EVALUATION GUIDANCE FOR ANNUAL REPORTS UNDER REVISED EU-MAP

version EWG 22-18

Introduction

Basic principle - what is expected from STECF

On Annual reports EC 2017/1004 - art 11.2:

In accordance with Article 10, STECF shall evaluate:

(a) the **execution** of the national work plans; and

(b) the **quality** of the **data** collected by the Member States.

Evaluators are supposed to assess execution and quality of the data collected by MS. However, quality of data has yet to be properly defined to allow for consistent evaluation. When evaluating the quality of the data collected by MS, two aspects should be considered (ICES, 2014[1]):

1) Information to indicate if national sampling schemes follow good practice in terms of the three key components: statistical design, method of selecting sampling units, and estimators and method of analysis. This provides information on whether the data, in principle, are likely to be representative of the population, or if there may be a bias related to these design aspects.

2) No matter how good or bad a sampling design might be, sampling may not go according to plan and there may be quality issues related to implementation, for example high rates of refusal to take observers on board vessels or answer telephone surveys, inadequate coverage of strata due to staffing, or other issues. These factors may lead to bias, or to poor precision due to small numbers of PSUs sampled.

Taking this into account, the work to be carried out by STECF in relation to data quality evaluation should be based on two well-differentiated reports:

1. General information on sampling design and implementation.
2. Specific **quality metrics**.

The first one is addressed with Annexes 1.1 and 1.2, which would need to be evaluated by STECF.

The second relates to the Annual Reports where the realisations of the planned data collection are detailed. In an ideal world, the **quality metrics** would include the contribution of **stratum size** (e.g., catches) to the overall **size of the population**, information related to **bias** (e.g., refused access to vessels or catches; evidence of non-random selection of sampling units; failures of sampling coverage), **number** of primary sampling **units achieved** in each stratum, precision of estimates etc. A number of these metrics are already in the AR, others may be developed in the future. This information should be regarded carefully in relation to the design to determine if a failure or an issue exists in the final sampling data. Statistics such as numbers of PSUs sampled per stratum, precision estimates etc. have their highest value as a time-series covering as long as possible period of time. Some form of diagnostics are needed to show where and how these problems affect subsets of data (e.g., feedback from end-users in the DTMT) and the likely impact on the overall quality of the scientific advice derived from these data.

The evaluation of the AR is a two-step approach

- *Pre-screening: this is done either in an automatized way and / or by expert analysis based on the guidance. The result of the pre-screening is communicated to the MS and a reply is expected by a deadline set before the EWG or at the latest by noon of the first day of the evaluation meeting. Comments received after this deadline are not taken into account during the EWG evaluation.*
- *Screening during the meeting: this is done by expert judgement based on the guidance.*

The evaluation of the Annual Report is based on:
- The DTMT tool.
- Tables and Text Boxes of the AR.
- Amendments of Annex 1.1 and Annex 1.2.
- (Before recommending actions for future WP submissions): cross check with the most recent adopted Workplan (following the AR under evaluation):
  - o Ex: some remarks of the screeners on the execution are related to topics of the previous year and have a comment to change this in the future. However, this might have already been included in the WP, and the comment is no longer relevant.

Guidance for evaluation

The evaluation is purely done on the **grey part** of the Annual report.

Part 1: Pre-screening

The pre-screening is conducted by a group of experts immediately after the submission deadline of the AR. It is meant to be a detailed check of consistency and quantitative information provided (e.g., samples taken, stations conducted).

In a later phase, some of the checks are suggested to be conducted automatically (see table below) The pre-screening will result in errors and warnings. The errors have to be corrected before the AR is officially submitted to the Commission. The warnings will not block the AR upload. The pre-screening is done in an automated way and will be conducted by the MS/NC while compiling the AR.

1. The annual report is checked against the workplan. The white part of the annual report may **NOT** be changed (e.g., numbers of planned sampling are NOT to be changed in the white cells).
2. Short comments are given in the grey cells of the annual report Tables.
3. Elaborate comments are given in the Text Box.

Table 1. Pre-screening checks for expert and suggested automation checks

Issue	Expert	Suggested for automation
Editorial (e.g., respect of master code list)		X
Identification of blanks		X
Correct year		X
Merged cells		X

All type of data		X
Syntax errors		X
Cross checks between tables		X
White part = WP/grey part = AR and is left unchanged		X
Cross checks between lines and columns per table		X
Text box completed		X
Cross checks with external sources		X
Comments in tables	X	
Pilot studies	X	
Etc (see list EWG 17-17) - list is currently under update		
Has MS followed the guidelines	X	
Check explanations (e.g. Deviations)	X	
Achieved sampling following NWP (e.g. oversampling)	X	
Multi-annual follow-up of the sampling		X
Cross check with RWP		X
Cross check tables & text	X	
Cross check if all MS relevant areas are referred to (incl. deleted/added)		X
Cross check if all MS relevant species are referred to		X
Cross check all tables with the regulation		X
Quality (by Table)	X	

Part 2: Screening by the expert at the EWG

The evaluation is done solely on the **grey part** of the Annual report.

General section

Summary (front page and Table 0)
- Is naming, date and version number consistent between the front page of the AR word document and Table 0?
- Have all filled tables and textboxes regarding the AR been listed and marked in Table 0? MS has to include, in addition to the filled WP tables, all tables and textboxes that are only related to the AR (e.g., Table 1.4, Textbox 2.1 and 2.2).

In the case of possible ping-pongs regarding the AR, version control should be ensured by the MS and checked by the evaluators. Updated versions should be given a position after the decimal point, e.g., 1.2. For consistency, in case of changes in the word file of the AR, it is necessary to also update Table 0 in the Excel file for the version number, even if there is no update to the tables.

Table 1.1 – Data availability Note: STECF highlights the need to rethink this table in the future

- Check that all fields are completed (suggested for automation).
- Check that all type of data are included in table 1.1 (suggested for automation).
- Cross check that table 1.1 has the correct links to the other tables (suggested for automation).
- Check in column L if the data were provided according to NP.

  YES/NO. Only yes/no is accepted value; NA or blank is not valid. (suggested for automation).

- Check if there is a reference to pilot studies (when relevant).

Link to DTMT/DTi: *YES – the table is linked to the timeliness of the data submission.*

Note: The link to the DTMT is not obvious and needs to be tested.

- If there is a timeliness issue: check a valid justification is given in the 'AR

  Comments' field. (expert)

- Questions included in the evaluation grid:Is Table 1.1 consistent with AR guidelines?Has the data been made available within the timeframe defined in the WP?
- Are all deviations identified and commented in the AR comments?

For the last question, note that any unacceptable deviations will be raised in the DTMT.

Table 1.2. - Planned regional and international coordination

Check that all fields are completed (suggested for automation).
Experts should check if the reasons for non-attendance in relevant Regional Coordination meetings are explained?

Note: According to the WP/AR submission guidance, attending the relevant Regional Coordination meetings and the National Coordination meetings is mandatory.

Questions included in the evaluation grid:

- Is Table 1.2 consistent with AR guidelines?
- Have newly added meetings been highlighted in grey at the end of the table?
- Are all deviations identified and commented in the AR comments?

Table 1.3 – Bi and multi-lateral agreements

A comment in the 'AR comments field' is required where there have been changes to agreements listed in the WP, or if an agreement stopped.

A repository of agreements has been established to guide the evaluation, available on the RCG website.

Questions included in the evaluation grid:

- Is Table 1.3 consistent with AR guidelines?

The evaluators should be aware that according to the AR guidelines, the column 'AR comments' should be filled as 'ongoing' if the agreement is still operational; 'obsolete' if it is no longer in force; 'new' if the agreement has been added.

- Are changes explained in AR comment?

Table 1.4 – follow-up of recommendations and agreements

Comment

The reference for Table 1.4 is the RCG Decision Meeting file containing all recommendations of the recent years for a particular region.

Question included in the evaluation grid:

- Is Table 1.4 consistent with AR guidelines?
- Are all relevant recommendations (RCGs/LM/STECF/Survey Planning Groups) for the MS listed?
- Have Member States followed-up on recommendations?

Note that the quality of the follow-up should be judged by the group that issued the recommendation.

Text Box 1a

Question included in the evaluation grid:

- Is Text Box 1a consistent with AR guidelines?
- Has the study been implemented as planned?
- Is the outcome of the test study sufficiently described (e.g., results, achievements, follow-up)

Text Box 1b

Question included in the evaluation grid:

- Is Text Box 1b consistent with AR guidelines?
- Have the activities been implemented as planned?

- Is the outcome of other data collection activities sufficiently described (e.g., results, achievements)?

Table 2.1 and Text Box 2.1 - List of required species/stocks

AR-specific table columns:
- Achieved number of individuals measured for length at national level from commercial sampling
- Achieved number of samples for length at national level from commercial sampling
- AR Comments

Pre-screeners/evaluators should:
- Check if AR follows the guidelines (cf. Section I in Annex of Implementing Decision 2022/39).
- Check all species selected for sampling, should have a number in the respective cell in the AR (suggested for automation).
- Check all species not selected for sampling, should have a number in the respective cell in the AR;
  - If it is not sampled, the number is 'zero',
  - If it is sampled, the number is > 0.
- Check that only numbers are used(no blank nor NA) for any species/stocks in Table 2.1 (see note 2).
- Check if addition of species/stocks are explained and if Table 2.2 has been updated accordingly, if necessary.

Questions included in the evaluation grid:

- Is Table 2.1 consistent with AR guidelines? (Y, N with comment).
- Is Text Box 2.1 consistent with AR guidelines? (Y, N with comment).
- Is there a 0 (zero) value entered for stocks selected for sampling in the WP? (Y, N).
- Are the explanations provided for 0 (zero) values, if any, for the stocks selected for sampling in WP, appropriate and valid? (N/A, Y, N with comment).
- Are actions considered/taken appropriate to address the absence of any measurements in the future? (N/A, Y, N with comment).
- Are proposed timeframes appropriate to avoid 0 (zero) values in the future? (N/A, Y, N with comment).
- Is there addition of species/stocks to the Table 2.1? (Y/N).
- Is the addition of the new species/stocks explained and justified? (N/A, Y, N with comment).
- Is Table 2.2 updated accordingly with the added species/stocks? (N/A, Y, N with comment).

Note 1: Justification understandable and explicit to the issues encountered:
Detailed description of actions to mitigate deviations should be included in Text Box 2.1 to evaluate if they are appropriate. Evaluators should take into account that in certain cases, deviations cannot be avoided due to external factors, such as global issues, quota reductions, decrease in landings, fisheries ban and closures, changes in fisherman's behaviour etc. Evaluators should consider if MS indicated a time-frame. As it is not mandatory to indicate numbers when a stock was not selected for sampling, any explanation can be valid.

Note 2: it should be clear from the guidelines that number of measurements should be provided for all species/stocks in Table 2.1. Explanations on the reasons for 0 (zero) values only apply to those stocks selected for sampling for length.

Table 2.2 and Text Box 2.2 – Planning of sampling for biological variables

AR-specific table columns:
- Achieved number of sampled individuals at national level
- Achieved number of samples
- Achieved % of sampled individuals at national level [suggested for automation]
- Indication if AR comments required concerning achieved % of sampled individuals [suggested for automation]
- AR Comments

Pre-screeners/evaluators should check:
- All species/stock/variable should have a number or 'N/A' in the respective cell in the AR. No empty cells are allowed.
    - If it is not sampled, the number is 'zero',
    - If it is sampled, the number is > 0. N/A' is acceptable only for opportunistic sampling from research surveys at sea,
    - When 'N/A' is indicated in the WP table 2.2 column 'Number of individuals to sample' and where 0 (zero) value is provided in the AR column 'Achieved number of sampled individuals at national level': see note 2.

Questions included in the evaluation grid:

- Is Table 2.2 consistent with AR guidelines? (Y, N with comment)
- Is Text Box 2.2 consistent with AR guidelines? (Y, N with comment)
- Are all the deviations identified and commented in the AR comments column in Table 2.2 and/or in Text Box 2.2? (Y/N)
- Are all explanations acceptable? (N/A, Y, N with comment)
- Are actions considered/taken appropriate to address the absence of any sampling in the future? (N/A, Y, N with comment)
- Are proposed timeframes appropriate to avoid deviations in the future? (N/A, Y, N with comment)
- Is there addition of species/stocks/variables to the Table 2.2? (Y/N)
- Is the addition of the new species/stocks/variables explained and justified? (N/A, Y, N with comment)

- ***Link to DTMT/DTi:*** *YES – the table is linked to the coverage or quality of the data submission.*

Note: The link to the DTMT is not obvious and needs to be tested.

Note 1: Justifications should be understandable and explicit to the issues encountered:
A detailed description of actions to mitigate deviations should be included in Text Box 2.2 to evaluate if they are appropriate. Evaluators should take into account that in certain cases, deviations cannot be avoided due to external factors, such as global issues, quota reductions, decrease in landings, fisheries ban and closures, changes in fisherman's behaviour etc. Evaluators should consider if MS indicated a time-frame when these actions are expected to come into effect, and if the proposed time frame is considered to be appropriate.

Note 2: According to the guidelines N/A can be used for opportunistic sampling and surveys only, but MS should report all of their commercial sampling etc. In this case, 0 values indicate that the considered species was not encountered; evaluators are invited to check

if an explanation is given to 0 values and if 0 are used only for rare species. Clarification may be requested from MS in cases any doubts on the reality of the 0 value.

Table and Text Box 2.3 – Diadromous species data collection in freshwater

AR-specific table columns:

- Achieved number of units
- Achieved % of units
- Indication if AR comments required concerning achieved number of units
- AR Comments

Pre-screeners/evaluators should check during pre-screening:

Questions included in the evaluation grid:

- Is Table 2.3 consistent with AR guidelines?
- Is Text Box 2.3 consistent with the AR guidelines?

1. Check if AR part (white part) is an exact copy of the accepted work plan. (This applies for Text box and tables).

   - If not, changes should be indicated. Changes should not be substantially reducing the planned efforts of the accepted NWP. If the AR provides different information (less or more) than planned in the accepted NWP, missing or additional parts must be indicated by Pre-screeners/evaluators in the comment column of the respective assessment grid.

2. Checkthe grey part of the AR (Execution of NWP) for pingpong for the MS to fix issues before EWG.

   - If the MS has provided a short explanation for non-conformity in the AR Table and a more elaborate explanation in the text box.
   - Check if species/stocks for which biological sampling is planned according to Table 2.4 are included in Table 2.2.
   - Indicate regions, areas, species, stocks, variables that were not sampled in the respective column of the assessment grid.
   - When a listed species is not sampled, check if "reasons for not sampling" is appropriate.
   - If appropriate reason for not sampling is given, 'N/A' is indicated in WP column 'Achieved number of units' and also in column 'Achieved % of units'.
   - Is there a recurrent and pending issue visible from previous evaluations & pre-screenings on diadromous data collection variables? If yes, is it addressed in the evaluation grid for EWG to consider in evaluation?

Screening by the expert:

Verify Pre-Screener's comments for the respective AR part in evaluation grid.

Questions included in the evaluation grid:

- Is Table 2.3 consistent with AR guidelines?
- Is Text Box 2.3 consistent with the AR guidelines?
- Is Text Box 3.2 consistent with the AR guidelines?
- Is the white part of the AR identical with the NWP?
- Is the achieved number of samples of fisheries-dependent (F) / stock related variables and catch quantity by area/life stage corresponding to the planned number of samples in Table 2.3?
- Is the achieved number of samples of eel recruits, standing stock and silver eels, salmon parr, smolts and ascending adults (fisheries-independent, FI) by management unit (EMU / river) corresponding to the planned number of samples in Table 2.3
- Is a valid explanation presented for each deviation from the NWP in the relevant Text Box or Table comments field?
- Are actions considered/taken appropriate to minimise deviations in the future?

Pre-screeners/evaluators should check:

- For the Species/stocks listed for sampling in the WP (indicated with a 'yes'): check if MS have entered zero-value or 'N/A'.
- In case the achieved rate is outside of accepted boundaries in relation to the planned number of samples (less than 90% or more than 150%), a proper justification for the deviation needs to be listed in respective line in the AR table and/or in Text Box 2.3.
- Is the given justification understandable and explicit to the issue(s) encountered?
- Indicate number of non-achieved surveys (less than 90%) separately for fisheries-dependent (F) and fisheries-independent (FI) surveys in the comments.
- Is there a recurrent and pending issue visible from previous evaluations & pre-screenings on diadromous data collection variables? If yes, is it addressed in the evaluation grid for EWG to consider in evaluation?

Table and Text Box 2.4 – Recreational fisheries

AR-specific table columns:

- Estimated annual catch quantities by species
- Estimated annual percentage release
- Collection of biological data
- Evaluated by external experts/bodies
- AR comments

Pre-screeners/evaluators should check during pre-screening:

Questions included in the evaluation grid:

- Is Table 2.4 consistent with AR guidelines?
- Is Text Box 2.4 consistent with the AR guidelines?

1. Check if AR part (white part) is the exact copy of the accepted work plan. (This applies for Text box and tables).

o If not, changes should be indicated. Changes should not be substantially reducing the planned efforts of the accepted NWP. If the AR provides different information (less or more) than planned in the accepted NWP, missing or additional parts must be indicated by Pre-screeners/evaluators in the comment column of the respective assessment grid.

2. Check now the grey part of the AR (Execution of NWP).

o If the MS has provided a short explanation for non-conformity in the AR Table and a more elaborate explanation in the text box.
o Indicate areas, species, stocks, variables that were not sampled in the respective column of the assessment grid.
o When a listed species is not sampled, check if "reasons for not sampling" is appropriate.
o If appropriate reason for not sampling is given, 'N/A' is indicated in WP column 'Achieved number of units' and in column 'Achieved % of units'.

Screening by the expert:

Verify Pre-Screener's comments for the respective AR part in evaluation grid.

Questions included in the evaluation grid:
- Is Table 2.4 consistent with AR guidelines?
- Is Text Box 2.4 consistent with the AR guidelines?
- Is the white part of the AR identical with the NWP?
- Are all the species/life stages in Table 4 of the EU-MAP included?
- Are all mandatory collected catch variables (catch data, release data) reported in the table
- Are collected biological variables reported in the table
- Is a valid explanation presented for each deviation from the NWP in the relevant Text Box or Table comments field?
- Are the surveys evaluated by external experts/bodies. If MS indicated 'Y', has the MS provided information on evaluator (e.g., ICES WGRFS) and details of evaluations (year, part of the survey, progress etc.) in the 'AR comments' column?
- Are actions considered/taken appropriate to minimise deviations in the future?

Pre-screeners/evaluators should check:
- For the Species/stocks listed for sampling in the WP (indicated with a 'yes'): check if MS have entered zero-value or 'N/A'.
- In case the achieved rate is outside of accepted boundaries (less than 90% or more than 150%), a proper justification for the deviation needs to be listed in respective line in the AR table and/or in Text box 2.3.
- Is the given justification understandable and explicit to the issue(s) encountered?
- Indicate number of non-achieved surveys (less than 90%) separately for fisheries-dependent (F) and fisheries-independent (FI) surveys in the comments.
- Is there a recurrent and pending issue visible from previous evaluations & pre-screenings on diadromous data collection variables? If yes, is it addressed in the evaluation grid for EWG to consider in evaluation?

Table and Text Box 2.5 - Sampling plan description for biological data

AR-specific table columns:
- Total number of PSUs in the implementation year
- Achieved number of PSUs in the implementation year
- Achieved % of PSUs
- Divergence (%) of implementation year vs. reference period
- Indication if AR comments are required concerning number of PSUs achieved
- Number of unique active vessels in the sampling frame
- Number of unique vessels sampled
- Number of fishing trips in the sampling frame
- Number of fishing trips sampled
- Percentage of sampled fishing trips where the observer dedicated time to record the bycatch of PETS
- Number of fishing trips sampled with PETS mitigation device
- Number of species with length measurements
- AR comments

General comment: This table should provide information on the achieved level of sampling by Member States and also if incidental catches of protected, endangered, threatened or sensitive (PETS) species were monitored. A new scheme/frame, not included in the work plan, may be inserted as additional rows highlighted in grey, at the end of the table.

Evaluators to check that responses to the pre-screening exercise have been implemented in the revised submission (same questions to be answered) and check for inconsistencies between the pre-screening comments and MS responses

Pre-screeners/evaluators should:
- Check if AR follows the guidelines (cf. Section I in Annex of Implementing Decision 2022/39).
- Check that values are reported here with the same units as the value for the reference year in the NWP (column W).
- Check that values are reported (all columns) Check that values are meaningful (all columns).
- Check if the output of the formula in the respective calculations are correctly presented and no manual input is done.
- Check percentage of sampled trips for PETS is in the format xx (0-100) (column AF).
- Check if the comment clarifying the deviations indicated by an 'X' in column (..) is present in the table or text box 2.5 and is understandable (if explanation is extended in text box, then a short notice is given in the table with ref to text box as per the guidelines).
- Check in text box 2.5 if the section ''Action to avoid deviations' is applicable and the text is appropriate and valid for both the actions planned and the timeframe. For the new schemes or frames added, if any, are new rows added at the end of the table?
    - Is there an explanation as to   why these new schemes/frames were included in the AR?

- o Is there a supporting annex 1.1 relating to the new sampling scheme?
- o Is there indication in Annex 1.1 that the new scheme/frame involves collection of measurements of new species and/or new biological variables? If yes, then are Table 2.1 and 2.2 updated accordingly?

Questions included in the evaluation grid:

- Is Table 2.5 consistent with AR guidelines? (Y, N with comment)
- Is Text Tox 2.5 consistent with AR guidelines? (Y, N with comment)
- Have the sampling schemes listed in Table 2.5 been executed?
- Have the planned numbers of sampled units/vessels/trips been achieved?
- Are new schemes added in the AR? (Y/N)
- Is the addition of the new schemes/frames explained and justified? (N/A, Y, N with comment)
- Are additional schemes supported by a corresponding Annex 1.1? (N/A, Y, N with comment)
- Are all the deviations identified and commented in the AR comments column in Table 2.5 and/or in Text box 2.5? (Y/N)
- Are all explanations acceptable? (N/A, Y, N with comment)
- Are actions considered/taken appropriate to minimise deviations in the future? (N/A, Y, N with comment)
- Are proposed timeframes appropriate to minimise deviations in the future? (N/A, Y, N with comment)

Table and Text Box 2.6 – Research surveys at sea

For questions that are marked as "N", a comment indicating the survey name and issue is required by the pre-screener.

Questions included in the evaluation grid:

- Is Table 2.6 consistent with AR guidelines?
- Is Text Box 2.6 consistent with the AR guidelines?Have the surveys listed in Table 2.6 been conducted?
- If a cost-sharing agreement exists, has financial MS participation been fulfilled?
- Has the planned number of sampling activities been achieved?
- Was the required temporal and spatial coverage achieved?
- Are the links to the meeting report from the body coordinating the survey or the status report given in Textbox 2.6 and do they work?
- Is the main use of the results of the surveys presented in Text Box 2.6
- Are all the deviations identified and commented in the AR comments column in Table 2.6 and if necessary additionally in Text Box 2.6?
- Are all explanations for deviations acceptable?

At the start of an evaluation, the degree of acceptability of deviations should be agreed upon among the experts.

(more guidance needed here?)

Section 3

Table and Text Box 3.1 – Fishing Activity Data

This section should include only those transversal data that are not available through Control Regulation (logbooks, landing declarations and sales notes). Data collected under the Control Regulation (CR) shall not be included. It concerns data collection which is performed in addition to data collection under CR.

 AR-specific table columns:

- AR reference year
- Number of vessels
- Planned sample number
- Achieved response number
- Response rate (%)
- Achieved coverage (%)
- AR comments

The yellow columns that contain formulas for estimating these parameters should not be modified/edited.

Potential automatic checks:
- All fields selected should have a number in the respective cell in the AR except for the column 'AR Comments'.
- Check that all fields are completed.
- Cross check that table 3.1 segmentation corresponds to Table 5.1.
- Check that the columns in yellow were not modified and a number is included for every line.
- Check that 'AR reference year' is correct compared with table 1.1.
- Check that AR (white part) is an exact copy of the accepted work plan. (This applies for Text box and tables). AR can contain additional lines. In instances where rows are added to indicate new or modified segmentations the existing lines should not be edited or deleted.

Questions included in the evaluation grid:
- Is complementary data collection implemented?
- Is Table 3.1 consistent with AR guidelines?
- Is Text Box 3.1 consistent with AR guidelines?
- Is the reference year correct?
- Has the planned/updated planned sampling rate been achieved?
- Are the achieved response and coverage rates sufficient?

Currently there is no common approach of evaluating achieved response and coverage rates. This question can only be answered once an appropriate approach has been made available.
- Are there any deviations from NWP?

For the subsequent questions: If no deviation is filed, the answer should be "NA"; in case of deviations evaluator should provide a comment if the explanation is acceptable
- Are deviations for Fleet segmentations/clustering explained in text Box 3.1?
- Are deviations for data source explained in text Box 3.1?
- Are deviations for data collection scheme explained in text Box 3.1?

- Are deviations for sample rate explained in text Box 3.1?
- Are other deviations explained in text Box 3.1?
- Are the actions and timeframes considered/taken sufficient to avoid deviations in the future?

(more guidance needed here?)

Section 3.2: Fishing activity variables data collection strategy (for inland eel commercial fisheries)

Pre-screening & Expert evaluation

o Check if deviations on collection & descriptions on effort data & information on inland eel commercial fisheries are covered in Text Box 3.2 "Fishing activity variables data collection strategy".

Question included in the evaluation grid:

o Are all deviations identified and commented in the AR comments column in Text Box 3.2?
o Are all explanations for deviations acceptable?

(more guidance needed here?)

Section 4: Impact on marine ecosystem

Table 4.1 - Stomach sampling and analysis

Question included in the evaluation grid:
- Is Table 4.1 consistent with AR guidelines?
- Has the planned number of sampled stomachs been achieved?
- Was the required temporal and spatial coverage achieved?
- Are all deviations identified and commented in the AR comments column in Table 4.1?
- Are all explanations for deviations acceptable?

At the start of an evaluation the degree of acceptability of deviations should be agreed upon among the experts.

(more guidance needed here?)

Text Box 4.2 - Incidental catches of sensitive species

Questions included in the evaluation grid:
- Is Textbox 4.2 consistent with AR guidelines?

- Have the observers dedicated time to record PETS bycatch as planned (Table 2.5)?
- Are all deviations with regards to PETS identified and commented (in the AR comments column in Table 2.5, Textbox 2.5 and/or Textbox 4.2)?
- Are actions to avoid deviations listed?

Text Box 4.3 - Fisheries impact on marine habitats

Questions included in the evaluation grid:
- Is Text Box 4.3 consistent with AR guidelines?

- Has the study been implemented as planned?
- Is the outcome of the study sufficiently described (e.g. results, achievements, follow-up)?
- Are all deviations identified and justified?

(more guidance needed here?)

Table 5.1 – Fleet total population and clustering

The Table 5.1 describes the fleet population and the segments that are going to be surveyed. The total population shall include both active and inactive vessels. It also provides information on clustered segments.

 AR-specific table columns:

- AR reference year
- Total population (AR)
- AR comment

Potential automatic checks:

- All fields selected should have a number in the respective cell in the AR except for the column 'AR Comments'.
- Check that all fields are completed.
- Check that the columns in yellow were not modified and a number is included for every line.
- Check that 'AR reference year' is correct compared with Table 1.1.
- Check that AR (white part) is an exact copy of the accepted work plan. (This applies for Text box and tables). AR can contain additional lines. In instances where rows are added to indicate new or modified segmentations the existing lines should not be edited or deleted. Cross check column (12) with the EU Fleet Vessel Register that the number of the total population, both active and inactive vessels, is not lower than the total fleet register at the end of the reference year.
- Are fleet segments/cluster population totals consistent between Table 5.1 and 5.2?

Pre-screening & Expert evaluation:

Is Table 5.1 consistent with AR guidelines?

Table and Text Box 5.2 – Economic and social variables for fisheries data collection

AR-specific table columns:

- AR reference year
- Total population
- Updated planned sample rate (%)
- Updated sample number
- Achieved response number
- Response rate (%)
- Achieved coverage (%)
- Updated planned sample rate/ Planned sample rate (%)
- AR comments

The yellow columns, (containing formulas for estimating these parameters, should not be modified/edited.

Potential automatic checks:

- All fields selected should have a number in the respective cell in the AR except for the column 'AR Comments'.
- Check that all fields are completed.
- Check that the columns in yellow were not modified and a number is included for every line.
- Check that 'AR reference year' is correct compared with table 1.1.
- Check that AR (white part) is the exact copy of the accepted work plan. (This applies for Text box and tables). AR can contain additional lines. In instances where rows are added to indicate new or modified segmentations the existing lines should not be edited or deleted.
- Cross check that table 5.2 has the correct links to the other tables, the Table 3.1 and 5.1 e.g. clustering.

Questions included in the evaluation grid:
Is Table 5.2 consistent with AR guidelines?
Is Text Box 5.2 consistent with AR guidelines?
Has the planned/updated planned sampling rate been achieved?
Are the achieved response and coverage rates sufficient?
- Currently there is no common approach of evaluating achieved response and coverage rates. This question can only be answered once an appropriate approach has been made available.
Are there any deviations from NWP?
- For the subsequent questions: If no deviation is filed, the answer should be "NA"; in case of deviations evaluator should provide a comment if the explanation is acceptable
Are deviations for Fleet segmentations/clustering explained in Text Box 5.2?
Are deviations for data source explained in Text Box 5.2?
Are deviations for data collection scheme explained in Text Box 5.2?
Are deviations for sample rate explained in Text Box 5.2?
Are other deviations explained in Text Box 5.2?
Are the actions and timeframes considered/taken sufficient to avoid deviations in the future?

(more guidance needed here?)

Table and Text Box 6.1 – Economic and social variables for aquaculture data collection

AR-specific table columns:

- AR reference year
- Number of enterprises
- Updated planned sample rate (%)
- Updated sample number
- Achieved response number
- Response rate (%)
- Achieved coverage (%)
- Updated planned sample rate/ Planned sample rate (%)
- AR comments

The yellow columns, containing formulas for estimating these parameters, should not be modified/edited.

Potential automatic checks:

- All fields selected should have a number in the respective cell in the AR except for the column 'AR Comments'.
- Check that all fields are completed.
- Check that the columns in yellow were not modified and a number is included for every line.
- Check that 'AR reference year' is correct compared with table 1.1.
- Check that AR (white part) is the exact copy of the accepted work plan. (This applies for Text box and tables). AR can contain additional lines. In instances where rows are added to indicate new or modified segmentations the existing lines should not be edited or deleted.

Questions included in the evaluation grid:

Is Table 6.1 consistent with AR guidelines?
Is Text Box 6.1 consistent with AR guidelines?
Has the planned/updated planned sampling rate been achieved?
Are the achieved response and coverage rates sufficient?
- Currently there is no common approach of evaluating achieved response and coverage rates. This question can only be answered once an appropriate approach has been made available.
Are there any deviations from NWP?
- For the subsequent questions: If no deviation is filed, the answer should be "NA"; in case of deviations evaluator should provide a comment if the explanation is acceptable
Are deviations for techniques and species groups explained in Text Box 6.1?

(more guidance needed here?)

Table and Text Box 7.1 – Economic and social variables for fish processing data collection

AR-specific table columns:

- AR reference year
- Number of enterprises
- Updated planned sample rate (%)
- Updated sample number
- Achieved response number
- Response rate (%)
- Achieved coverage (%)
- Updated planned sample rate/ Planned sample rate (%)
- AR comments

The yellow columns, containing formulas for estimating these parameters, should not be modified/edited.

Potential automatic checks:

- All fields selected should have a number in the respective cell in the AR except for the column 'AR Comments'.
- Check that all fields are completed.
- Check that the columns in yellow were not modified and a number is included for every line.
- Check that 'AR reference year' is correct compared with table 1.1.
- Check that AR (white part) is the exact copy of the accepted work plan. (This applies for Text box and tables). AR can contain additional lines. In instances where rows are added to indicate new or modified segmentations the existing lines should not be edited or deleted.

Questions included in the evaluation grid:

- Currently there is no common approach of evaluating achieved response and coverage rates. This question can only be answered once an appropriate approach has been made available.

Are there any deviations from NWP?
- For the subsequent questions: If no deviation is filed, the answer should be "NA"; in case of deviations evaluator should provide a comment if the explanation is acceptable

Are deviations for segmentation explained in Text Box 7.1?

Are deviations for data source explained in Text Box 7.1?

Are deviations for data collection scheme explained in Text Box 7.1?

Are deviations for sample rate explained in Text Box 7.1?

Are other deviations explained in Text Box 7.1?

Are the actions and timeframes considered/taken sufficient to avoid deviations in the future?

(more guidance needed here?)

Annex 1.1- Quality report for biological data sampling scheme(s)

For all schemes identified in Tables 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, and 4.1 of the WP/AR names of the schemes should be identical to those in the Annex and conform to the guidelines.

All schemes identified in the tables should have a corresponding record in the Annex. This includes any schemes that have been added.

Modifications to existing sampling schemes should be recorded and an indication to which section is affected provided.

Where documentation is not currently available, a timeframe for inclusion should be given.

Annex 1.2 - Quality report for socioeconomic data sampling scheme(s)

The evaluation should be performed by section and by sampling scheme(s).

Are there any deviations from NWP?
- For the subsequent questions: If no deviation is filed, the answer should be "NA"; in case of deviations evaluator should provide a comment if the explanation is acceptable

Are deviations for survey planning explained?

Are deviations for survey design and strategy explained?

Are deviations for estimation design explained?

Are deviations for error checks explained?

Are deviations for data storage and documentation explained?

Are deviations for revision explained?

Are deviations for confidentiality explained?

Are the actions and timeframes considered/taken sufficient to avoid deviations in the future?

(more guidance needed here?)