending/Not checked)
End User Comment	Manual input of comment by end user on if the issue has been addressed.
STECF EWG DTI Comment	Manual input. Insert any appropriate comment that justifies the STECF assessment and suggested follow-up action
STECF EWG DTI Assessment	Select from drop-down menu (NOT ASSESSED, SATISFACTORY, UNSATISFACTORY, UNSATISFACTORY-TO BE REVISED FOLLOW-UP NEEDED- see above)
Follow up responsible	Select from drop-down menu (MS/DGMARE/END-USER)
DG MARE Comment	Manual input. Insert any appropriate comment that justifies the DG MARE assessment and follow-up action
DG MARE Decision	Select from drop-down menu (Not a DT Failure, Issue Closed, Failure)

**New Issue**

Country Austria	Year of the data call* 2023
Data Call [None]	End User JRC
Issue Type COVERAGE	Recurrent Issue NO
Data Reference Year <input type="text"/>	
Issue* <input type="text"/>	
Severity LOW	Meeting (e.g. EWG 21-03) <input type="text"/>
Data Requested* <input type="text"/>	

\* Mandatory field

**Figure 2. Add issue dialogue box.**

**Edit Issue with id 4984**

id  
 4984

Country  
 [Redacted]

Data Call  
 Fleet economics

End User  
 STECF EWG

Data Requested  
 Revenue

Issue Type  
 QUALITY

Recurrent Issue  
 NO

Data Reference Year  
 [Empty]

Issue  
 [Redacted]\_seindicator GP and RE. Non consistant values for operating subsidies (significant mismatches) for all the time series

Severity  
 MEDIUM

Meeting (e.g. EWG 21-03)  
 EWG 23-04

MS Comment  
 [Empty]

MS Action Taken  
 Unknown

MS Action When  
 [Empty]

End User Check (issue status)  
 Unknown

End User Comment  
 [Empty]

STECF EWG DTi Comment  
 [Empty]

STECF EWG DTi Assessment  
 NOT ASSESSED

Follow Up Responsible  
 Unknown

Mare Comment  
 [Empty]

Mare Decision  
 UNKNOWN

Save | Cancel

**Figure 3. Member State dialogue box.**

## Guidance for STECF EWG DTi, experts working on the evaluation of data transmission issues

The following decision tree provides guidance to experts assessing data transmission issues. It could be provided as a separate document to help in their evaluation, instead of the whole DTMT guidance document.

Experts should assess both the reported issue and the MS comment and provide a concise but clear explanation of the final evaluation. It is recommended that prior to upload the evaluation into the DTMT, two or three experts read it to ensure harmonisation and facilitate the use of a search engine (such as filters, or words search). This table provides an overview of general comments to include but it is not exhaustive or exclusive.

## DTI guidelines for STECF evaluators - 2023

### Basic principle for the DTI evaluation

1 – The relevance and veracity of the end-user presentation of the issue (description, severity, recurrence, ...) and MS comments are not questioned;

2 – STECF seeks for maximum objectivity in its response, although some subjectivity will subsist given the wide range of issues reported;

3 – The decision tree provides an overview of general comments to include but it is not exhaustive or exclusive

4 – The decision tree below is meant to ensure consistency of approach and statements and, in addition, STECF experts are invited to provide a concise but clear explanation of the final evaluation.

### Decision tree

Quality	Issue acknowledged in MS comments	Issue corrected	Corrected dataset uploaded	#1
			Corrected dataset planned to be uploaded	#3
			No word on any resubmission	#4
		Issue planned to be corrected	Corrected dataset planned to be uploaded	#2
No word on any resubmission	#4			

Quality	Issue not acknowledged by MS	Contradiction with end-user	#8
Quality	Issue still to be checked by MS	No word on possible correction	#5
All types	Response by MS is unclear		#6
All types	Issue identified by end-user is not clearly stated or specific		#7
Coverage	The issue raised relates to lack of data collection		#9
Timeliness	Issue relates to timeliness		#10
Coverage	Data exists but MS fails to submit		#11
Coverage	Failure to transmit data collected beyond DCF requirement		#12
Coverage	The issue relates to data collected and called for in the past and data transmission has previously been evaluated		#13
All types	No comment by MS		#14

1. Issue is acknowledged, data are corrected and re-uploaded in time to be used by the EWG.
  - a. STECF acknowledges MS response as acceptable: SATISFACTORY
  
2. Issue is acknowledged, committed to correct and upload during next data call.
  - a. STECF acknowledges MS response and is awaiting MS to follow-up on its commitments and upload the corrected data during the next data call: UNSATISFACTORY – TO BE REVISED
  
3. Issue is acknowledged and corrected, and MS commits to resubmit in the next data call.
  - a. STECF acknowledges the willingness of MS to take care of the issue in the next data call: UNSATISFACTORY – TO BE REVISED
  
4. Issue acknowledged, corrected or not but no word on any resubmission.
  - a. STECF acknowledges the willingness of MS to take care of the issue. MS to clarify whether a corrected data set will be uploaded during the next data call: UNSATISFACTORY – TO BE REVISED
  
5. Issue still to be checked and corrected if necessary.
  - i. MS did not answer the question. MS needs to clarify the issue raised: UNSATISFACTORY
  
6. Unclear MS comment in reply to the issue
  - a. The comment by the MS is unclear: FOLLOW-UP NEEDED (MS)

7. The DT issue identified by an end user is not clearly and explicitly described (the end user must always provide self-sufficient comment/feedback to the STECF EWG DTi).
  - a. The end-user should be more specific in defining the deficiencies: FOLLOW-UP NEEDED (end user)
  
8. Information provided by end-users and MS is contradictory and there is no evidence to allow the STECF EWG DTi to give an assessment.
  - a. The information provided by end-users and MS is contradictory: FOLLOW-UP NEEDED (MS/DGMARE/END-USER)
  
9. The issue raised relates to lack of data collection.
  - a. Failure concerning data collection (MS has not planned to collect mandatory data). If relevant, the following statement may be added: MS should look for additional ways to improve the data collection. UNSATISFACTORY
  - b. Failure in data collection (data was planned to be collected but it was not due to some issues): UNSATISFACTORY
  - c. MS was not required to collect the data (end-user is asking for data which is not planned and not mandatory): SATISFACTORY
  - d. Issue is acknowledged, MS committed to collect missing data and upload during next data call. STECF acknowledges MS response and is awaiting MS to follow-up on its commitments and upload the corrected data during the next data call: UNSATISFACTORY – TO BE REVISED
  
10. When the issue raised is related to lack of timeliness on data transmission.
  - a. If severity is HIGH - The severity of the issue reported by the end-user is high and the requested data was transmitted after the deadline: UNSATISFACTORY
  - b. If severity is LOW/MEDIUM and RECURRENT - The severity of the issue reported by the end-user is LOW/MEDIUM and the requested data was transmitted after the deadline: UNSATISFACTORY
  - c. If severity is LOW/MEDIUM and NON-RECURRENT - Expert should judge according to the MS justification (no fixed rules agreed)
  
11. Data exists but MS fails to submit.
  - a. Failure to submit the required data: UNSATISFACTORY
  - b. Data collection and transmission covered by bi or multilateral agreement: SATISFACTORY
  
12. If MS, according to the agreed NWP, plans to collect additional data beyond DCF requirements and does not transmit these data in response to a data call (this additional collection must be however clearly stated in the NWP).

- a. MS needs to clarify the issue raised. If relevant, the following statement may be added: MS should consider aligning the planning and collection of optional data: UNSATISFACTORY

13. If the issue relates to data collected and called for in the past and data transmission has previously been evaluated

- a. Issue is assumed to be closed since it relates to the past and data transmission has previously been evaluated. Assessors should add the previously addressed issue ID: NOT ASSESSED

14. No comment by MS

- a. No comment by MS: UNSATISFACTORY

## **Annex 1 - Guidance for End users for reporting data issues in the DTMT**

The information below is organised by EWG and provides guidance to experts working on identifying and reporting data transmission issues. It could be provided as a separate document to help in their assessments, instead of the whole DTMT guidance document.

Even though some of the data field names are the same for different calls (e.g. Landings), the values of these may end up being different, so they are dealt with separately for each call and should be reported separately in the DTMT. It is accepted that to uniquely identify a data issue it will be jointly defined by '**Data Requested**' and '**Data Call**' identifiers. Generally, entries need to be understandable, so longer forms are used, but for species and gear type codes follow the respective data call annexes to uniquely identify data items in the '**Issues**' field.

### **FDI WG/data call (Fisheries dependent information)**

Refer to the data call annex <https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/FDI2021> to uniquely identify data items in the '**Issues**' field.

#### **FDI Data request**

One of the following descriptions should be entered in the Data Requested field:

- Capacity
- Effort
- Landings
- Discards
- Landings length
- Discard length
- Landings age
- Discard age
- Spatial effort
- Spatial landings

All data

### FDI Issue examples

1. Data request = Capacity
  - a. Capacity not provided year 2015
2. Data request = Effort
  - a. Effort not provided TBB in year 2015
  - b. Effort not provided BEAM and DREDGE areas 27.7.d and 27.7.e
  - c. Effort not provided for vessels with length <10m
  - d. Effort not provided year 2017, although catches data provided same year
3. Data request = Landings
  - a. For 2017, total landed weight of all species is 2.5 times higher than the corresponding figure reported in Eurostat dataset
  - b. Landings not provided for quarters 2 and 3 years 2016 and 2017
  - c. Landings not provided for SPECON\_TECH T90 for year 2015
4. Data request = Discards
  - a. Discard weight not provided for year 2015 and 2016
  - b. Discards year 2017 are ~ 10 times higher than the previous years; data should be checked to verify their reliability.
5. Data request = Landings length
  - a. No length frequency distribution was provided year 2015
6. Data request = Landings age
  - a. No landings at age data were provided for HKE
7. Data request = Discard length
  - a. No discard length frequency distribution was provided year 2015
8. Data request = Discard age
  - a. Discard age data were not provided for any species
9. Data request = Spatial effort
  - a. Data not provided for vessels with length >18m year 2015
  - b. Spatial effort data were not provided for year 2016, even if spatial landings data were provided for the same year
10. Data request = Spatial landings
  - a. The latitude and longitude values have been swapped
11. Data request = All data
  - a. The vessel length was always provided with value Not Known

### STECF Mediterranean and Black Sea Assessment EWG /Data Call (MBS)

Refer to the data call annex <https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/dc/medbs> to uniquely identify data items in the '**Issues**' field.

### MBS Data requested codes

One of the following descriptions should be entered in the Data Requested field:

Catch

Landings length  
Discards length  
Effort  
Maturity ogive at length  
Maturity ogive at age  
Growth parameters  
Sex ratio at length  
Sex ratio at age  
Age length key  
MEDITS survey TA\*  
MEDITS survey TB\*  
MEDITS survey TC\*  
Other surveys abundance by length and sex  
Other surveys biomass by length and sex  
Other surveys abundance and biomass by age and sex

\* During the EWG for some parameters some cross-checking/ combining between different data tables may be carried out. In this case the data request code should be modify accordingly (i.e. if there is a mismatch between table TA and TB the codes should be MEDITS survey TA\_TB)

### MBS Data issues examples

Generally, the entry for this field should be reported to area (GSA) and the species (FAO 3 digit alpha code) at the beginning and then the details of the issues documented.

1. Data request = Fisheries catch, landings and discards by length.
  - a. GSA\_09\_HKE. Landings in weight are missing in years 2002, 2005, 2006
  - b. GSA\_09\_HKE. Abundance by length classes are missing in year 2008 for gear OTB
  - c. GSA\_09\_HKE. Landings in weight and volume are missing in years 2002, 2005, 2006
  - d. GSA\_09\_HKE. Abundance by age classes are missing in year 2008 for gear OTB
  - e. GSA\_09\_HKE. Abundance and mean weight by age classes are missing in year 2008 for all gears
2. Data request = Effort
  - a. GSA09\_OTB. Fishing days are missing for years 2002, 2012 and 2016 (quarter 1)
3. Data request = Biological parameters and ALK (Age length Key)
  - b. GSA\_09\_HKE. Maturity at length data are missing for years 2002 and 2012.
4. Data request = Medits surveys
  - a. GSA\_09\_HKE. Total weight reported in year 2002 haul number 102 different between table TB and TC.
  - b. GSA\_09\_HKE. Data in weight and number are reported for year 2002 haul number 102 even though the haul is not reported in table TA.

5. Data request = Other surveys
  - a. GSA\_09\_HKE. No abundance by length and sex are reported in year 2002.
  - b. GSA\_09\_HKE. Ratio between total biomass and abundance by length for year 2002 seems too low for the species.

## Fleet Socio-economic data call/EWG (FSE)

Refer to the data call guidance <https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/dc/fleet/guidance>

to uniquely identify data items in the '**Issues**' field.

### FSE Data requested

One of the following descriptions/data types should be entered in the Data Requested field:

- Capacity
- Landings
- Effort
- Employment
- Income
- Subsidies
- Expenditure
- Capital
- Social
- Recreational
- Multiple\*

\*when the issue is broader than or covers multiple data types, for example, at the fleet segment level when only capacity data are reported and all other variables are missing.

### *Main Issue type*

- Missing data
- Partial data
- Questionable data
- Confidential\*

\*missing data due to confidentiality reasons; not necessarily a transmission failure (=missing data) but flagged to highlight the fact that full coverage of the fleet (national and EU) is not achieved because it has been withheld by MS.

## FSE Data issues entries

Data Issues should be reported at aggregated at the lowest level possible allowing to identify the issue by:

- main issue +
- details, first give aggregation level, the detailed variable (see list below by Data Requested field), with year(s), fleet segment, species, sub-region, etc. added as necessary.

*Aggregation levels used for different variable types*

Aggregation levels	Variable group	Variables
<b>National total</b>	All variables	all
<b>Fleet segment</b>	All variables	all
<b>FAO area (sub-region, level 3 or 4, GSA)</b>	Landings	Weight and value
	Effort	Days at sea, fishing days, GT and kW fishing days
<b>FAO species codes</b>	Landings	Weight and value

*List of the*

*variables by the variable group defined in 'Data Requested' field.*

Data requested	Issue - variables
<b>Capacity</b>	Number of vessels, age of vessels, mean LOA of vessels, total vessel power, total vessel tonnage
<b>Landings</b>	Live weight of landings, value of landings
<b>Effort</b>	Fishing days, days at sea, energy consumption, kW fishing days, GT fishing days, number of fishing trips
<b>Employment</b>	Engaged crew, Total hours worked per year (engaged crew) (MAP), Unpaid labour (MAP)
<b>Income</b>	Gross value of landings, income from leasing out quota or other fishing rights, other income
<b>Subsidies</b>	Operating subsidies, subsidies on investments
<b>Expenditure</b>	Personnel costs, energy costs, other non-variable costs, repair & maintenance costs, rights costs, value of unpaid labour, consumption of fixed capital
<b>Capital</b>	Fishing rights, investments, long/short debt (MAP), tangible asset value (replacement), total assets (MAP)
<b>Social</b>	Employment, FTE, unpaid labour
<b>Recreational</b>	Weight of catch

## Aquaculture Socio-economic data call/EWG

Refer to the data call guidance <https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/dc-aqua/guidance-social> to uniquely identify data items in the 'Issues' field.

## Aquaculture Data requested

One of the following descriptions/data types should be entered in the Data Requested field:

Income  
Capital  
Costs  
Raw material weight  
Employment  
Number of enterprises  
Sales  
Social  
Environmental  
Multiple\*

\*when the issue is broader than or covers multiple data types (e.g. there are reported more enterprises than persons employed), and it is decided to report aggregated.

### *Main Issue type*

Missing data  
Partial data  
Questionable data  
Confidential\*

\*missing data due to confidentiality reasons; not necessarily a transmission failure (=missing data) but flagged to highlight the fact that full coverage of the fleet (national and EU) is not achieved because it has been withheld by MS.

## Aquaculture Data issues entries

Data Issues should be reported at aggregated at the lowest level possible allowing to identify the issue by:

- main issue +
- details, first give aggregation level, the detailed variable (see list below by Data Requested field), with year(s), segment, species, etc. added as necessary.

### *Aggregation levels used for different variable types*

Aggregation levels	Variable group	Variables
<b>National total</b>	All variables	all
<b>Segment</b>	All variables	all
<b>FAO species codes</b>	Sales	Weight of sales and Value of sales per species

<b>Medicines or treatments administered by type</b>	Environmental	Medicines
---	---------------	-----------

List of the variables by the variable group defined in 'Data Requested' field.

<b>Data requested</b>	<b>Issue - variables</b>
<b>Income</b>	Gross sales (total), Operating Subsidies, Other Income
<b>Costs</b>	Wages and salaries, Imputed value of unpaid labour, Energy Costs, Livestock costs, Feed costs, Repair and maintenance, Other operational Costs
<b>Capital</b>	Total Value of Assets, Consumption of fixed capital, Financial Income, Financial Expenditure, Net Investments, Subsidies in investments, Debt
<b>Raw material weight</b>	Livestock used, Fish Feed used
<b>Employment</b>	Persons employed, Persons employed FTE, Number of hours worked by employees and unpaid labour, Unpaid labour, Unpaid labour FTE
<b>Number of enterprises</b>	Number of enterprises with less or equal than 5 employees, Number of enterprises with 6-10 employees, Number of enterprises with more or equal than 11 employees.
<b>Sales</b>	Weight of sales per species, Value of sales per species
<b>Social</b>	Employment, FTE, Unpaid labour
<b>Environmental</b>	Medicines, Mortalities

## Processing Socio-economic data call/EWG

Refer to the data call guidance

<https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/dc/proind/eum/social> to uniquely identify data items in the '**Issues**' field.

### Processing Data requested

One of the following descriptions/data types should be entered in the Data Requested field:

- Income
- Capital
- Costs
- Employment
- Number of enterprises
- Weight of raw material
- Social
- Multiple\*

\*when the issue is broader than or covers multiple data types (e.g. there are reported more enterprises than persons employed), and it is decided to report aggregated.

*Main Issue type*

Missing data  
 Partial data  
 Questionable data  
 Confidential\*

\*missing data due to confidentiality reasons; not necessarily a transmission failure (=missing data) but flagged to highlight the fact that full coverage of the sector (national and EU) is not achieved because it has been withheld by MS.

**Processing Data issues entries**

Data Issues should be reported at aggregated at the lowest level possible allowing to identify the issue by:

- main issue +
- details, first give aggregation level, the detailed variable (see list below by Data Requested field), with year(s), size class, product, etc. added as necessary.

*Aggregation levels used for different variable types*

Aggregation levels	Variable group	Variables
<b>National total</b>	All variables	all
<b>Size class (optional)</b>	All variables	all
<b>Product (optional)</b>	Weight of raw material	Weight of raw material

*List of the variables by the variable group defined in 'Data Requested' field.*

Data requested	Issue - variables
<b>Income</b>	Gross sales (total), Operating Subsidies, Other Income
<b>Costs</b>	Personnel costs, Value of unpaid labour, Payment for external agency workers (optional), Energy Costs, Purchase of fish and other raw material for production, Other operational Costs
<b>Capital</b>	Total Value of Assets, Consumption of fixed capital, Financial Income, Financial Expenditure, Net Investments, Subsidies on investments, Debt
<b>Employment</b>	Number of persons employed, FTE national, Number of hours worked by employees and unpaid labour, Unpaid labour
<b>Number of enterprises</b>	Number of enterprises.

<b>Weight of raw material</b>	Weight of raw material (optional)
<b>Social</b>	Employment, FTE