

EVALUATION GUIDANCE FOR WORK PLANS

General principle

For each section, two summary comments should be reported to inform:

- a) if the Work Plan is in line with the EU-MAP:
 - are the segments and supra-regions listed consistent with entries in EU-MAP?
 - are all required variables listed from the EU-MAP?

- b) if the Work Plan is in accordance with the template guidelines (in particular):
 - does the sampling rate match the data collection scheme (e.g. 100% for census, <100% for PSS)?
 - is the correct codification from the MasterCodeList used?
 - is the correct data collection year for the WP implementation provided?
 - Are the formulas applied in yellow columns (automated calculation)?
 - Does the first page of the text document include correct legal references and logos?

In order for the Commission to be able to assess whether further clarification or action is required from MSs, all EWG comments need to be clear, self-explanatory and consistent.

TextBox “General Information”

- Are details for national correspondent (postal address, phone e-mail) included?
- Are the full name, acronym and contact details of all institutes that will contribute to the WP (postal address, phone, website – if any) included?
- Is the role of each participant described?

Table 1.1 – Data availability

- Does Table 1.2 include all types of data? The types of data are listed below:
 1. Biological variables
 2. Fishing Activity Data
 3. Economic and social data for fisheries
 4. Economic and social data for aquaculture
 5. Economic and social data for the processing industry (optional)

- Is it possible to link each data set with the corresponding part of the WP?
- Is the date of data delivery reasonable? (N, or N+1)

Table 1.2 – Planned regional and international coordination

Are the reasons for planned non-attendance at relevant meetings explained?

Relevant meetings are those where the MS has a significant share of the fisheries/stock (e.g. assessment WGs), Regional Co-ordination Groups for the regions where the MS is a neighbouring country of the respective sea basin or region, and pan-European meetings dealing with overarching methodologies of data collection.

Table 1.3

When a MS refers to an agreement with other MSs check all the participants of the agreement.

If a MS mentions a Regional coordination agreements in other tables (like 2.2, 2.5, etc.), it also should be present in Table 1.3

Text box 1a and 1b – Test studies description and other data collection activities

Evaluators should check if aim, duration, methods and expected outcomes are stated. Following their expert knowledge, they should also evaluate the robustness of planned actions.

Table 2.1

Evaluators should make sure that all regions where MS is operating are listed in Table 2.1.

Additional species are authorized to be listed in Table 2.1 if they are agreed at marine regional level (RCG or RFMO). If so, an indication of the agreement should be given. Also species of particular national interest are allowed if duly justified in the WP comments.

Landings figures should be checked against official data sources (Eurostat, RCG data calls, and official regulation regarding TACs and quotas).

The applied thresholds must be justified, in particular if quota swaps or regional agreements on sampling are in place.

In particular, check the figures for multispecies/multistock TACs and quotas.

All species/area units selected for sampling of biological variables should have an entry in Table 2.2.

Check if there is a reason given if any species are added that are not included in EU MAP Table 1.

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

Check if all the species that have a “Y” in the column “Selected for sampling of biological variables” in Table 2.1 have an entry in Table 2.2 in all years.

Reference to Regional Work Plan postponed until clearer interlink between NWP and RWP is established (original question: In case a Regional Work Plan (RWP) is in force, check if the species/variable is included in that RWP). **Evaluators to have special focus on the consistency between the RWP and NWP.**

Reference to a sampling scheme is two-fold:

- No variable should be left uncovered by a combination **Observation type/sampling scheme type/Sampling scheme identifier**
- All the combinations should appear in Quality Annex 1.1?

In case of variables not sampled annually, check if the variable is planned at least in one year of the period. It is not mandatory to collect all variables (except length) in all years (e.g. in the RCG Med&BS, all Member States decided to sample some variables triennially in the same year and during the MEDITS survey. In similar cases, not all variables will have entries for all years).

The addition of species in Table 2.2 that were not selected in Table 2.1 should be clearly justified.

The name of the observation type/ sampling scheme type/sampling scheme identifiers should be consistent in all the Tables and in Annex 1.1. When the number of individuals is related to sampling schemes of other Tables, the evaluator should check the consistency among them.

Did MS follow the guidance for filling Table 2.2? This question is a summary of the whole section and should be answered after the answering the previous questions.

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

The evaluator should check that:

- ∄ all mandatory species, listed in Table 3 of the EU-MAP Delegated Decision, are included.
- ∄ the reason for not sampling the mandatory species is documented by providing specific references and/or scientific evidence (e.g. species not present in the area, regulations/laws in the country etc.).
- ∄ the required variables, sampling schemes and methods are documented in the quality document (Annex 1.1)

Did MS follow the guidance for filling Table 2.3? This question is a summary of the whole section and should be answered after the answering the previous questions

Table and Text Box 2.4 – Recreational fisheries

The evaluator should check if:

- ∄ all mandatory species, listed in Table 4 of the EU-MAP Delegated Decision and all species agreed by RCGs, are included. For the elasmobranchs and highly migratory ICCAT species, the MS can decide on the list of species targeted for sampling by recreational fishery, as long as species are listed individually.
- ∄ the reason for not sampling the mandatory or agreed species is documented by providing specific references and/or scientific evidence (e.g. species not present in the area, regulations/laws in the country etc.).
- ∄ the details for the required estimations and sampling schemes are documented in the quality document (Annex 1.1)

€

Did MS follow the guidance for filling Table 2.4? This question is a summary of the whole section and should be answered after the answering the previous questions

€

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

Question on all parts of the population covered by a sampling frame: check against the exact instructions in the guidelines for MS, especially the existence of the out-of-frame parts (parts of the population not covered by the sampling frames).

1. Considerations about coverage: the coverage of the sampling design in relation to the total population

Have the MS included in Table 2.5 an indication of the activity not covered under all the schemes (? The schemes are a combination of observation type*sampling scheme type*species coverage)

Such activities should appear as lines with a 0 value in the column “Planned number of PSUs” in 2.5. Although it is recommended for all combinations it should be provided at least for Sampling scheme type='commercial fishing trip.

This is fundamental information to understand the real coverage of the sampling design developed. Calculation of the coverage is only possible based on this information.

Consideration in relation to other new fields requested. Assistance to assess on some quality aspects derived from the sampling data

Number of unique vessels sampled can be regarded in relation to the number of total vessels with activity in that sampling frame.

Quality aspects of sampling schemes are included in Annex 1.1. MS may use Text Box 2.5 for additional information on commercial sampling.

For sampling schemes dedicated and designed for PETS , the description should be in annex 1.1. In the case of sampling schemes no designed specifically for PETS, the additional information should be included in Text Box 4.2.

Did MS follow the guidance for filling Table 2.5? This question is a summary of the whole section and should be answered after the answering the previous questions

Table and Text Box 2.6 – Research survey at sea

Evaluators should carefully review the consistency of the reporting of the research surveys-at-sea with the Table 1 of the EU-MAP Implementing Decision.

All the agreements (cross-participation, related to some catch threshold should, etc.) should be checked.

Did MS follow the guidance for filling Table 2.6? This question is a summary of the whole section and should be answered after the answering the previous questions

Section 3 – Fishing Activity Data

Main principles

Fishing Activity Data refer to data formerly called transversal (capacity, effort, landings), that are available under the Control Regulation.

Whenever data are collected under the Control Regulation, no further details on sampling, coverage, estimation, cross-validation etc. should be expected as these procedures are already part of the CR.

If no logbooks or sales declarations are available or they are insufficient, additional surveys should be undertaken to collect the required information. This case should be reported in this section (Table 3.1) and justified in Text Box 3.1.

The additional data collection should be reported by segment or clustered segment. Also, MS can distinguish segments according to the activity level. Methodology used to apply activity level and clustering strategy should not be provided in this section, but in section 5.

Information on implemented survey should be reported in Annex 1.2 (quality report).

Table 3.1 and Text Box 3.1

What to check

- Is it comprehensively explained why data collected under the Control Regulation are not sufficient (where applicable)? If not, what is missing?
- Is the Work Plan in line with the EU MAP?
Are all variables, listed in Table 6 of the EU-MAP Delegated Decision, reported in table 3.1?
- Is the Work Plan in accordance with the template guidelines?
- Does the sampling rate match the collection scheme (i.e. 100% for census, <100% for others)?

Section 4:

Table 4.1 – Stomach sampling and analysis

Evaluators should be aware of the new sampling and information requested in table and text box, and so, preferably further guide the MS in providing the correct information if necessary. Evaluators should also be aware, that, despite all effort, it is possible that the template does not request all relevant information. In those cases, evaluators should propose additional guidance text for MS and/or additional columns for the template.

Evaluators should at least check:

- What is the justification for the Expected number of stomachs (e.g. based on the sampling protocol).
- If the chosen sampling scheme is in line with stomach sampling of the species (e.g. flatfish stomach sampling in a pelagic research survey at sea is not a logic combination)

- If there is a stomach sampling protocol available (references in Annex 1.1)

[Text Box 4.2 – Incidental by-catch of sensitive species

This text box contains more specific details on sampling of incidental catches of sensitive species, that are specified in Table 2.5.

In the case of identified specific PETS bycatch monitoring surveys, the evaluator should check:

- If the aims, methods and timelines are defined
- If the data needed to achieve these objectives is determined

OR like in textboxes 1a, 1b, 4.3: **Evaluators should** if aim, duration, methods and expected outcomes are stated. Following their expert knowledge, they should also evaluate the robustness of planned actions. – Depending on the final text of textbox 4.2]

Text Box 4.3 – Seabed studies (EU MAP point 4.2)

Evaluators should if aim, duration, methods and expected outcomes are stated. Following their expert knowledge, they should also evaluate the robustness of planned actions.

Sections 5-7 of the Work Plan template

Main principles

The main checks on Tables 5.1-5.2-6.1-7.1 are for completeness and consistency. All requested variables should be listed.

Table 5.1 describes the fleet population and the segment that will be surveyed. It explains the segment clustering. The total population should include all active and inactive vessels registered in the Union Fishing Fleet Register. MS can distinguish segments according to the activity level. Text Box 5.2 should describe methods used to allocate the activity level.

The total population in Table 5.2 must be the same as in Table 5.1.

Regarding aquaculture section, the evaluators should check if the thresholds as reported in Table 6.1 and Text Box 6.1 are applied correctly. In case of doubts and if deemed necessary in the evaluation procedure, some production figures might be compared with EUROSTAT online database.

Data collection on fish processing is voluntary and may include only variables not covered by European Business Statistics. MS should describe and justify the complementary data collection activities in Table 7.1 and Text Box 7.1. If data collection on fish processing takes place, then the list of variables should be consistent with the MasterCodeList.

Tables 5.1 and 5.2, Text Box 5.2

What to check

- Is the Work Plan in accordance with the template?

- Are the segments and supra-regions listed in Table 5.2 consistent with entries in Table 5.1 of the Work Plan?
Are all mandatory variables, listed in Tables 7 and 9 of the EU-MAP Delegated Decision, reported in table 5.2?
- Does the sampling rate match the collection scheme (i.e. 100% for census, <100% for others) in Table 5.2?
- Is clustering explained and justified in Text Box 5.2?
- Is the activity indicator properly described (where applicable) in Text Box 5.2?
- Are the deviations from RCG ECON / PGECON definitions explained and justified (where applicable) in Text Box 5.2?
- Is the quality report provided in Annex 1.2?

Table 6.1, Text Box 6.1

What to check

- Is the Work Plan in accordance with the template?
- Are the segmentation correctly applied in Table 6.1?
- Are all mandatory variables, listed in Tables 9 and 10 of the EU-MAP Delegated Decision, reported in table 6.1?
- Does the sampling rate match the collection scheme (i.e. 100% for census, <100% for others) in Table 6.1?
- Are the thresholds for aquaculture correctly applied in Text Box 6.1?
- Is the quality report provided in Annex 1.2?

Table 7.1, Text Box 7.1

What to check

- Is it comprehensively explained why complementary data collected for the Fish Processing is necessary in Text Box 7.1?
- Is the Work Plan in accordance with the template?
- Does the sampling rate match the collection scheme (i.e. 100% for census, <100% for others) in Table 7.1?
- Is the quality report provided in Annex 1.2?

Annex 1.1 – Quality report for biological data

The quality report for biological data is not intended to be evaluated in terms of achievement of conformity but to show current status and mark any significant improvement done by MS. The general idea is that MS should have clear, transparent and agreed documentation of their procedures made publicly available, at the end of the period covered by the WP. In this sense, it is expected that they show a gradual transition to that situation and that must be reflected in the Quality document.

Annex 1.2 Quality Report for socio economic data sampling scheme

This section should be evaluated once during the period of implementation of the WP. The evaluation during the first round (Nov. 2021) should assess the actual provision of the quality

reports by MS while the evaluation of the content could be considered as preliminary. An additional detailed evaluation of the quality reports may require additional expertise and a dedicated working group.

A quality report should be reported for each sector (fisheries, aquaculture and any complementary data collection of fishing activity and processing).

The Quality Report describes quality aspects of the data collection process (design, sampling implementation, data capture, data storage and data processing etc.).

Evaluators should assess if all the requested information is provided and if the methodologies are sound and coherent with the handbook on sampling design.

What to check

Sections 5-7

- Is the description of the population the sampling schemes applies to clear and understandable?
- Are all data sources which are used described concisely and do they appear appropriate?
- Are survey methods and distribution clearly described?
- Is the method of calculating population estimate from sample in line with the Handbook or otherwise justified?
- Is the method of calculating derived data in line with the Handbook or otherwise justified?
- Is the treatment of nonresponse in line with the Handbook or otherwise justified?
- Is the process of detecting and elimination of potential errors well described?
- Is storage of data described?
- If provided, is a link to a webpage where additional methodological documentation can be found?
- Are any issues with publication of data due to confidentiality reasons described and justified?