



RCG's Secretariat

**Co-funded by
the European Maritime
and Fisheries Fund**



Regional Coordination Groups 2023 Decision Meeting

DECISIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS



Regional Coordination Group
North Atlantic
North Sea & Eastern Arctic



Regional Coordination Group
Baltic



Regional Coordination Group
Mediterranean and Black Sea



Regional Coordination Group
Large Pelagics



Regional Coordination Group
Long Distance Fisheries



Regional Coordination Group
on Economic Issues

ERRATA SHEET

Date: 24th November 2023

Document Release: Version 1.1

Page affected: page 42, ECON_2023_R08

This errata sheet describes the omission occurred at the release date of this document.

The 2023 Regional Coordination Groups – Decision Meeting report was released omitting RCG ECON recommendation number 8:

ECON_2023_R08: Price per capacity unit and PIM assumptions should be regularly updated so that changes in technologies and investments can be better considered.

The recommendation ECON_2023_R08 was presented and commented during 2023 RCGs Decision Meeting. Therefore, ECON_2023_R08 has been included in this version 1.1. The full recommendation with the justifications and follow up actions can be found in page 42.

Content

Background.....	1
1. RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations	2
RCG NANSEA – Participating countries.....	2
RCG Baltic – Participating countries	2
RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic - Decisions and recommendations.....	2
RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Next season (2023 - 2024)	17
2. RCG LP – Decisions and recommendations	18
RCG LP – Participating countries.....	18
RCG LP – Decisions and recommendations.....	18
RCG LP – Next season (2023-2024).....	27
3. RCG LDF – Decisions and recommendations.....	28
RCG LDF – Participating countries.....	28
RCG LDF – Decisions and recommendations	28
RCG LDF – Next season (2023 – 2024)	30
4. RCG ECON – Decisions and recommendations.....	31
RCG ECON – Participating countries.....	31
RCG ECON – Decisions and recommendations	31
RCG ECON – Next season (2023-2024).....	50
5. RCG Med&BS – Decisions and recommendations.....	52
RCG Med&BS – Participating countries.....	52
RCG Med&BS – Decisions and recommendations.....	52
RCG Med&BS – Next season (2023 – 2024).....	62

Background

The RCG's Decision Meeting took place in the Centre Albert Borschette, Brussels, Belgium as a hybrid meeting, on the 27th of September 2023.

The Decision Meeting is the Regional Coordination Groups decision forum, where the RCG chairs present to the national correspondents the recommendations and decisions coming from the RCGs for their endorsement. The recommendation and decisions are the result from the intersessional work carried out throughout the year and in particular the outputs from the RCGs annual technical meetings.

The six Regional Coordination Groups (RCGs): RCG Baltic; RCG North Atlantic, North Sea & Eastern Arctic (NANSEA); RCG Mediterranean and Black Sea (Med&BS); RCG Long Distance Fisheries (LDF); RCG Large Pelagics (LP); RCG Economic Issues (ECON) were represented in the meeting by RCG chairs. Member States were represented by the Data Collection Framework national correspondents, and DG MARE unit C3 participated in the meeting as the Commission representative. The RCG's Secretariat facilitated the meeting.

After opening of the meeting, the draft agenda was adopted by the participants. The 2023 decision meeting agenda:

14:30	<i>Welcome of participants and adoption of the agenda</i>
14:40	<i>Decisions from RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic</i>
15:10	<i>Decisions from RCG LP</i>
15:40	<i>Coffee break</i>
16:00	<i>Decisions from RCG LDF</i>
16:10	<i>Decisions from RCG ECON</i>
16:25	<i>Decisions from RCG Med&BS</i>
16:55	<i>AOB</i>
17:05	<i>Wrap-up and conclusions</i>
17:30	<i>Closure of the meeting</i>

The voting procedure was established as follows:

- National correspondents only to indicate if not in agreement with a decision.
- In the case of RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic, the vote from a MS is valid for both regions.

I. RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

The decisions and recommendations from RCG NANSEA & RCG Baltic annual back-to-back technical meeting 2023 are presented in the following pages. More details can be found in RCG NANSEA & RCG Baltic 2023 annual report, available on the RCGs website on both NANSEA and Baltic sites: <https://www.fisheries-rcg.eu/rcg-nansea/> <https://www.fisheries-rcg.eu/rcg-baltic/>

https://www.fisheries-rcg.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/2023_RCG-NANSEA-RCG-Baltic-TM_Rpt-Part-I.pdf

https://www.fisheries-rcg.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/2023_RCG-NANSEA-RCG-Baltic-TM_Rpt-Part-II.pdf

https://www.fisheries-rcg.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/2023_RCG-NANSEA-RCG-Baltic-TM_Rpt-Part-III.pdf

RCG NANSEA – Participating countries

Sweden, Estonia, Belgium, Spain, Germany, Denmark, France, Ireland, Lithuania, Latvia, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal.

RCG Baltic – Participating countries

Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Sweden

2

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic - Decisions and recommendations

The RCG Baltic and RCG NANSEA are holding their annual technical meeting together although they are still formally two separate groups.

In preparation of the Decision Meeting, two weeks beforehand a pre-Decision Meeting was organized, 8th Sep 2023, where National Correspondents (NCs) were briefed and informed about the recommendations and the proposed decisions from the two RCGs. During the pre-Decision Meeting, NCs were able to ask questions and receive further clarifications.

2023 Decision meeting – Report

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Status	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision to be taken by NC?	Formulation of the Decision
Enduser and RCG	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_D01	2023	D01	ongoing	NCs approval of the updates for the 'Mandates and Remits' document specifying the roles of RCGs vs. ICES	NCs to approve the updates for the 'Mandates and Remits' document specifying the roles of RCGs vs. ICES	NCs	DM 2023	'RCG Mandates and remits' document should be updated with clarification about the role of RCGs vs. ICES, i.e., ICES has the scientific coordination and RCGs has the decision making process and coordination of resources among MS.	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART I section 5.1.1, RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART III Chapter I ISSG End-users and RCGs.	YES	Do NCs approve the updates for the 'Mandates and Remits' document specifying the roles of RCGs vs. ICES
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_D01				Result DM 2023		Agreed						
				Comments DM 2023		No further comments						
Enduser and RCG	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R01	2023	R01	ongoing	Recommendation to ICES WGRDBESGOV to consider how ICES can take over the outputs created by ISSG RDB Overviews for ICES (WGs, Benchmarks).	Recommendation to ICES WGRDBESGOV to consider how ICES can take over the outputs created by ISSG RDB Overviews for ICES (WGs, Benchmarks).	ICES WGRDBESGOV	By the end of 2023	The RCG ISSG RDB catch, effort and sampling overviews currently produce outputs for ICES working groups. The overviews made for ICES WGBFAS can be seen as a test case. RCGs have access to EU MS data only. The main focus of the ISSG products is the regional coordination. It should be discussed with ICES how overviews and scripts developed can be taken over by ICES.	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART I section 5.1.1, RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART III Chapter I ISSG End-users and RCGs.	NO	
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R01				Result DM 2023								
				Comments DM 2023		No further comments						

2023 Decision meeting – Report

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Status	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision to be taken by NC?	Formulation of the Decision
RCG	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R02	2023	R02	ongoing	The RCG recommends that when giving new legislative proposals on fisheries control, the European Commission takes into account that adequate estimation of bycatch rates to meet the conservation objectives of the CFP, requires adequate monitoring of PETS incidental bycatch, adequate data on fishing effort, as well as adequate monitoring of PETS species abundance and distribution. The proposals from the European Commission should include the enforcement for all fishing vessels to report in the relevant catch documents all events of incidental bycatch of PETS, and obligation and enforcement to report fishing effort variables listed in EU-MAP Table 6, in a manner that allows for adequate estimation of fishing effort (see ICES WGBYC reports).	In line with the Data Collection Framework, the RCG will focus on actions under development, which are CFP and EU MAP compliant, e.g.: the improvement of the PETS incidental bycatch monitoring through the identification of high-risk fisheries to be prioritized in monitoring; as well as other agreements (made through the RVP) which improve data monitoring accuracy. Adequate estimation of bycatch rates to meet the conservation objectives of the CFP, requires adequate monitoring of PETS incidental bycatch, adequate data on fishing effort, as well as adequate monitoring of PETS species abundance and distribution.	COM	TM 2024	EU COM published in February 2023 the communication “EU Action Plan: Protecting and restoring marine ecosystems for sustainable and resilient fisheries”. COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS EU Action Plan: Protecting and restoring marine ecosystems for sustainable and resilient fisheries COM/2023/102 final https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52023DC0102	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART I section 5.1.2	NO	

2023 Decision meeting – Report

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Status	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision to be taken by NC?	Formulation of the Decision
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R02				Comments DM 2023		No further comments						
RCG	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R03	2023	R03	ongoing	It is recommended that the WGRDBESGOV and ICES Secretariat work together to find funding to develop 'RDBES functionalities prioritised'. Among the most important for RCG NANSEA&Baltic are FDI export module and inclusion of recreational data	It is recommended that the WGRDBESGOV and ICES Secretariat work together to find funding to develop 'RDBES functionalities prioritized'. Among the most important for RCG NANSEA&Baltic are FDI export module and inclusion of recreational data	ICES WGRD BESGO V, ICES Secretariat	By the end of 2023	The ICES Secretariat funded development of the RDBES is ending. There is a list of RDBES functionalities that have not been developed yet and are prioritized. It is important to find funding, if the RDBES development pace should stay at the same level.	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART I section 5.2.2	NO	
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R03				Result DM 2023		The initial recommendation has been reformulated to accommodate the discussions held with ISSG Diadromous at the 2023 Liaison meeting.						
				Comments DM 2023		The original recommendation can be found in RCG NANSEA & Baltic Technical Meeting Report part I						
RDB Overviews	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R04	2023	R04	ongoing	Request commercial landings and effort data from 2019-2023 in the 2024 RDBES data call	Request commercial landings and effort data from 2019-2023 in the 2024 RDBES data call	ICES WGRD BESGO V	March 2024	ISSG RDB Overviews plan to produce multiannual overviews. 5 years of data (2019-2023) could constitute a good option. The request for historical data could start to be done already in 2024.	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART I section 5.2.3, RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART III Chapter 2 SSG RDB Catch, Effort and Sampling Overviews.	NO	

2023 Decision meeting – Report

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Status	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision to be taken by NC?	Formulation of the Decision
Surveys	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_D02	2023	D02	ongoing	Renewal costsharing agreements for WHB survey (IBWSS).	To decide on renewal of the cost-sharing agreement for the WHB survey.	NCs (DK, DE, ES, FR, IR, NL, SE)	Prior to the survey 2024.	The current cost-sharing agreement for the WHB survey will terminate at the end of 2023. Renewal of the agreement is foreseen.	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART I section 5.2.5, RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART III Chapter 5 Surveys	YES	Do NCs agree to conclude a cost-sharing agreement for the IBWSS survey for 2024?
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_D02				Result DM 2023		Agreed						
				Comments DM 2023		Agreement already signed, available at RCGs Repository Multilateral and Bilateral Agreements						
Surveys	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_D03	2023	D03	ongoing	Renewal costsharing agreements for IESNS survey (ASH).	To decide on renewal of the cost-sharing agreement for the ASH survey.	NCs (DK, DE, IR, NL, SE)	Prior to the survey 2024.	The current cost-sharing agreement for the ASH survey will terminate at the end of 2023. Renewal of the agreements is foreseen.	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART I section 5.2.5, RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART III Chapter 5 Surveys	YES	Do NCs agree to conclude a cost-sharing agreement for the IESNS survey for 2024?
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_D03				Result DM 2023		Agreed						
				Comments DM 2023		Agreement already signed, available at RCGs Repository Multilateral and Bilateral Agreements						
Surveys	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R05	2023	R05	ongoing	Recommendation to the Commission to provide solutions for continuation of scientific monitoring in spatially restricted zones.	Provide guidance on the tools to be used to ensure the continuation of scientific monitoring in spatially restricted zones	DG MARE	TM 2024	Provide guidance on the tools to be used to ensure the continuation of scientific monitoring in spatially restricted zones, i.e. through licensing, Natura management, etc. This could include the emphasis on scientific monitoring that is required under legal obligations (i.e. mandatory surveys in	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART I section 5.2.5, RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART III Chapter 5 Surveys	NO	



2023 Decision meeting – Report

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Status	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision to be taken by NC?	Formulation of the Decision
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R05				Comments DM 2023		The guidance was presented by the Commission at the NCs Meeting on 28.09.2023						
EMT	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R06	2023	R06	ongoing	Each MS to assign at least one expert to participate in ISSG EMT and appoint an additional chair.	Each MS to assign at least one expert to participate in ISSG EMT.	NCs	By the end of September 2023	Initiatives on developing and using new electronic monitoring technologies, machinelearning software and other technologies are going on in several MS. In order to ensure that information on the initiatives disseminated and made available for the DCF community the ISSG for EMT recommend that all MS within the remit of the RCG Baltic and NANSEA are ensuring their representation in the ISSG of an expert working with new electronic monitoring technologies. In order to make the work of the ISSG EMT most efficient two chairs to the lead of the ISSG are needed. At present Gildas Glemarec, DTU Aqua, Denmark has been elected as chair. The ISSG recommend an additional chair is found as soon as possible.	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART I section 5.2.6, RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART III Chapter 4 ISSG Electronic Monitoring Technologies.	NO	
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R06				Comments DM 2023		In order to promote a pan-regional approach an invitation will be sent to RCG LP to participate to the ISSG on EMS						



2023 Decision meeting – Report

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Status	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision to be taken by NC?	Formulation of the Decision
Regional work plan	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_D04	2023	D04	ongoing	MS to agree on all Agreements and commitments contained in the Draft RWP Baltic.	To read the proposed Draft RWP Baltic and be aware of the agreements and commitments or amend or delay until further details.	NCs (DK, EE, FI, DE, LV, LT, PL, SE)	DM 2023	All agreements and commitments listed in the RWP are issued from RCG/ISSGs and were agreed in TM 2023. If NCs are uncomfortable with any agreements and commitments reported in the RWP, then it must be further developed to clarify the issue. The agreement and commitments stated in the RWP must then reflect the work to be undertaken and the timeframe.	Draft RWPs to be found at ICES Sharepoint: More details are to be found in the different ISSG reports (Part III)	YES	Do NCs agree on all Agreements and commitments contained in the Draft RWP Baltic?
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_D04				Result DM 2023		Agreed						
				Comments DM 2023		RWP will be submitted to STECF for evaluation in October 2023.						
Regional work plan	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_D05	2023	D05	ongoing	MS to agree on all Agreements and commitments contained in the Draft RWP NANSEA.	To read the proposed Draft RWP NANSEA and be aware of the agreements and commitments or amend or delay until further details.	NCs (SE, EE, FI, BE, ES, DE, DK, FR, IE, LT, LV, NL, PL, PT)	DM 2023	All agreements and commitments listed in the RWP are issued from RCG/ISSGs and were agreed in TM 2023. If NCs are uncomfortable with any agreements and commitments reported in the RWP, then it must be further developed to clarify the issue. The agreement and commitments stated in the RWP must then reflect the work to be undertaken and the timeframe.	Draft RWPs to be found at ICES Sharepoint: More details are to be found in the different ISSG reports (Part III)	YES	Do NCs agree on all Agreements and commitments contained in the Draft RWP NANSEA?
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_D05				Result DM 2023		Agreed						
				Comments DM 2023		RWP will be submitted to STECF for evaluation in October 2023.						

2023 Decision meeting – Report

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Status	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision to be taken by NC?	Formulation of the Decision
CS pelagic freezer trawler NEA	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R07	2023	R07	ongoing	Identify and conduct two pilot studies in 2023/2024, one by NLD and one by DEU, for sampling EU pelagic freezer trawler fleet.	Identify and conduct two pilot studies in 2023/2024 (one by NLD and one by DEU) and further harmonize protocol for sampling EU pelagic freezer trawler fleet in dialogue with the NLD and DEU NC	NCs (DE, NL)	TM 2024	The pilot study executed and analysed in 2022/2023 showed promising results. However, it focussed on only one species*area combination of the European pelagic freezer trawler fleet. In order to extend to the entire fleet, a common practically feasible protocol for all species*area combinations needs to be developed and tested.	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART I section 5.4.3, RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART III Chapter 9 ISSG Case Study Freezer Trawler Fleet Exploiting Pelagic Fisheries in the Northeast Atlantic.	NO	
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R07				Comments DM 2023		No further comments						
Diadromous	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R08	2023	R08	ongoing	Explore the feasibility and ensure the resources required for hosting the existing databases which are serving end-user needs of WGEEL in ICES servers	Explore the feasibility and ensure the resources required for hosting the existing databases which are serving end-user needs of WGEEL in ICES servers	ICES Secretariat, ICES DIG, COM, Non-EU Countries	TM 2024	Currently, no unified solution to host the mandatory data for diadromous species collected by member states in line with DCF exists. WGNAS and WGEEL have developed own databases,	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART I section 5.4.6, RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART III Chapter 13 ISSG Diadromous Species.	NO	
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R08				Result DM 2023		The original recommendation has been reformulated and merged with R09						
				Comments DM 2023		The original recommendation can be found in RCG NANSEA & Baltic Technical Meeting Report part I						

2023 Decision meeting – Report

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Status	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision to be taken by NC?	Formulation of the Decision
Diadromous	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R09	2023	R09	ongoing	Store and host all DCF-collected mandatory data on central ICES databases for better organization and accessibility for end users	Store and host all DCF-collected mandatory data on central ICES databases for better organization and accessibility for end users	WGRD BESGO ✓	TM 2024	Currently, no unified solution to host the mandatory data for diadromous species collected by member states in line with DCF exists. WGNAS and WGEEL have developed own databases, that comprise data beyond DCF collected data and are currently not compatible with RBDEs data structure.	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART I section 5.4.6; RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART III Chapter 13 ISSG Diadromous Species.	NO	
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R09				Comments DM 2023		Following on the discussions concerning ISSG Diadromous at the 2023 LM, R09 was merged with recommendation R08						
Stomach sampling	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R10	2023	R10	ongoing	MS participating in IBTS to incorporate not only stomach sampling but also stomach content analysis in the national work plans	MS participating in IBTS to incorporate not only stomach sampling but also stomach content analysis in the national work plans	NCs (DE, DK, FR, NL, SE)	TM 2024	So far only the sampling of the stomachs has been incorporated into the national work plans of MS, and the incorporation of the analyses of the stomach contents into the work plans of the relevant MS would significantly advance the regionally coordinated stomach sampling plan in the North Sea, Skagerrak and Kattegat.	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART I section 5.4.8; RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART III Chapter 15 Regionally Coordinated Stomach Sampling	NO	
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R10				Comments DM 2023		For the DM only the countries participating in IBTS North Sea case study on stomach sampling plan were considered but the recommendation is phrased more generally for all IBTS participating countries.						
RCGs Secretariat	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R11	2023	R11	ongoing	All MS to include the text about the long-term funding of the Secretariat under Textbox I.B. Other collection activities in their national work plans.	All MS to include the text about the long-term funding of the Secretariat under Textbox I.B. Other collection activities in their national work plans.	NCs	End of October 2023	Currently, in some MS the implementation of a long term (financial) scenario for RCG supporting services is a difficult process as it is not clear to some national administrations how to motivate the eligibility of the funds under the EMFAF national budget. To support the MS to explain to their respective administration, it is	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART I section 5.5.3	NO	



2023 Decision meeting – Report

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Status	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision to be taken by NC?	Formulation of the Decision
									recommended that all MS include the text in the National Work Plans, where it is clearly stated what is the link between these services and the support of the RCG work.			
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_R11				Comments DM 2023		No further comments						
ISSGs 2023-2024	NANSEA BALTIC_2023_D06	2023	D06	ongoing	Agree on proposed ISSGs to work during season 2023-2024 and ensure that experts and manpower is assigned to ISSG work.	The list of RCG ISSGs suggested by RCG NANS&EA and RCG Baltic to be confirmed to take place during season 2023-2024	NCs	DM 2023	Work in ISSG needs experts and manpower (approximately 1 week of work / ISSG and person). The ISSG work forces the MS to switch from working with a national focus to work with a more regional focus which is in line with idea of EU-MAP.	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2023 Report PART I section 5.5.6	YES	Do NCs agree on the list of ISSG for season 2023-2024 and ensure that experts and manpower is assigned to ISSG work?
NANSEA BALTIC_2023_D06				Result DM 2023		Agreed						
				Comments DM 2023		No further comments						

2023 Decision meeting – Report

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Status	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision to be taken by NC?	Formulation of the Decision
Surveys	NANSEA 2020_2020_R06	2020	R06	ongoing	Revision of the survey effort and coverage of the IBWSS	RCG NA NS&EA recommends ICES WGIPS to review the survey effort and coverage of the IBWSS and evaluate the impact of a 10% and 20% reduction in survey effort by Ireland and The Netherlands on the data quality of the survey indices. ICES to add this request to the ToRs of WGIPS for their work programme 2021; WGIPS to review and to summarise the results of their evaluation for the RCG NA NS&EA technical meeting in June 2021.	ICES WGIPS	01/06/2021	Since the 2017 implementation of the DCF recast, the participation by MS to surveys based on TAC shares has become mandatory for surveys listed in the EU-MAP. Currently, two surveys are subject to cost-sharing; the International Ecosystem Survey in the Nordic Seas (IESNS, also known as ASH) and the International Blue Whiting Spawning Stock survey (IBWSS). The EU part of the IBWSS is being carried out by Ireland and The Netherlands. As part of a multilateral agreement, Denmark, Germany, France and the United Kingdom contribute to the ship time cost with financial contributions proportional to their relative TAC share. Since 2019, Spain is also contributing ship time to the survey, however this is outside the multilateral agreement. The IBWSS will continue to be a mandatory survey under the new EU-MAP from 2022 onwards. In order to develop new task sharing agreements for the IBWSS including cost contributions under the next EMFAF programme, the RCG NA NS&EA recommends an evaluation of the current EU survey effort including the effect of the additional survey effort by Spain since 2019 and the impact of a potential reduction of survey effort by Ireland	RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2020 Report PART I section 5.4.1.1 (cost sharing agreements)	NO	

2023 Decision meeting – Report

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Status	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision to be taken by NC?	Formulation of the Decision
									and Netherlands by 10% and 20%, respectively.			
RDB overviews	NANSEA BALTIC_2022_R01	2022	R01	ongoing	ICES give download rights of RDB/RDBES data to ISSG chairs for the ISSG work	ICES give download rights of RDB/RDBES data to ISSG chairs for the ISSG work	ICES	DM 2022	At the moment RCG has not download rights and ISSG chairs have to do a request to ICES everytime they need the data. Direct access will increase the efficiency of ISSG work, which is especially relevant given the short deadlines ISSG has to prepare the overviews. *LDF also wants to give this recommendation (need for coordination)	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2022 Report PART I section 5.2.1, RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2022 Report PART III Chapter 2 ISSG RDB Catch, Effort and Sampling Overviews	NO	
SSF	NANSEA BALTIC_2022_R04	2022	R04	ongoing	Implement the collection of additional variables needed for SSF effort estimates in the control regulation.	COM to contact Control Regulation colleagues.	DG MARE / MSs	By the end of September 2022	Information collected from the control regulation (Council Regulation (EC) No. 1224/2009) named as transversal data (logbooks, sales notes, Vessel Monitoring System etc.) is one of the main source of information used also for scientific purposes. However, in the case of the SSF, due to the exemptions that these fleet have in the current regulation, there are shortcomings that make it	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2022 Report PART I section 5.4.5, RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2022 Report PART III Chapter 10 Evaluation of the Data Collected for SSF at EU level	NO	

2023 Decision meeting – Report

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Status	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision to be taken by NC?	Formulation of the Decision
									difficult to have a good understanding of the activity of this fleet. This is particularly the case for the vessels below 10m LOA, where filling logbooks is not mandatory etc. Some minimum information should be considered as mandatory considering management needs for scientist.			
PETS	NANSEA BAL TIC_ 2022_R0 5	2022	R05	ongoing	Implement the collection of additional variables needed for bycatch estimates in the control regulation.	COM to contact with Control Regulation colleagues.	DG MARE / MSs	By the end of September 2022	Information collected from the control regulation (Council Regulation (EC) No. 1224/2009) named as transversal data (logbooks, sales notes, Vessel Monitoring System etc.) is one of the main source of information used also for scientific purposes. However, in the case of the data needed for PETS bycatch-related advice, the information collected is not sufficient. Some needed fields are not mandatory to be provided in logbooks etc. For passive gears, soak time, number of nets, hooks, traps are essential information to provide sound PETS bycatch rates. It is necessary to make these fields mandatory in the logbooks for all fleet segments.	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2022 Report PART I section 5.4.6, RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2022 Report PART III Chapter I I Identification of Case Studies for PETS Bycatch Monitoring	NO	

2023 Decision meeting – Report

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Status	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision to be taken by NC?	Formulation of the Decision
PETS	NANSEA BALTIC_2022_R06	2022	R06	ongoing	Provide prioritization of PETS species list.	DGENV to prioritize PETS to be sampled by region.	DG ENV	By the end of September 2022	It is essential that there is prioritisation when sampling PETS for each of the regions. The PETS ISSG is working on possible coordinated sampling programmes at the regional level to start developing a specific plan to present to each of the MS. The priority should be decided by the COM to respond to the needs they have.	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2022 Report PART I section 5.4.6, RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2022 Report PART III Chapter I I Identification of Case Studies for PETS Bycatch Monitoring	NO	
Stomach sampling	NANSEA BALTIC_2022_R07	2022	R07	ongoing	Participation in the regional stomach analysis program.	MS should map the laboratory capacity and staffing situation in their own country and come to a decision on whether they can or want to process the samples in their own country, or whether they want to send them out. The aim is to prepare firm agreements for the RWP period 2025-2027.	NCs	DM 2022	The regionally coordinated stomach sampling case study in the North Sea has started in the first quarter 2022. Approximately 2 000 Stomach samples have been collected and a similar number of samples will be sampled during the third quarter IBTS 2022. All samples are stored in the freezers of the IBTS participating countries. In order to establish this as a coordinated stomach sampling program, the stomachs have to be analysed and made available to the relevant ICES working groups (e.g. WGSAM, WGNSSK).	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2022 Report PART I section 5.4.9, RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2022 Report PART III Chapter I 4 Regionally Coordinated Stomach Sampling	NO	
Stomach sampling	NANSEA BALTIC_2022_R08	2022	R08	ongoing	MS to evaluate options and capacities of national labs to become analysis hub for the collected IBTS case study stomachs.	MS to indicate if national lab can serve as stomach analysis hub for the collected IBTS stomachs. If so, MS to indicate the "exact" capacities and corresponding costs of	NCs	DM 2022	The regionally coordinated stomach sampling case study in the North Sea has started in the first quarter 2022. Approximately 2 000 Stomach samples have been collected and a similar number of samples will be sampled during the third quarter IBTS 2022. All samples are stored in the freezers of	RCG NANSEA RCG Baltic 2022 Report PART I section 5.4.9, RCG NA NS&EA RCG Baltic 2022 Report PART III Chapter I 4 Regionally	NO	

2023 Decision meeting – Report

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

ISSG/SG	ID	Year	R or D	Status	Short Description	Action to be taken	Responsible for the action	Deadline	Background for decision or recommendation	Where to find more details	Decision to be taken by NC?	Formulation of the Decision
						stomachs to be analysed annually. The aim is to prepare firm agreements for the RWP period 2025-2027.			the IBTS participating countries. In order to establish this as a coordinated stomach sampling program, the stomachs have to be analysed and made available to the relevant ICES working groups (e.g. WGSAM, WGNSSK).	Coordinated Stomach Sampling		

2023 Decision meeting – Report

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Decisions and recommendations

RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic – Next season (2023 - 2024)

Chairing

- RCG NANSEA: Josefine Egekvist (DNK) and Rita Vasconcelos (PRT)
- RCG Baltic: Maciej Adamowicz (POL)

Technical meeting – Dates and venue

- 11-14 June 2024; 1 day virtual meeting 4 June 2024
- Bremerhaven (Germany)

Intersessional groups

Subgroup	SG name short	ISSG chair
Enduser and RCG interaction	Enduser and RCG	RCG chairs
RDB catch, effort and sampling overviews	RDB Overviews	Ana Cláudia Fernandes, Lucia Zarauz
Metier and transversal variable issues	Transversal issues	Josefine Egekvist, Sébastien Demaneche
Data quality	Data quality	On hold
Diadromous Fishes	Diadromous	Marko Freese, ???
Surveys	Surveys	Sieto Verver, Christoph Stransky
Optimized and Operational Regional Sampling Plans	Umbrella	On hold
Case Study on the trawl fishery in Iberian Waters	CS trawler Iberian Waters	Rita Vasconcelos
Optimisation of PETS bycatch sampling	PETS	Estanis Mugerza
Case Study on freezer trawler fleet exploiting pelagic fisheries in the NEA	CS pelagic freezer trawler NEA	Jens Ulleweit, Andrew Campbell
Case study on fisheries for small pelagics in the Baltic	CS small pelagics Baltic	Katja Ringdahl, Marie Storr-Paulsen
Evaluation of the data collected for the SSF at EU level	SSF	Estanis Mugerza
Regionally coordinated stomach sampling	Stomach sampling	Pierre Cresson, Matthias Bernreuther
Recreational fishery	Recreational	Harry Strehlow
Development of Draft Regional Work plan	RWP	Joel Vigneau, Maria Hansson
National Correspondents	NC	Anna Hasslow
Electronic Monitoring Technologies	EMT	Gildas Glemarec, Pieter-Jan De Temmerman

2. RCG LP – Decisions and recommendations

The decision and recommendations from 2023 RCG Large Pelagics technical meeting are presented in following pages.

The 2023 RCG LP annual technical meeting was held in St Julian, Malta, 26 to 28th of June 2023. The final report is not available yet.

RCG LP – Participating countries

Croatia, Cyprus, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Malta, Portugal and Spain

RCG LP – Decisions and recommendations

Decision 01. Selection of regional database format to feed into a RDB	19
Recommendation 01. Transport/Movement of samples listed under CITES	20
Recommendation 02. Common Sampling Approach for EMS.....	21
Recommendation 03. Close-Kin Mark Recapture impact on Sampling design.....	21
Recommendation 04. Data requirements and data transmission issues.....	22
Recommendation 05. ISSG Métiers and transversal variable issues	23
Recommendation 06. ISSG Recreational Fisheries.....	24
Recommendation 07. Pan-regional ISSG Mediterranean Sea Large Pelagics.....	25
Recommendation 08. Attendance of National Correspondents at RCG LP.....	25
Recommendation 09. RWP – Roadmap	26

Decision 01. Selection of regional database format to feed into a RDB	
LP_2023_D01	Selection of a single regional database <u>format</u> which can feed RCG LP data into either RDBES or RDBFIS.
TOR 3	Development of a regional database for the RCG LP.
Justification	<p>During the RCG LP 2023 TM, the ISSG Large Pelagics Regional Database Development presented the ongoing issues surrounding selection of a regional data base.</p> <p>As a reminder, this ISSG was created in 2021 as a direct recommendation of the RCG LP 2021 annual meeting. The structure of this sub group was established to consider the diversity of the RCG LP's data input.</p> <p>In 2022, despite two dedicated meetings as well as the annual RCG LP T.M. no solution with regards to the selection of a regional data base was found. This is due to the lack of consensus among M.S. on their preference for either RDBES or RDBFIS database.</p> <p>In order to move forward and propose a partial solution, a reduction in the level of ambition was suggested by the ISSG. Instead of trying to select a unique database, the group focused on selecting a single database <u>format</u>.</p> <p>During the 2023 RCG LP T.M., with the available information and knowledge on the subject, the RDBES format was put forward as the most accepted format for data entry to regional databases, be it RDBFIS or RDBES.</p> <p>In any case further development will be necessary in all the different scenarios to fit with all the LP fisheries specificities. However, it was noted that the RDBES format is included (at least several hierarchies) in the RDBFIS database.</p> <p>During the meeting feedback from ISSG RDBES on the matter was received. According to this ISSG, this proposed solution would be very similar to the way that recreational data is currently being approached. The working group associated have proposed a format for recreational data which similar to the RDBES commercial catch and effort data format (data call with a submission of excel file sin the proposed format sent to the RDBES system).</p> <p>RDBFIS did not provide feedback on this solution during the RCG LP TM 2023.</p> <p>The proposal is a partial solution, in order to progress the requirement for a regional database for RCG LP</p>
Follow-up actions needed	Decision on a single regional format for RCG LP data input into an RDB.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	NC / Member States.
Time frame/Deadline	Decision Meeting 2023
Comments	
Results DM 2023	Not agreed. 3 MS in disagreement

Decision 01. Selection of regional database format to feed into a RDB

Comments DM 2023

HRV: expressed concerns with the decision and raised a question with regards to the RDBES data format, whether or not it is compatible with ICCAT format? Furthermore, asked whether this decision has been consulted with ICCAT previously as ICCAT is the main end-user of RCG LP.

GRC and MLT: Similarly, to HRV both MS have concerns with the decision. The data format issues should be clarified with ICCAT prior to taking a decision. Concerns with an increased burden for MS if data formats are not fully compatible. More information and clarifications should be sought from ICCAT and RDBFIS.

RCG LP chair: explained that ICCAT was consulted, however they did not want to get involved in the decision. RCG Chair added that the format issue does not affect how data is given/fed into ICCAT. The RCG chair will further explore this issue with ICCAT.

Els Torreele (WGRDBESGOV chair): praised the work of the group to try to find a solution for this long-standing issue. Els, as chair of the WGRDBESGOV, offered the possibility for the WG to have a look at the three data formats together: ICCAT, RDBES, RDBFIS and find commonalities and differences. RCG LP chair will further liaise with Els in this regard.

Recommendation 01. Transport/Movement of samples listed under CITES

LP_2023_R01

Revive former recommendation to address issues arising when transporting samples from one country to another for the purpose of genetic analysis of tissues, particularly during import the European Union. Issue is related to species listed under CITES and has remained unresolved since it was last put forward as a recommendation in 2019.

TOR 4

Sampling and regional working plans. Provide a global overview of observer coverage by country and gears.

Justification

Tissue sample movements for analysis have been hindered and or stopped by CITES on occasion, in particular when these samples are being shipped to a Member State in the European Union. ICCAT have had similar issue and so far this has not been resolved. CITES has not, to date, responded to a request for an exception. This has been an ongoing issue since 2019.

This mainly concerns sensitive species caught as bycatch (e.g. sharks) and the impediments that can occur when shipping samples owing to the CITES protocol. ICCAT has attempted to negotiate a solution, however the issue remains unresolved. There is a need for EU support on this matter and therefore the RCG LP proposes this as a formal recommendation in order to highlight the issue at hand and reactivate the former recommendation made in 2019.

Recommendation 01. Transport/Movement of samples listed under CITES	
Follow-up actions needed	Investigate possibility of an exception on sample movement from CITES, coordinated with ICCAT.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	European Commission
Time frame/Deadline	Before next RCG LP
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	COM will raise this issue at the bilateral meeting with ICCAT in October

Recommendation 02. Common Sampling Approach for EMS	
LP_2023_R02	Development of a joint sampling approach for the Electronic Monitoring (EM) programmes necessary as EM implementation is becoming more and more common in EU fisheries.
TOR 4	Sampling and regional working plans. Provide a global overview of observer coverage by country and gears.
Justification	Electric Monitoring is becoming a common tool for observer data collection and catch monitoring for all fisheries, in particular in purse seine fisheries. Development of joint sampling approach is necessary in order to have agreement on a common protocol going forward.
Follow-up actions needed	Avenue needed for participation in pan-regional EM subgroup organised by RCG NANSEA in order to promote this discussion.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	ISSG EMT (Electronic Monitoring Technologies)
Time frame/Deadline	End of 2024
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	Promote a pan-regional approach towards EMS; collaboration through the ISSG EMT established by the RCG NANSEA and RCG Baltic

Recommendation 03. Close-Kin Mark Recapture impact on Sampling design	
LP_2023_R03	CKMR sampling requirements may have an impact on sampling designs. A proper implementation plan is needed in order to correctly respond to the need of ICCAT's CKMR methodology.
TOR 4	Sampling and regional working plans. Provide a global overview of observer coverage by country and gears.
Justification	ICCAT's bluefin tuna species group's most recent developments are related to

Recommendation 03. Close-Kin Mark Recapture impact on Sampling design

the implementation of genomics, namely of CKMR methodology for the eastern bluefin tuna stock assessment.

Several aspects of CKMR are being considered:

- capacity to provide an abundance index;
- estimation of absolute abundance;
- reduce uncertainty in the context of management strategy evaluation (MSE).

If this method is approved for Eastern bluefin tuna stock assessment, this will have important implications for the GBYP biological sampling programme. One of the major limitations of this stock assessment method is that it requires a very large sampling scheme. DCF will need to move from a proportional sampling to a targeted sampling programme to respond the requirements of this genetics analysis method.

Sampling schemes for LP should be updated considering genetics and a possible future implementation of a CKMR approach in bluefin tuna or other species. Most of the assessment for BFT currently use data made available by GBYP and not from national efforts for the DCF. There is a need for coordination between sampling at national level through the DCF.

Should this method be implemented by ICCAT, the DCF there will be need to amend and adapt the sampling for CKMR sampling requirements as the current sampling level under DCF will not be sufficient. An implementation plan is therefore required in order to attain a suitable level of sampling for CMKR coordinated with ICCAT, particularly on standardized procedure.

Follow-up actions needed	Presentation to be made on the RCG LP and ISSG Bluefin tuna during the SCRS group on bluefin tuna meeting at ICCAT.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	EU delegation scientists – bluefin specialist attending the SCRS species group.
Time frame/Deadline	September 2024 at the ICCAT SCRS bluefin tuna species group meeting
Comments	Possibly addressed at the ICCAT 2023 SCRS.
Comments DM 2023	The ISSG Bluefin tuna is leading this recommendation

Recommendation 04. Data requirements and data transmission issues

LP_2023_R04	Following up on the process of transferring biological data from DCF to ICCAT; a need for improved harmonization on denomination of variables and coordination on metadata for traceability of biological samples between databases.
TOR 2	RFMOs feedback and summaries of possible issues, like data transmission

Recommendation 04. Data requirements and data transmission issues	
	failures or potential collaboration in data calls.
Justification	<p>ICCAT representatives from statistics and GBYP have been participating in LMs and RCG LP meetings since 2019 in order to improve coordination. The status of coordination efforts is not yet satisfactory according to the RFMO (e.g. request of information to DCG RCGLP have not been answered satisfactorily). Continued and improved coordination is recommended.</p> <p>Possibility of a new data call to be launched on the availability of relevant samples for ICCAT (to be discussed within the bluefin tuna SCRS group). ICCAT need to look at launching a dedicated data call for its specific needs; namely biological sampling data not just length data for example. ICCAT do not want to have to create a data call.</p> <p>Further/continued harmonization work on the denomination of variables has been request by ICCAT as there are currently many discrepancies in the denomination and interpretation of certain variables which creates issues when it comes to accessing the correct data.</p> <p>Traceability metadata on biological sampling is not available. Existing RDBFIS/RDBS data bases do not contain enough metadata to trace the data to the sample storage location. These two aforementioned databases do not contain fields to register this information. Improved metadata is needed to link the database containing A.R. extracted data with the ICCAT database containing biological samples, which would enable further consistency/coherence (Q.A/Q.C. checks).</p>
Follow-up actions needed	Include RFMO in the process of improving data transmission but also data requirements after database has been chosen for RCG LP.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	EU scientists attending the SCRS species group, RCG LP chairs, ISSG bluefin tuna, DG MARE ,Bluefin tuna in CPS advice group (ICES assessment)
Time frame/Deadline	After selection of regional data base and before next RCG LP T.M. and ICCAT SCRS species group meeting
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 05. ISSG Métiers and transversal variable issues	
LP_2023_R05	As métier codes listed in the reference list by RCG LP (amongst other RCGs) are being requested in data calls, there is a need to establish a pan regional procedure to manage the reference list. Furthermore, responsibilities need to be assigned to the RCGs, end users managing the data calls and the ISSG on Métier and Transversal Variable issues.
TOR I	Present and discuss the current structure approval of the RCG LP and of each subgroup, make a status check on each subgroup and promote the possibility of

Recommendation 05. ISSG Métiers and transversal variable issues	
	the group to express suggestions improvement or modifications in the structure/organisation.
Justification	<p>Continue collaboration with the ISSG on métier and transversal variables issues to update the reference list of métier codes for RCG LP (requirement to maintain information on target species in the code- Level 7 for FDI data call). RCG LP will coordinate and advise on the new métier codes requested to ensure that it follows agreed principles.</p> <p>The agreed reference list of métier codes is used as input for ICES and STECF FDI data calls. Codification developed by ISSG Métiers should take into account all the end users (RFMOs) and the need for the conversion of codes.</p> <p>The group will revise the table with new métier codes and transversal variables, if necessary, once a year and communicated to the ISSG Métiers and Transversal Issues</p>
Follow-up actions needed	RCG LP chairs should organise a meeting with ISSG on Métier and Transversal variable issues and MS national experts.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCGS NANSEA, BALTIC, MED&BS, LDF, LP, ISSG Métiers, STECF, ISSGs LP.
Time frame/Deadline	Prior to next RCG LP TM.
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 06. ISSG Recreational Fisheries	
LP_2023_R06	Recreational fisheries and associated data is relevant for different groups (RCGs). Need for increased communication and coordination and interaction between RCGs which have recreational fisheries and ISSG Recreational Fisheries.
TOR I	Present and discuss the current structure approval of the RCG LP and of each subgroup, make a status check on each subgroup and promote the possibility of the group to express suggestions improvement or modifications in the structure/organisation.
Justification	<p>This is an area of pan regional interest. When recreational fisheries affect the stocks, the national authority should ask for a biological sampling programme to assess/monitor the situation. If there is a significant catch effect this should be monitored. Additionally, this is where the RCG can play an important role in coordinating these efforts.</p> <p>There is need for increased communication and coordination, however it is not clear how to take this forward.</p>
Follow-up actions needed	ISSG Recreational fisheries chairs to take up this task with assistance from RCG LP Chairs

Recommendation 06. ISSG Recreational Fisheries	
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	ISSG Recreational fisheries chair and RCG LP chairs
Time frame/Deadline	Before RCG LP TM 2024
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	Promote a pan-regional approach, increase communication. Explore synergies between LP and NANSEA and Baltic.

Recommendation 07. Pan-regional ISSG Mediterranean Sea Large Pelagics	
LP_2023_R07	Progress in forming pan-regional ISSG Mediterranean Sea large pelagics fisheries between the RCG Mediterranean and Black Sea and RCG LP.
TOR I	Present and discuss the current structure approval of the RCG LP and of each subgroup, make a status check on each subgroup and promote the possibility of the group to express suggestions improvement or modifications in the structure/organisation.
Justification	At the RCG LP technical meeting in 2023, a request was placed for updates on progress on the forming of the ISSG on Mediterranean Sea Large Pelagics. Currently there has been no progress on the creation of this ISSG. This ISSG will be pan-regional and will therefore require nominations from the member states involved in the two parent regional coordination groups. RCG LP needs guidance on what additional needs this ISSG requires.
Follow-up actions needed	MS (NC) to nominate experts to the ISSG RCG LP and RCG Med & BS to coordinate on pan-regional ISSG logistics.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS, RCG LP chairs, RCG Med & BS chairs
Time frame/Deadline	Prior to RCG Med BS TM in 2024.
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	The possibility of setting up an ISSG on Med Long line fisheries with the RCG Med & BS will be explored.

Recommendation 08. Attendance of National Correspondents at RCG LP	
LP_2023_R08	Absence of National Correspondents at the regional coordination group on large pelagics is a concerning and ongoing issue. RCG LP recommend that national correspondents be present at the RCG's technical meeting, particularly for the last day. Alternatively, present on for the final two hours of the technical meeting where an overview can be provided. Additionally, should a national correspondent not be available to participate in the technical meeting, an acting national representative should be present. This national representative will need to be nominated to the technical meeting.

Recommendation 08. Attendance of National Correspondents at RCG LP	
TOR 1	Present and discuss the current structure approval of the RCG LP and of each subgroup, make a status check on each subgroup and promote the possibility of the group to express suggestions improvement or modifications in the structure/organisation.
Justification	<p>It is desirable that NCs attend the RCG technical meetings, however acknowledging the difficulties to attend them all, they should at least guarantee that all the countries in a given RCG are represented by the appointed experts as well as a national representative.</p> <p>The group recommends the presence of national correspondents, or appointed acting national representatives in lieu of national correspondents who cannot attend the hybrid T.M., on the last day of the technical meeting at minimum.</p> <p>There is an additional suggestion whereby a 2-hour timeslot on the agenda of the final day of the technical meeting could be used to update the NCs at to the proceedings, recommendations and decisions the RCG LP will put forward.</p> <p>In addition, N.C.s are recommended to nominate a country representative in advance of the meeting if they cannot be present.</p>
Follow-up actions needed	NC to appoint national representative prior to TM if unable to be present prior to TM and communicate this nomination to the chairs of the RCG LP.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	NC and MS.
Time frame/Deadline	Prior to the RCG LP TM 2024
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 09. RWP – Roadmap	
LP_2023_R09	Roadmap for adopting the agreed draft RWP from all RCG LP MS
TOR 4	Sampling and regional working plans. Provide a global overview of observer coverage by country and gears.
Justification	Updated draft RWP will be circulated to all RCG LP M.S. before Decision Meeting in 2023.
Follow-up actions needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circulate RWP by the RCG LP chairs • Reviewed by MS • Submission to COM
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCG LP chairs, NC/ MS
Time frame/Deadline	End of October 2023.
Comments	Prior to the DM 2023, only 2 MS have provided feedback to the draft RWP.
Results DM 2023	The recommendation was not addressed during the 2023 DM because MS did not receive the draft RWP well in advance.

Recommendation 09. RWP – Roadmap

Comments DM 2023

It was confirmed that Table 2.1 (Stocks) will not be included in the RWP LP. Additional time will be allowed for MS to review the draft RWP and provide feedback by 11 Oct. MS's feedback will be incorporated in the RWP prior to the official submission to COM on the 15th Oct 2023 for STECF evaluation.

RCG LP – Next season (2023-2024)

Chairing

In 2022, a randomising script was run to select a chair and co-chair, which were Ireland and Malta for the 1st rotation in 2023.

RCG LP CHAIRING SCHEDULE			
	YEAR	CHAIR	CO-CHAIR
1st rotation	2023	Ireland*	Malta
	2024	Malta	Portugal
	2025	Portugal	Cyprus
	2026	Cyprus	Greece
	2027	Greece	Italy
	2028	Italy	France
	2029	France	Spain
	2030	Spain	Croatia
	2031	Croatia	Ireland

**First Chair only one year to resume the cycle*

In case MS cannot chair the designated year, they can find a replacement chair among other MS to swap with.

→ Jurgen Mifsud (MLT) will become the main chair and Dália Reis (PRT) will co-chair alongside.

Comments DM 2023

PRT: Regarding the chairing for next season, PRT is not sure they can assure the co-chairing of the RCG LP at this stage.

RCG LP chair: acknowledged the situation exposed and asked PRT to come back to RCG LP chairs asap so the chairmanship of the group can be coordinated with other MS in case needed. Deadline, end of Jan 2024 at the latest.

Technical meeting – dates and venue

→ Meeting venue in Portugal is TBD (Portugal mainland or Azores?).

3. RCG LDF – Decisions and recommendations

The decisions from RCG Long Distance Fisheries 2023 technical meeting are presented below, there were no formal recommendations from the group. Further details can be found on the 2023 RCG LDF technical meeting report.

https://www.fisheries-rcg.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/2023_RCG-LDF_Report_final.pdf

RCG LDF – Participating countries

Germany, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Spain, The Netherlands, Estonia.

RCG LDF – Decisions and recommendations

Decision 01. Renewal of SPRFMO Multilateral agreement.....	29
Decision 2. Renewal of CECAF Multilateral agreement.....	30

Decision 01. Renewal of SPRFMO Multilateral agreement	
LDF-2023_D01	Extend the Multilateral Agreement between Germany, Lithuania, The Netherlands and Poland for biological data collection of pelagics fisheries in SPRFMO waters.
TOR 5	Future data collection set up in SPRFMO. Data collection of small pelagics in the SPRFMO area
Justification	<p>At the 2018 RCG LDF meeting, the multi-lateral agreement between Germany, Lithuania, Poland and The Netherlands for sampling small pelagics in SPRFMO waters was extended to 2020. At the 2020 meeting, similar to the CECAF agreement, the RCG agreed that the best option would be to extend the current agreement, which was approved at the decision meeting in September 2020 by extending the agreement to the end of 2023.</p> <p>As the agreement is ending in 2023 and in line with the 2022 RCG LDF recommendation, RCG LDF discussed extending the agreement into 2024, as this will be the last year under the current SPRFMO monitoring obligations. Starting from 2025 onwards, new obligations will be in place based on SPRFMO Observer Programme accreditation. RCG LDF concluded, therefore that the extension of the current agreement into 2024 is appropriate to ensure an efficient continuation of the data collection under the current obligations. The agreement will be proposed to the relevant NCs at the Decision Meeting in September 2023.</p>
Follow-up actions needed	In order to ensure an efficient continuation of the data collection, the draft agreements on the extension of the SPRFMO Multilateral Agreement will be proposed to the relevant NCs at the Decision Meeting in September 2023
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCG LDF chair; NCs (DEU, LTU, NLD, POL)
Time frame (Deadline)	Decision Meeting in September 2023
Comments	
Result DM 2023	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	SPRFMO Observer Programme Accreditation, the group has been working to address a newly required SPRFMO observer programme accreditation procedure to prepare for data collection in the SPRFMO area beyond 2024. During the LM 2023, a notification from SPRFMO Accreditation Evaluator (MRAG) was received that, based on the draft assessment report, the EU Observer Programme passed all the requirements without conditions and that MRAG recommends the programme for accreditation. The finalization and grant of the accreditation is expected on Q4 2023 or Q1 2024. After granting accreditation, new updates of the accreditation will be mandatory every 5 years.

Decision 2. Renewal of CECAF Multilateral agreement	
LDF_2023_D02	Extend the Multilateral Agreement between Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, The Netherlands and Poland for biological data collection of pelagics fisheries in CECAF waters.
TOR 5	Future data collection set up in CECAF. Data collection of small pelagics in the CECAF area – future Data needs
Justification	<p>At the 2017 RCG, a renewed agreement was reached for sampling small pelagics in CECAF waters. This agreement covered the period 2018-2020. At the 2020 meeting, the RCG agreed that the best option available would be to extend the current agreement. Subsequently, at the decision meeting in September 2020 this agreement was extended to the end of 2023.</p> <p>As the agreement is ending in 2023, and in line with the 2022 RCG LDF recommendation, RCG LDF discussed a further extension of the agreement into 2024 to align with an updated agreement for SPRFMO.</p>
Follow-up actions needed	In order to ensure an efficient continuation of the data collection, the draft agreements on the extension of the CECAF Multilateral Agreement will be proposed to the relevant NCs at the Decision Meeting in September 2023
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCG LDF chair; NCs (DEU, LVA, LTU, NLD, POL)
Time frame (Deadline)	Decision Meeting in September 2023
Comments	
Result DM 2023	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

RCG LDF – Next season (2023 – 2024)

Chairing

→ Maksims Kovsars (LVA) unanimously elected by the Group as the new chair of the RCG LDF.

Technical meeting – dates and venue

- The next RCG LDF meeting is planned for early July 2024 (the week 2–5 of July or alternatively 9-12 July),
- Spain kindly offered to host this meeting in Cadiz or Tenerife (t.b.d.)

4. RCG ECON – Decisions and recommendations

In the following pages the decisions and recommendation from RCG ECON 2023 Technical meeting are presented. Further details can be found on the 2023 technical meeting report. Additionally, the **Economic Issues Regional Work Plan** for data collection in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors 2025 -2027, can also be found in the report as annex III.

https://www.fisheries-rcg.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/2023_RCG-ECON_TM-report_final.pdf

RCG ECON – Participating countries

Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The Netherlands; Austria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia

RCG ECON – Decisions and recommendations

Decision 01. Feedback from ISSG Regional workplan (Fishn'Co) and RWP approval.....	32
Recommendation 01. Feedback from the ISSG Fish processing.....	33
Recommendation 02. Feedback from ISSG Fish processing	34
Recommendation 03. Feedback from ISSG Fish processing	35
Recommendation 04. Stakeholder feedback presentation by the Commission.....	36
Recommendation 05. Data needs to support the energy transition on EU fisheries and aquaculture	38
Recommendation 06. Feedback from ISSG Evaluation of tangible and intangible capital values.....	39
Recommendation 07. Feedback from ISSG Evaluation of tangible and intangible capital values.....	41
Recommendation 08. Feedback from ISSG Evaluation of tangible and intangible capital values.....	42
Recommendation 09. Feedback from ISSG Effects of alternative segmentation.....	43
Recommendation 10. Feedback from the STECF EWGs.....	44
Recommendation 11. Feedback from STECF EWG social & ICES social (national profiles, and analysis of social data).....	45
Recommendation 12. Fishn'Co: Roadmap for Quality assurance framework in work plans.....	46
Recommendation 13. Quality assurance framework and improving the data collection using digital data.....	47
Recommendation 14. Effect of inflation on the data collection programs - inventory of best practices and possible problems.....	48
Recommendation 15. Work towards combining FDI and AER data calls.....	49
Recommendation 16. RDBFIS II - Developing a module for socioeconomic data from the Mediterranean and Black Seas countries	50

Decision 01. Feedback from ISSG Regional workplan (Fishn'Co) and RWP approval	
ECON_2023_D01	RCG ECON agrees on the draft RWP as it was discussed during the meeting and recommends the national correspondents RCG decision meeting to agree with the draft RWP as it is now and propose it to STECF for evaluation.
TOR 3	Feedback from ISSG Regional Work Plan (Fishn'Co) and RWP approval
Justification	The Fishn'Co project produced the draft format for the RWP including the definitions agreed by the ISSG on the RWP. The group discussed the additional texts and agreed on the inclusion of the text as proposed by the chairs and the ISSG on the processing industry.
Follow-up actions needed	Discussion and agreement of the RWP by the RCG Decision meeting
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCG ECON chairs
Time frame (Deadline)	September 2023
Comments	Agreed
Result DM 2023	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 01. Feedback from the ISSG Fish processing	
ECON-2023_R01	The population of fish processing shall refer to enterprises whose main activity is defined according to the EUROSTAT definition under NACE Code 10.20: 'Processing and preserving of fish and fish products'. Accordingly, a footnote should be added in the Regional Work Plan draft with the definition of the frame population of fish processing enterprises. The group proposed a new definition for the variable raw material: 'Weight of raw material per species and origin (optional)' to be added in the RWP/guidance template. MS should provide raw material data using 3-alpha FAO code for species. Also in case the raw material reporting is based on 'commodities', to convert these 'commodities' into species.
TOR I	Feedback from ISSG Fish Processing
Justification	<p>Several data issues were detected during STECF EWG 21-14. RCG ECON 2022 proposed a workshop to solve these issues. A questionnaire on the possible issues was sent before the meeting, replies from 17 MS.</p> <p>Main issues found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frame population and identifying the main-activity enterprises and non-main activity enterprises. Approximately one-third of the MS have difficulties defining the frame population. The group suggested including a footnote to the Guidance for the Regional Work Plan with the definition of the frame population. • Low coverage and high heterogeneity in reporting when providing data on raw materials. The group suggested changing the name of the variable (raw materials) for the adaptation of the Regional Work Plan.
Follow-up actions needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Work Plan draft should take these modifications into account. • JRC should adjust the data call template for the raw material to allow MSs to clearly provide data in line with the 4 categories recommended by RCG ECON: Weight and value of raw material by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Species (3-letter FAO code) ○ Production environment Origin (Capture based fishery and aquaculture sector) ○ Country of Origin (Domestic, other EU, non-EU) <p>Recommendation: If collecting the volume of raw material also by typology of processing it is recommended to provide data according to the following categories: fresh, frozen and semi-processed materials.</p>
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCG ECON chairs to adjust the Regional Work Plan draft
Time frame/Deadline	2023 adjusting the Regional Work Plan draft
Comments	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 02. Feedback from ISSG Fish processing	
ECON_2023_R02	MS that has included the data collection of fish processing into their National Work Plans should collect the income and cost variables or social variables where possible that are part of the Regional Work Plan draft. MS are asked to follow the categories for social variables in the guidance document.
TOR I	Feedback from ISSG Fish processing
Justification	The current legislation does not include a Table of variables to be collected for the fish processing. Thus, the list of variables provided by the MSs can vary and some income or cost variables may be reported combined. In the light of the optionality characterising the fish processing data collection and emerging from the MSs replies on specific variables, e.g. the non-main “segment” (some MSs collecting both No. of enterprises and turnover, others just No.), the RCG ECON was asked to provide a general clarification on what can be considered optional or not, on the understanding that MSs are obliged to collect and report only what is planned in their approved Work Plans.
Follow-up actions needed	Update the guidance document for fish processing accordingly.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCG ECON chairs to update the guidance document accordingly. JRC to publish the guideline document on the data collection webpage.
Time frame/Deadline	2023
Comments	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 03. Feedback from ISSG Fish processing	
ECON_2023_R03	To consider including two turnover variables in the future in the data collection: Turnover or Gross premium written (e.g. total turnover) and Turnover from the principal activity at 3-digit level NACE Rev. 2 as in SBS.
TOR I	Feedback from ISSG Fish processing
Justification	The definition of turnover was discussed thoroughly in ISSG fish processing and it was noted that the current definition differs from the definition of turnover in the SBS. The group acknowledges that SBS data provide two variables: Turnover or Gross premium written (e.g. total turnover) and Turnover from the principal activity at 3-digit level NACE Rev. 2. In order to have a full picture of the income returns from different activities, the group suggests having turnover from the main-activity (fish processing) and turnover from non-main activities reported separately.
Follow-up actions needed	Discuss the proposal during the development of the new DCF
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCG ECON chairs
Time frame/Deadline	2025
Comments	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 04. Stakeholder feedback presentation by the Commission

ECON_2023_R04

Member States should decrease the response burden for the data providers and make every effort to combine the questionnaires on different subjects and make them available online where possible. The group would like to remind that the members of the EU producer organisations can apply as observers in the STECF EWG on aquaculture.

TOR 2

Stakeholder feedback presentation by the Commission

AAC 2021-04 gave several recommendations on the DCF (March 2021). RCG ECON reviewed these recommendations and considered the following points (3 and 5) as the most relevant:

Point 3. Member States should make every effort to combine the questionnaires and make them available online.

Combining social data into economic surveys is becoming common practice, and the same approach should be encouraged for environmental data. The efficient use of online questionnaires for data transfer is essential for simple and fast collection and analysis.

Point 5. A feasibility study should investigate the potential for farmers' associations to play an active role in collecting data. Cooperation of the producers' associations is indispensable for several reasons:

- They are an end user—the link between detailed indicators (as proposed below) and data collection will be beneficial for prioritisation and implementation.
- To promote the legitimacy of analysis based on that data so that results are not disputed or discredited as being based on biased information.
- Data analysis should remain to be executed by organisations already involved in the compilation of statistical data.

After COM answer (July 2021), AAC followed up: The AAC would also welcome the Commission's support to encourage Member States to achieve recommendation 3 via the Open Method of Cooperation.

COM replied (January 2023) that DG MARE acknowledges the AAC recommendation on the questionnaires which is addressed to the MS and will bring it to the attention of the RCG ECON.

Recommendation 5 has been partly reiterated in [AAC 2022-17 Recommendation on STECF Aquaculture Report 2022](#) (June 2022).

Point 2. Explore options for involving EU producer organisations in data collection.

Justification

Recommendation 04. Stakeholder feedback presentation by the Commission

	COM replied (January 2023) that regarding the options to include producer organisations in data collection, the relevant forum to discuss such options would be the RCG ECON.
Follow-up actions needed	MS should combine the questionnaires on different subjects and make them available online where possible.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS and STECF EWG aquaculture
Time frame/Deadline	By the next aquaculture data call and STECF EWG aquaculture meeting in 2024.
Comments	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 05. Data needs to support the energy transition on EU fisheries and aquaculture	
ECON_2023_R05	The RCG ECON recommends organizing a workshop to discuss the methods used for the data collection and estimation of energy consumption. Based on the results from this workshop, pilot studies could be included in the national work plans on providing more data on energy consumption in the fleet and aquaculture sectors. This can be done after end users have provided more guidance on the data needs.
TOR 4	Data needs to support the energy transition on EU fisheries and aquaculture
Justification	From the end user's perspective more data on energy consumption is needed for an improved economic and policy analysis. Fluctuating energy prices in the recent year creates profitability problems in the fleet and aquaculture sectors. The EU Commission has also set up a target of being carbon neutral by 2030. There is a current need to improve the quality and coverage of energy consumption data. RCG ECON needs more guidance from the end users about what additional data is needed.
Follow-up actions needed	Organising a workshop for sharing the best practices on the data collection and estimation of the energy consumption for the fleet. The workshop should also consult end users to understand if more detailed data is needed in order to respond to the broadening data needs of the end users.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCG ECON chairs
Time frame/Deadline	2023
Comments	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 06. Feedback from ISSG Evaluation of tangible and intangible capital values

<p>ECON_2023_R06</p>	<p>MS should report assumptions used when applying PIM for valuing the fleet or the alternative methods of PIM in the NWP and AR. In the case the alternative valuation method to PIM is used, MS should provide justification for this. MS should also describe the method used to estimate investments and intangible assets in the methodological Annex of the NWP.</p> <p>A detailed description of the methods used to estimate investments (PIM or other methods) by segments would be reported in the methodological Annex of the NWP. In the NWP to specify which variables are collected according to the methodologies adopted (e.g PIM – sales of onboard equipment, SURVEY – sales and purchases of onboard equipment).</p> <p>MS should also include the methods of estimation of intangible assets by segment in the methods section of the NWP and AR. The outcomes of the valuations should be reported in data calls, but MSs should add a warning in the comments, i.e. not to use the data as this is a work in progress.</p>
<p>TOR 5</p>	<p>Feedback from ISSG Evaluation of tangible and intangible capital values</p>
<p>Justification</p>	<p>A detailed description of PIM assumptions, by fleet segments, should be reported in the methodological Annex of the National Work Plan. In case PIM is not applied and methods of estimation of fixed capital are implemented, according to the Guidelines MSs are requested to justify this choice in their NWP and AR. The methodology for determining the discount rates and life times for fishing rights could be harmonized further.</p>
<p>Follow-up actions needed</p>	<p>The Work plan guidance should be updated considering these recommendations. To report in the methodological Annex of the NWP a description of PIM assumptions used should be given for valuing the fleet, by fleet segments according to the following scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data sources for vessel value used for PCU • Price per capacity unit (to be included in the AR) • Service life by assets • Depreciation rates by assets and depreciation scheme • Assets share on total fixed value • Price indexes used <p>According to the Guidelines Investments in tangible assets= Gross investment in vessel and onboard equipment minus sales of (vessel and) onboard equipment. Methodologies include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Obtained directly from survey 2. Estimated from PIM method 3. Obtained from administrative source

Recommendation 06. Feedback from ISSG Evaluation of tangible and intangible capital values

	<p>However, with PIM it is not possible to produce net investment as currently defined as the use of PIM does not allow to estimate sales of onboard equipment but only the estimated “gross investments” in vessel and onboard equipment.</p>
<p>Responsible persons for follow-up actions</p>	<p>MS to report in the NWP and AR the assumptions used in PIM or alternative methods used for estimating the capital value of the fleet and investments. To specify how the data for sales of onboard equipment has been collected or estimated, eg.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sales of onboard equipment if PIM is used, 2. Sales and purchases of onboard equipment if a SURVEY is carried out. <p>Sales and purchases of onboard equipment if BALANCE SHEETS are used</p>
<p>Time frame/Deadline</p>	<p>2024</p>
<p>Comments</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>Comments DM 2023</p>	<p>No further comments</p>

Recommendation 07. Feedback from ISSG Evaluation of tangible and intangible capital values

ECON_2023_R07	The RCG ECON recommends a study on the hedonic valuation of intangibles and a workshop on valuation of intangible assets. When applying the discounted cash flow method for valuing the fishing rights, RCG ECON recommends the MSs to consider the ISSG recommendations (eg. using gross vs. net profit for valuation).
TOR 5	Feedback from ISSG Evaluation of tangible and intangible capital values
Justification	<p>The current implementation the hedonic valuation by MS is low, and the data collection context might not result in increased involvement of MS. Therefore, more cases would be needed to gain experience with this method.</p> <p>An exchange of experiences with the valuation of intangibles is very useful and leads to further development of these methods. Therefore, a series of follow up meetings for exchange of experiences will be needed in the coming years to increase the application of the methods and the quality of the resulting estimates. Sometimes MS end up having negative values for fishing rights when applying the Discounted Cash Flow Method using net profit. The ISSG proposed to use the gross profit, which might be a better proxy of current cash flows than net profit that already considers a capital cost.</p>
Follow-up actions needed	<p>A study on the hedonic valuation of intangibles.</p> <p>To organise a workshop on valuation of intangible assets to increase MS involvement and to gain more experience with the methods and enable the discussion on different and potential indicators.</p>
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS, ISSG chairs
Time frame/Deadline	2024
Comments	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 08. Feedback from ISSG Evaluation of tangible and intangible capital values	
ECON_2023_R08	Price per capacity unit and PIM assumptions should be regularly updated so that changes in technologies and investments can be better considered.
TOR 5	Feedback from ISSG Evaluation of tangible and intangible capital values
Justification	<p>Many differences exist among MS in the estimation of the Price per capacity unit and for this reason surveys to estimate the reference prices and other PIM assumptions should be regularly carried out.</p> <p>Evidence from MSs application also highlight that, in case of questionnaires asking for estimated market value according to the vessels' owners, it is necessary to ask separately for the value of licenses and for the value of tangibles, taking into account that the market value of a vessel is heavily affected by the value of licenses.</p> <p>Over the last years technical innovations (mainly in fuel efficiency and alternative fuels) are being implemented and this might have important implications in the PCU of newly built vessels and in the cost structure of these vessels. The group suggests looking into this development and the consequences for the use of the replacement value based on newly built vessels and envisages that a diversification of the PCU per vintage vessel class could be an option to mitigate this issue.</p> <p>More analyses and surveys are needed on the service life of assets to collect more details on the composition of the "other equipment" group of assets (which is deemed to include very different type of assets) to better tailor PIM assumptions to the real cycles of capital of a vessel.</p>
Follow-up actions needed	MS should update regularly the assumptions used in PIM to evaluate and to take into account the impact of changes in technologies and investments.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS
Time frame (Deadline)	2023 - 2024
Comments	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 09. Feedback from ISSG Effects of alternative segmentation

<p>ECON_2023_R09</p>	<p>RCG ECON recommends continuing the development of the alternative segmentation approach in the next year to further analyse the issue of pre-segmenting by gear as well as the question of how to address the use of various gears by vessel (polyvalency) throughout the year. Moreover, the grouping of catches to describe typical catch profiles should be assessed.</p> <p>Moreover, RCG econ recommends to the group to extend the analyses on the consistency of the segmentation result over longer time periods and the regional comparison of the resulting segments in order to assess if the novel approach also leads to results that may facilitate better quality regional analyses.</p>
<p>TOR 6</p>	<p>Feedback from ISSG Effects of alternative segmentation</p>
<p>Justification</p>	<p>The results of the ISSG were presented. The group made progress on the pre-segmentation of the fleets and showed the results from cases for which the segmentation worked and also some cases for which the application of the alternative approach did not result in more homogeneous fleet segments. The group found four criteria for proper segmentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connection to specific fisheries (high priority): Segmentation should aim for a closer link of segments to stocks or groups of stocks. • Cost structure (high priority): Segments should combine vessels with homogeneous cost structure (reflected by indicators or proxies) • Feasibility (high priority): The segmentation procedure has to be clear, doable without excessive extra burden, and repeatable. • Compatibility (lower priority): It is desirable that the segmentation is compatible with an existing time series. <p>The novel segmentation has a more direct link to the fish stocks and may lead to a lower number of segments in some cases. In other cases, the method still results in a large number of small highly specific segments which might be due to the use of multiple gears by individual vessels and the occurrence of a high number of species and stocks in the catch. In order to further increase the usefulness of the method the group proposes to carry out additional analyses on these topics (standardising the use of gears in the pre-segmentation and the segmentation of species). Besides RCG econ concluded that although there are some indicative results about the effects of the alternative segmentation on the variability of the cost structure in the segments and clusters, these analyses, would need to be extended. Also, the consistency of the segmentation approach through time and among MS could be elaborated further.</p>
<p>Follow-up actions needed</p>	<p>The group identified a need for an additional workshop to solve the issues identified by the ISSG: standardising the use of gears in the pre-segmentation and the dimensionality reduction of heterogeneous, diverse catch profiles.</p>
<p>Responsible persons for follow-up actions</p>	<p>Jörg Berkenhagen, Erik Sulanke</p>
<p>Time frame/Deadline</p>	<p>Before the next RCG ECON.</p>
<p>Comments</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Recommendation 09. Feedback from ISSG Effects of alternative segmentation

Comments DM 2023

There is an ongoing collaboration between *ISSG Effects of alternative segmentation* and *ISSG Metier and transversa variables issues* in order to align the approaches and to avoid duplications between the groups.

Recommendation 10. Feedback from the STECF EWGs

ECON_2023_R10

Voluntary variables (Geo indicator, Gear, Fishery, Activity level) should be used only for the purpose they are designed for following the guidelines in data collection website and they should be used consistently in time. New length class should be applied for the Baltic Sea (0-8 m and 8-12 m). The group recommends using these new classes for the whole time series where possible based on the data available.

TOR 7

Feedback from the STECF EWGs

Justification

In the data call for AER 2023 there were new voluntary variables included: Geo indicator, Gear, Fishery, Activity level. Some MS used these voluntary variables when reporting the data for AER, but the variables were not always used appropriately. In addition, there are new length classes for Baltic Sea SCF in the current regulation:

VL0008 = Vessel less than 8 meters in length.

VL0812 = Vessel between 8 and 12 meters in length.

Only a few member states in the Baltic Sea region provided the data using the new vessel length classification. For the next data call for AER, the new length classification should be applied, ideally for the whole time series depending on the data availability in the MS of Baltic Sea region.

Follow-up actions needed

In the next data call for AER the MSs should consider these recommendations.

Responsible persons for follow-up actions

MS to follow the recommendation by RCG ECON.

Time frame/Deadline

2023 onwards

Comments

Agreed

Comments DM 2023

No further comments

Recommendation 11. Feedback from STECF EWG social & ICES social (national profiles, and analysis of social data)	
ECON_2023_R11	RCG ECON recommends that the working groups of STECF and ICES which are concerned with the development of the social variables to take into consideration the practical aspects of data collection and data availability and that the timelines for adjustment of the DCF are adhered to.
TOR 8	Feedback from STECF EWG social & ICES social (national profiles, and analysis of social data)
Justification	Both in ICES and STECF work has been carried out to implement the social dimension of the CFP. For the data collection this involves further development of the exploitation of the variables that are currently already included in the DCF and potentially extending the data collection on social aspects with new variables. RCG Econ discussed these developments and adjusted the guidelines for the social variables where needed. With regards to the possible inclusion of new variables RCG Econ concluded that the practical aspects of collection of the data and availability from other sources should be taken into account.
Follow-up actions needed	
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	STECF
Time frame/Deadline	2023-2025
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	STECF and ICES to take into consideration the practical aspects of data collection on social variables

Recommendation 12. Fishn'Co: Roadmap for Quality assurance framework in work plans	
ECON_2023_R12	To follow the roadmap presented in the RCG ECON 2023 for developing the quality assessment system and developing evaluation criteria or appropriate indicators to the quality assessment system in the coming years. Organising an ISSG on quality assurance framework and reporting the best practices.
TOR 10	Fishn'Co: Roadmap for Quality assurance framework in work plans
Justification	<p>Currently the reporting on quality and methodology for the data collection framework is very limited, incomparable between MS and hardly accessible for end users. The next version of the DCF will start from 2027 onwards. Before it would be good to have a revised and enhanced quality assurance framework and quality reporting system up and running. This system of evaluation can only be incorporated in case the MS have clear guidelines on how to report on methods and quality. These guidelines are also lacking now.</p> <p>The objective of Fishn'Co task was to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Develop a set of clear guidelines on methodology reporting and quality reporting for the MS 2) Develop a set of evaluation criteria for National Work Plans and Annual reports on methodology reporting and quality reporting. <p>Because the current guidelines and reporting is rather fragmented, an iterative process with the MS is needed to come to these objectives.</p> <p>The following roadmap for the RCG ECON work was suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2022: Setting up timetable and roadmap for the RCG Econ process • 2023 RCG ECON: Deciding on roadmap. • 2023 ISSG (online): WS on current quality assurance framework and reporting and best practices • 2024 RCG ECON: Discuss outcomes of WS and agree on initial quality criteria and reporting guidelines • 2025: Test by MS (through ad hoc contracts or ISSG work) • 2025 RCG ECON: Discuss outcomes of the test and agree on final criteria for methodology reporting and data quality reporting.
Follow-up actions needed	Organising an ISSG on quality assurance framework and reporting and best practices.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	ISSG chairs
Time frame/Deadline	2023
Comments	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 13. Quality assurance framework and improving the data collection using digital data	
ECON_2023_R13	The group recommends increasing exchange of information about the implementation of the EU MAP in the various MS. The format for the PACIOLI (Pacioli) was mentioned as an example. The ISSG on Statistical Issues and Methodologies (SIM) will be revived in order to facilitate this exchange.
TOR II	Quality assurance framework and improving the data collection using digital data
Justification	The group discussed the existence of various digital sources of information as input for the DCF data. The group concluded that because of differences in time lags and quality considerations, the general use of these data sources is not an option, but it would be useful to gain better insight in the tools that various MS are using to collect data (either in digital form or other). Therefore, more exchange of the implementation details of the NWP in the various MS would be useful to learn from one another.
Follow-up actions needed	ISSG on Statistical Issues and Methodologies (SIM) to take up this task.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	ISSG chairs
Time frame/Deadline	2023
Comments	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 14. Effect of inflation on the data collection programs - inventory of best practices and possible problems	
ECON_2023_14	RCG Econ recommends that in the process of the revision of the new DCF and the possible inclusion of new variables, the increased costs of collection of the information is being taken into account.
TOR 13	Effect of inflation on the data collection programs - inventory of best practices and possible problems
Justification	The groups discussed that many countries' data collection programmes are affected both directly and indirectly by the increased costs of fuel and general price levels. Many MS foresee problems in funding all their data collection activities in the coming years. Indirectly, increasing fuel prices are resulting in changes in both the fishing fleet, aquaculture and fish processing and also the general price levels, and interest rates have an influence on the economic viability of the sectors. As such the activities on the various data collection programs may also change accordingly, but it is good to realise that a decrease in the size of the sector will not result in a proportional decrease in data collection costs.
Follow-up actions needed	None
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	None
Time frame/Deadline	
Comments	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 15. Work towards combining FDI and AER data calls

ECON_2023_R15	To organise a workshop on raising transversal data from FDI data call for the AER report purposes. The workshop should also include experts working with the FDI data call. This workshop should take into account the work that has been done in the FDI meeting on 9/2023 on comparing the FDI and AER data. The workshop should also consider responses from the questionnaire regarding harmonization data submission for AER and FDI data calls (landings, effort and capacity) that is analysed in STECF EWG 23-10 FDI.
TOR 12	Work towards combining FDI and AER data calls
Justification	In recent years, there have been efforts to harmonise definitions used in different data calls and to decrease the amount of data calls on transversal variables. The goal is to submit all the transversal data needed for the AER and FDI in one data call (=FDI). Steps towards this goal have been taken during the 2023, and next the FDI meeting in 9/2023 will compare the data from AER and FDI data calls to see if there are discrepancies in the data reporting between these two data calls. A questionnaire regarding harmonization data submission for AER and FDI data calls (landings, effort and capacity) is sent to the data providers to collect data. The questionnaire is to be filled in by data submitters for AER and FDI data for analysis in the STECF EWG 23-10 FDI. After that, a test run on raising the transversal variables from FDI for the purposes of the Annual Economic Report is needed. This could be done in a workshop including economists and the experts preparing the FDI data.
Follow-up actions needed	To organise a WS on raising transversal data from FDI data call for the AER report purposes.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	WS chair
Time frame/Deadline	2023
Comments	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 16. RDBFIS II - Developing a module for socioeconomic data from the Mediterranean and Black Seas countries

ECON-2023_16	RCG ECON acknowledges the fact that the combination of the socio-economic data with other data sources (e.g. FDI) will enhance the quality of the data and facilitate a more efficient data reporting the DCF framework although duplication of data submission should be avoided. RCG ECON recommended to be updated on the progress in the project.
TOR 16	RDBFIS II: Developing a module for socioeconomic data from the Mediterranean and Black Seas countries
Justification	The outcomes of the RDBFIS project were presented, which ended RDBFIS is a web-based integrated fisheries information system for the MED&BS. The base of the system is the regional database and it also includes data processing facilities, GUI through end user interaction and facilities for data uploading. It also includes a large variety of databases: a.o. FDI, spatial data, biological data, environmental data, Medits data. The new project on the further development of RDBFIS was started 1st of April 2023. One of the activities is to incorporate the data of the fleet register and develop a module for the development of fishing activities. Also, the economic data will be incorporated. The advantage of incorporating this data will be to cross check data with the other included data bases. Another objective is to use the database as a source for integrated analysis. RCG ECON supports the activities of RDBFIS in order to incorporate the socio-economic data into the RDBFIS database. RCG ECON acknowledges the fact that the combination of the socio-economic data with other data sources (e.g. FDI) will enhance the quality of the data and facilitate a more efficient data reporting the DCF framework although duplication of data submission should be avoided.
Follow-up actions needed	Planning a presentation of the project for the next RCG Econ meeting
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	ISSG chairs
Time frame/Deadline	2024
Comments	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

RCG ECON – Next season (2023-2024)

Chairing

→ Hans Oostenbrugge (NLD) main chair; together with Irene Tzouramani (GRC) co-chair.

Technical meeting – dates and venue

- Preliminary dates May
- Venue: TBD, Athens?

Intersessional work

→ 5 ISSG or subgroups in total:

1. Workshop on methods on energy consumption (Rec. 5)
2. Workshop on valuation of intangible assets (Rec. 7)
3. ISSG on quality assurance framework and reporting the best practices (Rec. 12)
4. Workshop on raising transversal data from FDI data call for the AER report purposes (Rec. 15)
5. Alternative fleet segmentation (Rec. 10)

5. RCG Med&BS – Decisions and recommendations

The recommendations from 2023 RCG Mediterranean and Black Sea technical meeting are presented in following pages.

The 2023 RCG Med&BS annual technical meeting took place recently in Madrid, 29 Aug to 1 Sep. The final report is not available yet.

RCG Med&BS – Participating countries

Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy, Malta, Romania, Slovenia, Spain.

RCG Med&BS – Decisions and recommendations

Decision 01. RWP – Roadmap.....	53
Recommendation 01. Data requirements and data transmission issues.....	53
Recommendation 02. Information included in RCG Med&BS Data Call.....	54
Recommendation 03. Marine Action Plan – role of RFMOs	55
Recommendation 04. Marine Action Plan – Inclusion in the WVP activities covered by other programmes....	56
Recommendation 05. Surveys – Sampling season for scientific surveys	57
Recommendation 06. Surveys – Quality checks.....	58
Recommendation 07. Surveys – Acoustic data collection during the pelagic trawl surveys in the Black Sea ..	59
Recommendation 08. Surveys – test study for new sampling during acoustic MEDIAS survey.....	60
Recommendation 09. Data Calls – increasing demand on MS	61
Recommendation 10. RDBFIS – Regional Data Base.....	62

Decision 01. RWP – Roadmap	
Med&BS_2023_R11	Roadmap for adopting the agreed draft RWP from all Med&BS MS
TOR 5	Regional Work Plan for the Mediterranean and Black Sea
Justification	Updated draft RWP will be circulated by all Med&BS MS by Wednesday 13 th of September to final agreement on RCG Decision Meeting.
Follow-up actions needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circulate RWP by the RCG Med&BS chairs • Reviewed by MS • Submission to COM after the RCG Decision Meeting
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RCG Med&BS, MS
Time frame/Deadline	LM 2023
Comments	
Result DM 2023	Agreed
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 01. Data requirements and data transmission issues	
Med&BS_2023_R01	Following-up the process of transferring biological data from Mediterranean and Black Sea Data Call to FDI, including in the process the RCG Med&BS
TOR 1	End- users input - Data requirements and data transmission issues
Justification	<p>Currently, information of biological data from the Mediterranean and Black Sea is being submitted in a Data Call with specific formats. In addition to this, MS submit data to the FDI. A process has started to include data from the official Med&BS Data Call to the FDI. However, it would be necessary include in the “Id” field in the Med&BS Data Call the information of “Domain” to make possible the transfer of information. Although there was a proposal to do this in the Med&BS Data Call 2024, there are still concerns about the possibility and adequacy to do so. For this reason, it was proposed to include the RCGMed&BS in the follow-up of this topic.</p> <p>In addition to this, the role of the RDBFIS in the data transmission process should also be considered in the future.</p>
Follow-up actions needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include in the discussion the RCGMed&BS
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	FDI JRC focal, DGMARE, RCG Med&BS chairs, STECF
Time frame/Deadline	Before making any modifications to the Data Call Med&BS
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 02. Information included in RCG Med&BS Data Call	
Med&BS_2023_R02	For the RCG Med&BS Data Call, it is reminded that landings data by species submitted by MS should only include those species and GSAs included in Table IA of the Delegated Decision (EU) 2021/1167. If a combination species-GSA is not in this table, this information should not be submitted by MS.
TOR I	End- users input - Data requirements and data transmission issues
Justification	<p>Before the RCG Med&BS, a Data Call is yearly launched to collect information of landings by species and catches (biomass, value and effort) by metier. Regarding the landings data, information is submitted for those species and GSAs included in Table IA from the Delegated Decision (EU) 2021/1167. However, in this table not all the combinations of species-GSAs are included. MS should only submit the data for those cases in which the information is included in this table.</p> <p>MS agreed to provide data only for those stocks for which data collection is mandatory based on the EU MAP and resulting WP.</p>
Follow-up actions needed	Submit the landing in accordance to the requested table.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MS
Time frame/Deadline	Next RCG Med&BS Data Call
Comments	
Result DM 2023	
Comments DM 2023	<p>GRC: Proposed alternative text for the <i>Justification</i> text above prior to the DM. In order to allow MS to provide data for other species that might not be included in the table.</p> <p>RCG Med&BS: the alternative text was not considered relevant as MS will be allowed to include any species they wish to monitor at national level in their respective NWP. Data calls is issued at national level, the list of species is not exclusive.</p> <p>DG MARE: Data is sent in response to the RCG Med&BS data call to calculate the most important métiers, it is linked to the sharing of landings. In previous years, the calculation of the sharing of landings was not adequate because MS submitted data for other species.</p>

Recommendation 03. Marine Action Plan – role of RFMOs	
Med&BS_2023_R03	Including RFMOs with influence in the Mediterranean (GFCM and ICCAT) in the special group DGENV and taking into account their work plans and the already existing guidelines (ex. FAO guidelines)
TOR 2	COM input on priorities and relevant initiatives
Justification	<p>The Marine Action Plan was adopted on 21 February 2023 in the ‘Fisheries and Ocean’ package together with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFP functioning report – relevant for DCF e.g. recreational fisheries • Energy transition in the EU fisheries and aquaculture – relevant for possible socioeconomic data collection – follow-up at RCG ECON technical meeting • Common market organisation – implementation report <p>The plan is focussed in assessing the state of seas and the sustainability of fisheries, being a bridge between fisheries and environment worlds. It is built on existing legislative framework for both areas</p> <p>The plan aims at improving gear selectivity and address bycatch of sensitive species and protecting the seabed. Thus, it should get sound knowledge base through systematic data collection and scientific monitoring, to assess impact of fishing on marine habitats and species. This would be done through targeted bycatch monitoring programmes, covering high-risk fisheries and the potential impacts of all relevant fleet segments, including smaller vessels and looking at data on recreational fisheries, including recreational fishing boats. However, some of these activities are currently part of research programs or workplans of RFMOs operating in the Mediterranean, such as GFCM and ICCAT, so they should be part of the process of implementing the Marine Action Plan. Additionally, already available guidelines for some type of sampling (like FAO guidelines for vulnerable species) should be respected.</p>
Follow-up actions needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include RFMOs operating in the Mediterranean and Black Sea in the process of implementation of the Marine Action Plan • Take into account the already available guidelines for some type of sampling (like FAO guidelines for vulnerable species)
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	DGENV, DGMARE
Time frame/Deadline	In the next meeting of this special group at the latest
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 04. Marine Action Plan – Inclusion in the WP activities covered by other programmes	
Med&BS_2023_R04	Establishing guidelines on how to include work done by other programmes or projects (e.g. MSFD) in the WP
TOR 2	COM input on priorities and relevant initiatives
Justification	Currently, marine data is collected not only from the DCF but also from other programmes (such as Marine Strategy Framework Directive) and projects. With the increasing sampling that the implementation of the Marine Action Plan will bring, it is important to coordinate the activities of the different programmes, in order of not to duplicate efforts, but also to inform the relevant authorities (DGMARE, DGENV) of the work performed in these other programmes. However, if these activities are included in the WPs, it would imply a request of funding, which would not be needed as these programmes have their own sources of funding. So, it is necessary to establish clear guidelines on how MS can communicate the different activities carried out under these programs and how to integrate all the data collected by them.
Follow-up actions needed	Establish clear guidelines to MS about how to integrate all the data collected by different programmes
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	LM, DGMARE, STECF, RCGs, MSs
Time frame/Deadline	LM 2023
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	Text Box IB of the WP was proposed as a possible solution. More discussions are expected in the joint special group in support of the MAP meeting on 6 October 2023.

Recommendation 05. Surveys – Sampling season for scientific surveys	
Med&BS_2023_R05	Establishing a limit period of time for which the seasonality of the scientific surveys (e.g. MEDITS and MEDIAS) would not affect the information obtained
TOR 7	Scientific surveys
Justification	<p>Internationally coordinated scientific surveys include specific time frameworks in which their activities should be carried out, in order to reduce the variability of the data collected. For instance, according to the MEDITS handbook, the period of the MEDITS survey should be centered around June (from May to July) and keep the sampling period consistent among years. In relation to the MEDIAS handbook, the period of the MEDIAS survey should be in the summer and autumn season from June to October. June-July is the best period for MEDIAS survey for biological reasons, however depending on vessel availability the period could be extended to October.</p> <p>However, due to different reasons, the period can vary among GSAs and years and this could make that data obtained are not useful for the purposes of its collection. In this sense, it is requested to mark a limit of time, before and after the mentioned months, for which it is considered that the seasonality would not significantly affect the results of the information obtained.</p>
Follow-up actions needed	Establish a limit of time for which it is considered that the seasonality would not significantly affect the results.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Scientific survey Coordination Groups (e.g. MEDITS and MEDIAS), GFCM and STECF
Time frame/Deadline	Spring 2024
Comments	
Result DM 2023	
Comments DM 2023	HRV: Suggested to include end-users in the follow-up actions. Include STECF and GFCM. There is the need for some legislative buffer. HRV it is of the opinion that if the discussions go back to the groups, nothing will change.

Recommendation 06. Surveys – Quality checks	
Med&BS_2023_R06	Using the available tools for quality checks of data before being submitted to the Data Call
TOR 4 & TOR 7	Cooperation with regional projects/ Scientific surveys
Justification	<p>In the last years, several tools have been developed in order to check the quality of the data collected before being submitted to any data call, such as RoME for MEDITS survey or the RDBQC R package for the information obtained in the monitoring of the commercial fleet. In addition to this, the Qualitrain project will be providing training on quality checks, which will be a very good opportunity for building capacity and improve the quality of Med and BS data. Regarding these training activities, it is recommended that the hands-on training session foreseen in 2024 is scheduled in April not to clash with a too busy period already in May.</p> <p>All MS should be well aware of these tools which may help to provide consistent information to all end-users through the different data calls. It is also recommended that MS go into the QualiTrain github (https://github.com/COISPA/RDBqc) and follow-up the process of the project regarding quality checks. Additionally, there is a purpose to organise a network of training experts and two reference people by MS should be appointed to this group and work complementarily to the network of experts on data optimisation.</p>
Follow-up actions needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MS should use the available quality check tools to ensure the consistent information provided to end-users MS should appoint two experts to be part of the network organised by the Qualitrain project
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MSs, QualiTrain consortium
Time frame/Deadline	Before submitting information to any Data Call
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 07. Surveys – Acoustic data collection during the pelagic trawl surveys in the Black Sea	
Med&BS_2023_R07	Investigating the possibility to collect acoustic data during the Pelagic Trawl Survey in the Black Sea (PTSBS).
TOR 7	Scientific surveys
Justification	In order to have consistent and harmonized surveys for the assessment of pelagic species in the Black Sea the RCG recommends to the Black Sea Member States to ensure the availability and use of equipment according to MEDIAS protocol. In addition, Software and training could be provided by the MEDIAS scientific network.
Follow-up actions needed	Investigate the possibility to ensure the use of equipment according to MEDIAS protocol (e.g. Simrad EK80).
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	Bulgaria and Romania (both NC and experts), MEDIAS Coordination Group
Time frame/Deadline	End of 2023
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 08. Surveys – test study for new sampling during acoustic MEDIAS survey	
Med&BS_2023_R08	Including test studies in MS National Work Plans for egg and meso-zooplankton sampling and processing during MEDIAS surveys.
TOR 7	Scientific surveys
Justification	<p>According to the conclusions of MEDIAS steering committee in 2023 (Report of 16th meeting for Mediterranean International Acoustic Surveys) MSs shall explore the potential for plankton and eggs sampling in parallel with acoustic sampling. To achieve this objective, they are encouraged to seek funding for a test study via the DCF to cover additional efforts.</p> <p>The reasons for this proposal are numerous. First of all, sampling of plankton scattering layers using plankton nets could facilitate echogram interpretation by providing a ground truth of some targets in the acoustic data, so that, during the acoustic processing, these targets could be discarded with a higher degree of certainty, while separating the small pelagic fish echoes from unwanted plankton echoes. The accuracy of this process could be further enhanced through the knowledge of the kind of planktonic organisms that are prevalent in a certain area.</p> <p>Plankton and eggs sampling are also important because of the potential relationships between acoustic surveys and anchovy stock assessments based on the daily egg production method. Finally, by knowing plankton abundance it is possible to have an index of productivity, and thus prey availability, that is important in the study of small pelagic fish abundance over the years and of their spatial distribution; this ecosystem indicator could also be important in the Marine Strategy Framework Directive.</p> <p>This proposal may concern the MEDIAS surveys that are held along the Iberian coast (GSA 1 and 6) carried out by IEO (Spain), Gulf of Lion (GSA 7) by IFREMER (France), Sicily Channel (GSA 16 and 15) by CNR-IAS (Italy), western Adriatic Sea (GSA 17 and 18) by CNR-IRBIM (Italy), eastern Adriatic Sea (GSA 17) by IOR (Croatia) and eastern Ionian Sea and Aegean Sea (GSA 20 and 22) by HCMR (Greece). The proposal also concerns the acoustic survey carried out by CNR-IAS (Italy) in the Tyrrhenian and Ligurian seas (GSAs 9 and 10), that are part of the MEDIAS since 2017. However, MSs should include in their NWPs only those GSAs in which the test study could be carried out, taking into account an adequate timing of the study.</p> <p>A proper number of stations (depending on transect length) could be performed along dedicated transects in order to collect information on meso-zooplankton and eggs with an appropriate resolution. A 3-year test study can be carried out for this purpose. Thus, a proper financial support is needed in order to plan and perform this kind of activities, including funding for the acquisition of equipment for sampling (i.e. WP2 plankton nets, flow meter, laboratory staff for the preservation) and for the analysis of the samples (i.e. conventional counting under a microscope or using a ZooCAM a in-flow imaging system for fast</p>

Recommendation 08. Surveys – test study for new sampling during acoustic MEDIAS survey	
	onboard counting, sizing and classification of fish eggs and meso-zooplankton already used within the ICES WGACEGG working group).
Follow-up actions needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSs interested in adding these additional data collection activities should ensure that the above justification is included in the "test study" section (text box 1a) in their National Work Plans.
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	MSs from the MEDIAS group
Time frame/Deadline	Submission of the next NWP
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	No further comments

Recommendation 09. Data Calls – increasing demand on MS	
Med&BS_2023_R09	Identifying ways to facilitate the managing of the increasing number of data calls through different ways, such as looking for commonalities, specific times for the data calls or tools that may facilitate the work.
TOR 8	Regional data requirements
Justification	In the last years, an increasing number of data calls for Med and BS data have ended in a situation in which MSs found it difficult to answer all the data calls in time and with consistent information. This is peculiarly important as the data requested is often the same, but the different formats and details have increased the workload of the MSs. Although the implementation of the RDBFIS could be a solution at the medium term, it is necessary to identify ways to facilitate their management and adequate response. In this situation, end-users may have an important role in order to find commonalities, fitting an adequate calendar or even specific tools that may help MSs to answer to all the data calls in time. This discussion may be carried out in a group including all the end-users involved.
Follow-up actions needed	Reconvene the end users group to facilitate the managing of the increasing workload of MS with the data calls
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	End-users (STECF, GFCM, ICES), DGMARE, RCG chairs, MSs
Time frame/Deadline	Before next RCG Med&BS
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	ITA and ESP , both strongly support this recommendation.

Recommendation 10. RDBFIS – Regional Data Base	
Med&BS_2023_R10	Continue the close collaboration with RDBFIS consortium through the RDB Steering Committee, ensuring the supplementary role of the Steering Committee and the technical experts group from the consortium.
TOR 3 & TOR 4	Regional database/ Cooperation with regional projects
Justification	In recent years, the work of the RDB Steering Committee have been complemented with the activities carried out by the RDBFIS consortium. This close collaboration should go on, together with the MSs, in all the aspects involving the RDB and provision as data, such as the case of the data call for the Med and BS. For instance, RDBFIS consortium will provide MSs with the first draft of the data call to be able to have the format of the requested data that will be recurrently facilitated by the RDB itself.
Follow-up actions needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate to MS draft formats of the data call before it is launched • Respond the data call • Facilitate recurrent work for the RCGMed&BS (e.g. data call) • Feedback from MS experts participating in trainings
Responsible persons for follow-up actions	RDBFIS Consortium, RDB Steering Committee, RCG Med&BS, MS experts
Time frame/Deadline	Before next RCG Med&BS
Comments	
Comments DM 2023	

RCG Med&BS – Next season (2023 – 2024)

Chairing

→ Emmanuel Tressier (FRA) main chair and Charis Charilaou (CYP) co-chair.

Technical meeting – dates and venue

→ Venue in France, location TBD

→ Preliminary dates, last week of August, 26-30th Aug 2024

Intersessional groups

- ISSG/Workshop on the decision-making process for developing RWPs (Alessandro Ligas)
- ISSG/Workshop on recreational fisheries RWP (Paraskevi Karachle and Manos Koutrakis)
- ISSG/Workshop on PETs bycatch monitoring (TBD)
- ISSG/Workshop on RWP on fish stomachs collection and analysis (Paolo Sartor and Cristina Follesa)
- ISSG/Scientific Network for sampling optimization (Isabella Bitetto)